OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

1-2 GEORGE V., 1910-11

VOL. XCIX

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE NINETEENTH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE TWENTIETH DAY OF FEBRUARY, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY C. H. PARMELEE, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOS
EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1911

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 19, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS—FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Alberta Electric Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Western Central Railway Company.—Mr. Rankin.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT—LINE FENCES.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 95) to amend the Indian Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The object of this Bill is to amend section 45 of the Indian Act. That section deals with line fences between a reserve or the land of an Indian and the land of a white man, and by it the question of fences is left solely to the discretion of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. We have a band of Indians in my constituency and the line fences between the white settlers and the Indians have been in disrepair for many years. Application has been made to the department, but no remedy has been applied. The object of this amendment is to make the band of Indians amenable to municipal by-laws relating to line fences. Subsection 3 provides:—

The said band or the said Indian is hereby made amenable to any provincial law or municipal by-law regulating the question of line fences where the reserve is situated, and the said band is entitled to the same rights and privileges and is subject to the same liabilities thereunder as any other person.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

[The questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

THE FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. On what date and by whom was application for charter made by the provisional directors of the Farmers' Bank?
2. On what date or dates was the required deposit made with the Finance Department, and by whom and by what cash or cheques?
3. What steps were taken by the Treasury Board to satisfy the requirements of section 15 of the Bank Act?
4. What was the date of issue of the charter and to what persons?
5. Did the Finance Department or any of its officials, the Finance Minister or any other member of the government, receive any communications, verbal or written, previous to the issue of the certificate of the Treasury Board, cautioning, warning or suggesting inquiry as to the standing or character of the promoters, or the proceedings by which the deposit was procured?
6. If so, did the government make any inquiry or investigation with the view of satisfying itself as to the bona fides and sufficiency of the undertaking?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1 and 4. The application for a charter for the Farmers' Bank of Canada was made by way of petition, presented to the House of Commons on the 27th May, 1904. James Gallager and others were the petitioners. James Gallager, of Teeswater; John Watson, of Listowel; John Ferguson and Alex. Fraser, of Toronto; Alex. S. Lown, of Drayton, all of the province of Ontario, were the provisional directors under the charter granted by parliament (cap. 77, Acts of 1904) on the 18th July, 1904. On the 20th July, 1905 (cap. 92, Acts of 1905) the life of the charter so granted was prolonged for an additional year, and on the 26th June, 1906 (cap. 94, Acts of 1906) the further period of six months from July 18, 1906, was added to the time within which the

certificate from the Treasury Board might be obtained.

2. W. R. Travers deposited, on October 23, 1906, $250,000 to the credit of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General in the Bank of Montreal, Toronto, and the following day the receipt of the bank for this deposit was received in course of mail in the Department of Finance.

3. A statutory declaration by Walter R. Travers, the general manager of the bank, together with exhibits attached, setting out in detail the manner in which the requirements of the Bank Act and of the special Acts of incorporation were complied with, was filed on the application for the certificate under the provisions of the Bank Act. The evidence of publication of the various statutory notices was verified. This evidence was submitted to the Deputy Minister of Justice, who stated that the statements in the statutory declaration of Mr. Walter R. Travers were sufficient, if accepted, to show compliance with the statutory provisions, and that on such evidence the Treasury Board might lawfully accept, under the Act, and thereupon issue the certificate referred to. The certificate authorizing the bank to commence business was accordingly issued by the board on November 30, 1906.

5 and 6. As it is not possible to give an answer to these questions in the absence of the Minister of Finance, a reply is for the present deferred.

CANADIAN COMMISSIONER TO FRANCE.

* Mr. MONK :

1. On what date did the position of Canadian commissioner for Canada in France become vacant?

2. Has the government received any applications for the vacant situation?

3. What is the cause of the delay in providing a new commissioner?

4. Is it the intention of the government to make any changes in the organization of the said office? If so, what are the changes and alterations contemplated?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The position of Canadian Commissioner for France became vacant about the first of September.

2. The government has received no official application for the same.

3. The matter of the appointment of a new commissioner is now under consideration.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—SECURITY RE CONTRACT.

Mr. LENNOX :

1. What is the total amount on deposit with the government as security for performance of contract in connection with the National Transcontinental railway?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

2. What rate of interest is allowed or paid by the government on these deposits?

3. Is this interest periodically paid or is it allowed to accumulate?

4. If not periodically paid, is it periodically entered up, and at what intervals, to the credit of the contractor?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER :

1. $1,424,933.18.

2. The same rate of interest as that allowed by the post office and Government Savings Banks, namely, 3 per cent.

3. Interest is allowed to accumulate.

4. Interest is credited the account on the 31st March, each year.

GOVERNMENT STEAMER 'EARL GREY.'

Mr. STANFIELD :

1. What is the name, place of residence and occupation on ship of each member of the crew, men and officers, of the ss. 'Earl Grey'?

Mr. BRODEUR : Answer is as follows :

LIST OF CREW, WITH PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND OCCUPATION ON CANADIAN GOVERNMENT STEAMER "EARL GREY".

Name and occupation.	Place of residence.
Angus Brown, master	Wood Islands, P.E.I.
John L. Read, 1st officer	Pictou, N.S.
Fergus Ferguson, 2nd officer	Chance Harbour, N.S.
H. R. Cook, wireless "	Pictou, N.S.
John MacMillan, boatswain	Wood Islands, P.E.I.
L. Williamson, carpenter	Belfast, P.E.I.
John Blue, quartermaster	Little Sands, P.E.I.
John Campbell "	9-Mile Creek, P.E.I.
Geo. LeBlanc "	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Mungo Ferguson, watchman	White Sands, P.E.I.
Dougal McIsaac, deckhand	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
John McDonald "	Charlotteto wn, P.E.I.
Wallace McDonald "	Charlotteto wn, P.E.I.
Jas. Shephard "	Charlotteto wn, P.E.I.
Geo. Birch "	Lot 16, Central, P.E.I.
Murdock McDonald "	High Bank, P.E.I.
Gilbert Desroches "	Miscoucae, P.E.I.
Wm. Poole "	Souris, P.E.I
Archie Arsenault "	St. Gilbert, Prince County P.E.I.
Wm. Cousins "	Campbellton, P.E.I.
Geo. Roberts "	Pictou, N.S.

LIST OF CREW ON C. G. S. 'EARL GREY'—Con.

Name and occupation.	Place of residence
J. H. Hill, steward	Murray Harbour, P.E.I.
Rowland Beck, 2nd steward	Pictou, N.S.
Robt. Trainor, waiter	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Wm. Bears "	Murray River, P.E.I.
Alfred Hennessey, waiter	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
John Gillis, pantry boy	Shamrock, P.E.I.
Wm. Watts, cleaner	Tracadie, P.E.I
Alfred Kaneen "	St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I.
George Warry "	Southport, P.E.I.
Maurice Donovan, mess steward	Georgetown, P.E.I.
Wm. Hinds, cook	Halifax, N.S.
John Murphy, 2nd cook	New London, P.E.I.
Tena Trainor, stewardess	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Michael Cheverie, scullerymaid	Souris, P.E.I.
D. D. Ryan, purser	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Andrew Lavers, checker	Georgetown, P.E.I.
A. Smith, pilot	Pictou, N.S.
Wm. Grant, deck hand	Murray River, P.E.I.
P. W. Lyon, 1st engineer	Pictou, N.S.
Wm. Hislop, 2nd "	"
Geo. Harris, 3rd "	"
Alfred Baines, 4th "	"
Bryon Dickson, 5th "	"
James Arbing, 6th "	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Frank Coyle, storekeeper	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
James Donovan, Oiler	Georgetown, P.E.I.
Sam Martin, "	Glenwilliam, P.E.I.
James Wisner, "	Fort Agustus, P.E.I.
Wm. McFayden, "	Ellerslie, P.E.I.
Dan. Murphy, "	Halifax, N.S.
T. Ranahan, "	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
A. Stevenson, leading stoker	Pictou, N.S.
Neil Norrison, "	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
A. Herron, stoker	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
H. Ferguson, "	Perthshire, Scotland.
Dan. Chipman, "	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
C. Galbraith, "	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
H. McNeill, "	Charlottetown. P.E.I.
Frank McEachern, "	Georgetown, P.E.I.
G. Boudreau, stoker	Lower Montague, P.E.I.
S. Ferguson "	Charlottetown, P.E.I.

LIST OF CREW ON C. G. S. 'EARL GREY'—Con.

Name and occupation.	Place of residence.
E. White stoker	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
E. Cantwell "	Souris, P.E.I.
A. Blacquier "	Summerside,
D. Gillis "	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
M. McKenzie "	Pictou, N.S.
J. Jennings, trimmer	Souris, P.E.I.
J. Trainor "	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Wm. Butler "	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
A. Williamson "	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
C. McDonald "	Pictou, N.S.
L. Doyle "	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Geo. Knockton "	Pictou, N.S.
J. Dunn, fireman	Charlottetown, P.E.I.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BRADBURY:

1. Has any money been paid by the government to the St. Peter's Indians since the 1st day of August, 1910? If so, what was the money paid for, when was this money paid, and what amount was paid?

2. Was it paid at the suggestion of the Rev. Dr. McDougall? If so, what reason did he give for asking that this payment be made?

3. What position does the Rev. Dr. McDougall hold under the government, and what are his duties?

4. Did the Rev. Dr. McDougall report that the St. Peter's Indians are very much dissatisfied with the surrender?

5. Did the Rev. Dr. McDougall report that the Indians complain of the way in which they were treated in relation to the disposal of their lands?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes. The money was paid under the terms of the St. Peter's surrender; in October, 1910; $7,691.50.

2. No. Dr. McDougall was informed by the department before he left for St. Peter's towards the end of September, of the amount ready for distribution under the terms of the surrender and was instructed to report to the department when the Indians desired the payment to be made. He wired on the 20th of October as follows: 'Indians desire land money now.'

3. Rev. Dr. McDougall holds no permanent position in the government service, but is employed from time to time on special matters by the Indian Department and the Department of the Interior.

4. No.

5. No.

DRILL HALLS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. STAPLES:

1. What did the drill hall erected at Virden, Manitoba, cost, and what was the cost of the site?

2. What did the Brandon armoury and site cost, respectively?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. $11,827.65. Site was donated by the city corporation of Virden.

2. $66,859.14, including cost of site, $3,100.

VICTORIA MEMORIAL MUSEUM.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. What was the cost of the land acquired for the purpose of the Victoria Memorial Museum?

2. What was the contract price for the building?

3. What amounts have been paid to date, respectively, on account of original contract, and extras?

4. What work has still to be performed before the contract is complete?

5. Are the accumulations of unsightly buildings, lumber, stone, derricks and other machinery on the land adjacent to the museum required for the completion of the contract? If not, why are they not being removed?

6. Will the work of laying out the grounds be performed by the contractor, the Department of Public Works, or the Ottawa Improvement Commission?

7. What is the quantity of floor space in the museum?

8. Have the several rooms been allocated? If so, for what?

9. What proportion of the space in the building is being utilized for administrative purposes?

10. What amount of space will be set apart for the Fisheries Exhibit and the National Art Gallery respectively?

11. Is it the intention to mount the large collection of birds and skins, which were stored in the old museum, so that students and the public may study them?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. $76,041.44, including legal expenses, &c.

2. $950,000.

3.

On contract	$941,580 00
" Heating	41,400 00
" Electric wiring	14,500 00
" Ventilation	23,400 00
" Elevators	22,500 00
" Carving and modelling	17,227 03
" Additional work, fitting up Art Gallery	10,752 00
" Drain	4,500 00

4. The only work on the contract to be completed is the lower stair railing.

5. No. The contractor has been notified to remove them.

6. Not decided.

7. 145,303 superficial feet.

Mr. OLIVER.

8. Three floors of east wing for Art Gallery and balance of building for Geological Survey.

9 and 10. The floor space in building is divided as follows:

Offices, portion of basement and 2nd floors, superficial feet	14,547
Exhibition room	71,660
Auditorium	6,568
Library	4,986
Art gallery	12,448
Halls, corridors and lavatories	28,942
Boiler, fan and store rooms	6,152
Total feet	145,303

11. It is the intention to mount some of the birds and skins for public display and to prepare and place the remainder in scientific collections accessible to students.

FISHERY OFFICER AT GRAND MANAN.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Is there an officer of the government stationed at or near Grand Manan, N.B., to prevent the dynamiting of pollock, or other fish?

2. If so, what is his name, occupation, residence, when was he appointed, what salary is he paid, and to whom does he report?

3. What means are at his command to prevent the schools of pollock being dynamited?

4. Has the government been informed of the dynamiting of pollock in the vicinity of Grand Manan, since the date of the appointment of such officer, if any?

5. If so, when, by whom, in what instances, and on whose complaint were penalties imposed?

6. In what instances, if any, penalties collected, and have any such been refunded in whole or in part? If so, which?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Yes, one at Whitehead, Grand Manan.

2. I. D. Irving, fishery guardian and fisherman, Whitehead, August 23, 1907, $15 per month. Inspector of fisheries, John F. Calder.

3. A gasoline motor boat.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. None since date in question.

MANUFACTURE OF MATCHES.

Mr. DANIEL:

1. How many persons were employed in the match factory in Hull, Quebec, for each year respectively, from 1900 to 1909 inclusive?

2. In the said respective years how many of such employees at Hull were affected with disease of bone due to phosphorus, and what was the actual number in each of such years?

3. The same information for the same years as to the employees in the match factory in Halifax, N.S., and as to the number of such employees affected with phosphorus necrosis?

4. And the same information for the same years as to the employees in the match factory at Hampton, N.B., and as to the number of

such employees affected with phosphorus necrosis?

He said: An asterisk was put on this question, but there is no asterisk in the printed notice. If the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) has the answer, I would ask him to give it, because the subject may come up this afternoon.

Mr. KING:

1. The government is not in possession of information as to the number of persons employed in the match factory at Hull, Quebec, for the years mentioned. It is understood that the number of employees in the factory in question is at the present time about 200.

2, 3 and 4. This has not been definitely ascertained. I may say, however, that the government has instances of necrosis, and I will give information to the House on that subject when we come to the discussion. But it was impossible to ascertain the exact number of cases. That is why the answer is not more complete.

YUKON—REPEAL OF BEER IMPORT TAX.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that the ordinance made by His Excellency the Governor General in Council in virtue of the provisions of section 16 of the Yukon Act, chapter 63 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, on the 9th day of December, 1909, and intituled: 'An Ordinance to rescind an Ordinance respecting the imposition of a tax upon ale, porter, beer or lager beer imported into the Yukon Territory,' a copy of which was, on the 13th day of January, 1911, laid before this House for its approval under section 17 of the said chapter 63, is now so approved.

Mr. OLIVER. Provision is made in the Yukon Act that the commissioner in council may make ordinances for the control and regulation of the sale of and traffic in liquor in the territory, subject to the provisions of any ordinance of the Governor in Council. In accordance with a resolution of the Yukon Council requesting the passage of an ordinance by the Governor in Council, an ordinance was passed in 1908 levying a tax of 50 cents a gallon on beer imported into the Yukon Territory. After an experience of one year of this tax, the Yukon Council saw fit to change its mind and pass a resolution asking that the tax be repealed. In accordance with the wish of the Yukon Council, an ordinance was passed by the Governor in Council repealing that tax. It is this ordinance of repeal to which the assent of parliament is now asked.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Does the minister intend to found a Bill on this resolution?

Mr. OLIVER. No. The Yukon Act requires that when an ordinance of this nature has been passed by the Governor in Council it shall be placed before parliament for its consideration and approval. If parliament disapprove of it it falls to the ground, but, if parliament approves of it, it remains effective.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is this the first time the Governor in Council has placed a tax on these liquors in the Yukon?

Mr. OLIVER. I think this is the first occasion on which a tax was placed on beer imported into the Yukon.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What led the council to ask that this be done in 1908?

Mr. OLIVER. It pleased them to do so.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They very soon found they wanted it changed.

Mr. OLIVER. That is true. But, of course, I cannot hold myself responsible for the forming of opinion of the Yukon Council or for the change of that opinion. But, we thought that as it was a matter pertaining to local revenue we were warranted in following their resolution.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Did not the government receive a revenue a number of years ago from liquors going into the Yukon?

Mr. OLIVER. From spirituous liquors. That remains; it has not been interfered with.

Mr. FOSTER. I had supposed that a Bill would be founded on this motion, but the minister tells us that is not the case. This, I understand, is to rescind a tax which has been, up to this time, leviable and levied, the proceeds of which have gone into the revenue of the Yukon.

Mr. OLIVER. No, we passed an ordinance in 1908 to levy such a tax; but, in 1909, at the request of the Yukon Council, we passed an ordinance repealing the ordinance of 1908, thereby repealing the tax. Now, it is the repeal of the tax that we ask the House to approve of. As soon as the ordinance was passed by the Governor in Council, the tax was thereupon and thereby repealed. It remains repealed if parliament approves of that order; if parliament does not approve of that order, then the order in council of 1908, establishing the tax, would, of course, again become effective.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, it is a question whether we leave this tax on or not?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That affects their revenue?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. To what extent?

Mr. OLIVER. It would not be possible for me to give a reply to that question without a reference to the records. And I fear it would not be possible to give an answer without a reference to the records of the Yukon. I am not certain that we have the information here that would enable me to give the answer.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that makes it a rather important matter for us to think about. If there is any shortage in carrying on the affairs of the Yukon—which is a very costly appendage to the Dominion at the present time, under the government of my hon. friends opposite—Canada as a whole must come to the rescue. Prima facie, articles like this, I think, should bear a tax, and usually do. What in the world is the reason actuating the Yukon Council in taking off the tax? The matter of revenue is so important that I do not think the minister ought to put his resolution through without giving us information as to how this affects the revenue. Does not the minister think that reasonable?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not agree at all with the view of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). The Yukon Council is an elective body, not a nominative body, as it was a few years ago. It has pleased the people of the Yukon to elect the council, and the council have come to this conclusion. If it was a body independent of our control, I could appreciate the objection of my hon. friend. But this is now an elective body, and therefore they carry with them the will of the people of the Yukon.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is a weak point in the argument of my right hon. friend. If they are elective and therefore their will should be carried out, what business have we with this thing here at all? But the very legislation under which they are acting is legislation of such a kind that this parliament holds the final approval of the matter in its own hands, and that is why the minister comes here. If the Prime Minister wants to give full democratic elective legislative power to the Yukon Council, let him get rid of anything which makes it necessary to bring down to this House the ordinances and laws passed by that democratic body. Evidently the meaning of the law was that there should be a supervision over them, and I think properly, in this sense, that after all, we have to come to the rescue in all financial matters with reference to the Yukon. It is inconsistent in the Prime Minister to demand this to be carried out. If he stands on the ground of representative power, let him abolish the necessity for revising their acts in this parliament. Does not my right hon. friend think that is right?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I think my hon. friend's memory is short. This law was passed when a council for the Yukon was adopted. That council was not elective but was nominated by this government, and therefore to a certain extent, we were responsible for their actions. Also, if my memory does not fail me, this provision was introduced at the time giving power to this parliament to review the acts of this nominative body, and I think it was at the suggestion of the hon. member for North Toronto himself that it was done. I think, if he will consult 'Hansard' he will find that it was his own suggestion, and a good one it was, that when the council was nominated by us, we should keep a hand over it. But since that time the council has been made elective, and though the council was made elective this provision was not abolished, and still we have to comply with the law, and give the sanction of parliament to this ordinance. Now my view of the matter is this, and I think my hon. friend will agree with me, that unless we are prepared to substitute our own wisdom for the wisdom of the Yukon Council, and to say that we know better what is good for the people of that territory than they know themselves, then we can say that we have power not to accept this, and to set it aside. But I think, unless there is a strong reason to the contrary, there is a prima facie case why this ordinance should be passed.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister has stated something which alters the case. But he must not hold me at fault, although he says it was a proper restriction to make when the council was nominated; I think it was. But when it was changed from a nominative to an elective body, that changed the basis, and the Prime Minister himself should have seen that this legislation was taken off, so that we would not lay traps for the unwary. But it seems to me it would be instructive to this House and to the people at large, if we could know why it is that an exception is made in the gay and merry Yukon, by not taxing commodities which in every other part of the Dominion, I think in almost every civilized country, are considered properly taxable. Surely the minister has some information with reference to that.

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say what might have been the inner reason for their so doing. But it was thought wise by this government in the early history of the Yukon, to make provision not only for the levying of the ordinary license fees upon the retail and wholesale sale of liquors within the Yukon territory—which, of course, is

provided for, and which does exist under the authority of the Yukon council—but it was thought proper that in addition a tax of $2 per gallon should be put on spirituous liquors taken into the Yukon territory over and above any customs duty or inland revenue. It was a super tax of $2 per gallon on liquor taken in, which I understand goes to the revenue of the Yukon territory. There was no such tax on beer. As I have said, I cannot give the inner reason why the idea struck the Yukon council in the year 1907, but the idea apparently did strike them; that the precedent in the case of the stronger intoxicant should be followed at a measurable distance in the case of the weaker intoxicant, and that if $2 a gallon was charged on spirituous liquor, it would be proper to charge fifty cents under like circumstances on malt liquor. They passed a resolution in accordance with that idea, and we acted upon it. After a year's experience I do not know why they saw fit to rescind their former resolution ; but they did, and we followed that by our action.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, we are getting down to a point where we can appreciate the whole case. As I understand it, this is an import duty—

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Which no province of the Dominion has a right to put on, and which the Yukon has exercised, and which we for a time exercised, and the benefit of that went to the Yukon. So it was done by this House for the benefit of the Yukon. The import duty on spirituous liquors is still on, but it is proposed now that the import duty on malt liquors shall be taken off, as I understand it, and as I think the House understood it. It would be a dangerous thing, to give an idea that in the Yukon you had free beer and whisky, and if that impression were to go abroad we might have less members of parliament here than we have now.

Mr. CROSBY. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior whether that tax of 50 cents a gallon pertains to all beers made in Canada, or only to those imported. I would like to know if there is any way by which we can discover whether there is any beer imported into the Yukon outside of Canadian beer.

Mr. OLIVER. It applies to foreign made beer, not to Canadian or British made beer.

Mr. CROSBY. Does the Yukon make any returns to this government, which would give us some idea of the amount of beer consumed in that territory?

Mr. OLIVER. They do not make any returns, under the system of government now prevailing they would not be required to make any returns. I do not think it would be possible to get the information my hon. friend desires. I could, however, inquire of the Yukon government, and get such information as may be possible, and give him the advantage of it later on.

Mr. CROSBY. That will be satisfactory.

Resolution reported, and agreed to.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL UNDER DOMINION LANDS ACT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that the following orders in council made by His Excellency the Governor General in Council under the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act, chapter 20 of the Statutes of 1908, on the dates respectively mentioned, that is to say:—

1. P.C. No. 729, dated 20th April, 1910, made under the provisions of section 37 of the said chapter 20, rescinding the regulation for the disposal of coal mining rights established by order in council of the 9th May, 1907, and amending orders in council, dated respectively 16th February and 9th December, 1909, and establishing new regulations in lieu thereof.

2. P.C. No. 1012, dated 25th May, 1910, amending P.C. No. 729, dated 20th April, 1910, respecting the disposal of coal mining rights.

3. P.C. No. 2469, dated 9th December, 1909, rescinding section 3 of the coal mining regulations established by order in council of the 9th May, 1907, and substituting a new provision.

4. P.C. No. 186, dated 31st January, 1910, as to the charging of royalty upon the output of coal mines.

5. P.C. No. 3, dated 17th January, 1910, making regulations for the issue of permits to remove sand, stone and gravel, the property of the Crown, from the submerged beds of rivers and lakes in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, the Northwest Territories and within the railway belt of the province of British Columbia.

6. P.C. No. 762, dated 21st April, 1910, rescinding section 3 of the regulations, established by order in council of the 17th January, 1910, for the issue of permits to move sand, stone and gravel, the property of the Crown, from the beds of rivers and lakes in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, the Northwest Territories, and within the railway belt in the province of British Columbia, and substituting a new section 3 therefor.

7. P.C. No. 313, dated 22nd February, 1910, amending the regulations established by the order in council of the 17th January, 1910, for the issue of permits to remove sand, stone and gravel, the property of the Crown, from the submerged beds of rivers and lakes in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Northwest Territories, and within the railway belt in the province of British Columbia.

8. P.C. No. 933, dated 13th May, 1910, made in virtue of the provisions of subsection (b)

of section 3, section 38 and subsection (k) of section 76 of the Dominion Lands Act, approving the regulations annexed thereto for the leasing and administration of lands containing limestone, granite, slate, marble, gypsum, marl, gravel, sand, or any building stone, in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, the Northwest Territories, within twenty miles on either side of the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway in the province of British Columbia, and in the tract of three and one-half million acres acquired by the government of the Dominion from the province of British Columbia and referred to in subsection (b) of section 3 of the Dominion Lands Act.

9. P.C. No. 414, dated 11th March, 1910, rescinding the regulations governing the disposal of petroleum and natural gas rights the property of the Crown, in Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, established by order in council dated the 31st May, 1901, the 22nd December, 1902, the 23rd March, and the 1st of October, 1904, the 22nd of July, 1905, and the 26th December, 1906, and substituting therefor the regulations annexed.

10. P.C. No. 277, dated 14th February, 1910, approving and establishing regulations governing the disposal of tar-sand deposits, the property of the Crown, in that portion of the province of Alberta lying north of township 80, and between the 4th and 5th initial meridians, under and in accordance with the provisions of section 37 of the Dominion Lands Act, being chapter 20 of 7-8 Edward VII.

11. P.C. No. 188, dated 9th May, 1910, rescinding clause (m) of number 17 of the regulations governing the granting of yearly licenses and permits to cut timber on Dominion lands, and substituting therefor a new clause (m).

12. P.C. No. 2103, dated 15th October, 1909, ordering that provision be made in the regulations governing the granting of yearly licenses and permits to cut timber on Dominion Lands, for the issue of yearly permits in the Peace River district to portable sawmill owners, whereby each such owner shall be permitted to cut timber on a definitely described tract of land not exceeding one square mile in extent, the quantity not to exceed 200,000 feet B.M. Dues shall be paid at the rate of 75 cents per thousand feet B.M., 20 per cent being payable in advance and the balance at the expiration of the permit.

13. P.C. No. 261, dated 1st March, 1910, amending section 29 of the Quartz Mining Regulations, approved by order in council of the 13th August, 1908, by adding the following paragraph thereto:—

'The grant issued for such a location shall include the right to the iron and mica only, and shall not include the surface. The grantee may, however, upon application, be permitted to purchase at the rate of $10 an acre whatever area of the available surface rights thereof the minister may consider necessary for the efficient and economical working of the rights granted.'

14. P.C. No. 595, dated 20th April, 1910, amending the regulations established under the order in council of the 2nd June, 1909, governing the mode of granting water-power rights in connection with Dominion Lands in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

15. P.C. No. 91, dated 21st January, 1910, ordering that the dues payable under permits to cut timber under Timber Licenses issued for tracts of unsurveyed lands which, upon survey, become school lands, shall be 50 cents per 1,000 feet B.M. and the rental $5 per square mile.

Copies of each of which orders in council were laid before this House on the 11th day of January, 1911, for the approval of this House under the provisions of section 77 of the said Act, are now so approved.

On resolution No. 1,

Mr. OLIVER. Order 729, as stated in the resolution, is an amendment of the regulations for the disposal of coal lands which regulations were passed in 1907. After two years of operation it was found desirable to make amendments in certain minor particulars, but particularly in regard to the location of lands so as to secure proper priority to the person who actually located. In order to reach this end, instead of making an amendment to certain sections, it was thought advisable rather to draft an entirely new set of regulations for the information of the public, so that any person who had a copy of the regulations would have the law on the subject complete. There is no material difference between the regulations of 1910 and those of 1907.

For the information of the committee I may say that the regulations of 1907 made a very radical change from the regulations that prevailed previously. Up to that time coal lands were disposed of by sale at a fixed price per acre. The coal right was sold at $7 an acre and the surface right in addition, at an additional price of $3 per acre, so that up to the passage of the order in council of 1907 the condition was that any person had the right to apply for and purchase coal and surface rights at $10 an acre.

Mr. SPROULE. Had he the right to purchase any quantity?

Mr. OLIVER. No, he had only the right to purchase 320 acres, but he had the right to assign or take an assignment so that the effect was that any person might acquire any area of land that he saw fit to buy at that price. There was, however, a royalty of ten cents per ton upon the coal mined. The effect of these regulations was, first, to give an opportunity to acquire valuable surface rights when the policy and administration did not look to the acquirement of such rights by private individuals. Where the surface right had appreciated in value so as to be worth more than $10 an acre and where the ordinary purchaser could not acquire that land, an individual might come forward and, by applying for it as coal land, could acquire it subject, of course, to

the royalty on the mined coal. But the fact of the royalty being ten cents per ton deterred the mining of coal upon that land because a great deal of land had passed from the hands of the Crown in the early days without any condition of royalty, and as there was plenty of such land to furnish an opportunity for coal operators the ten cents per ton royalty was a bar to development. The $10 per acre price afforded an opportunity for speculation and the ten cents per ton royalty was a bar to development. In 1907 the regulations were changed so that coal lands would not be sold, so that only the right to the coal could be acquired and that under lease at a rental per year. At the same time the royalty on coal to be mined was reduced from ten cents to five cents a ton upon such leased land, the result of which was that the man who wanted to acquire coal land for actual development found his opportunity improved by the change in the regulations because he acquired the right to operate by the payment of a yearly rental and on his operation he paid only half as much royalty as in the former case.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me to interrupt him for a moment, only for the sake of getting clearly at this legislation—the minister will see that this is just the same as if he brought down fifteen Bills and put them before the House with the idea that the House would legislate upon them. If they were Bills they would be on file and every member would have the Bills and could study their provisions and go along with the minister in his explanations. These orders in council have been brought down, they have been put on the table of the House, but the clerk has put them in his capacious pocket and spirited them away, and from that hour up to this not a single member of parliament has seen one of them unless he has been curious or wise enough to get at them and look into them. Under these circumstances it seems to me that it is absolute blindness for us to pass fifteen Bills really simply from the minister's explanations, which are plain enough, but, although we listened to the explanations we cannot form a judgment upon them because they are diffuse, and there are too many of them. In some way or other, if legislation like this is to take place, orders in council ought to be treated the same as Bills, printed and put before the members so that we could have them the same as Bills. This just occurs to me; it is all a blind piece of work to me; I try to follow it as nearly as I can, and I think the same would be true with regard to most members of the House. It is important legislation. Does the minister not know any way by which he could suggest a more intelligent consideration of the matter than this? I suppose these orders in council are fairly voluminous, are they, or are they rather short?

Mr. OLIVER. They are not very long.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will suggest to the minister that it would make things far better if he would print a stated number of them so that each member of the House would have his copy the same as he would have a Bill and then in a little time take them up. Does the minister not think that would be a better way?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no objection, I know of, to following the hon. gentleman's suggestion, but I may say that I am merely following the terms of the statute and the precedent of other years.

Mr. FOSTER. If we had not so many of them thrown at us at once it would not be so bad.

Mr. OLIVER. We have every desire that every member should have the fullest information. These regulations have been printed for the information of every person interested, and I assumed there was sufficient information in the hands of members to enable them to form their judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably the minister has a sufficient number printed now.

Mr. OLIVER. Very likely. I do not know whether there would be enough of the order in council in its original form, but I think we would have sufficient copies of the information which was prepared for general use.

Progress reported.

CLOTHING OF DISCHARGED CONVICTS

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to say a word with reference to a matter that was brought to the attention of the House yesterday by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). It was stated that some articles had appeared in local newspapers complaining of the hardship a prisoner had suffered in being discharged from the penitentiary at Kingston at a time when the thermometer was below zero, with insufficient clothing. On seeing the article in the newspaper, I instructed a report on the subject to be asked at once from the warden of the penitentiary. That report has reached me this morning, and I think the substance of it ought to be made public in justice to the warden. This particular prisoner was released under direction of His Excellency as an exercise of clemency a few months before the expiration of his sentence by effluxion of time. He was a man liable to be deported to the United States, a citizen of the United States. All necessary inquiries and arrangements for his deportation as soon as

he should be released from the penitentiary had been previously made, and an officer of the Immigration Department was in readiness to escort him across the boundary. The warden says that upon receiving the order for the release of the prisoner he stated that fact to the prisoner, and told him that if he wished he might remain longer in the penitentiary until he could communicate with his friends in the United States or elsewhere if he had any hope that he would receive money from them. It was the prisoner's own wish that he should not wait for any such communication, but should be released at the earliest moment possible. He was accordingly allowed to go. But before leaving the penitentiary he was furnished with the clothing which he had when he came into the institution, and also with a complete new suit, boots, cap and underwear, and he was also furnished with five dollars in money. Instructions were given to the immigration officer who was to accompany him to Ogdensburg that no part of this five dollars was to be expended within Canada. The prisoner was, therefore, when he arrived at Ogdensburg, not penniless, or in the condition which has been represented, and the regulations of the penitentiary, as well as the interests of ordinary humanity, have, in this case, I think, been fully complied with.

COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT.

Mr. MADDIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Labour when he will have ready for the House the report under the Combines Investigation Act, also whether regulations have been passed pursuant to the provisions of section 45 of the Act, and when we may expect the report of all such investigations as may have taken place under that statute, or whether any investigations at all have taken place.

Mr. KING. Such report as there is to present has been presented to the House already in connection with the report of the Department of Labour. The hon. member will find in the annual report of the department the information he has asked for.

Mr. MADDIN. Section 46 of the Act says that the minister shall lay before parliament within the first 15 days of the next session the annual report of proceedings under this Act. I submit that a mere reference to it in the report of the Department of Labour is not a report such as was contemplated by this section of the Act. One would look in vain for a report of the proceedings under this Act if he were to search for it in the annual report of the Department of Labour. I submit that the minister should lay before this parliament the report required under section 46 of the Act.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH.

THE HAGUE TRIBUNAL—FISHERIES REGULATIONS.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take this opportunity to refer to the negotiations which took place last week in Washington with reference to the differences still at that time existing between the government of the United States and this country in regard to the regulations and laws governing the operation of Canadian fisheries in Atlantic waters. It will be remembered that one of the principal questions in dispute referred to the arbitrament of the tribunal at The Hague was the question whether the legislation of Canada or of Newfoundland could be considered binding upon citizens of the United States while exercising their treaty privileges within British waters; so long as such legislation had not been assented to by the government or Congress of the United States. If the decision of that question had upheld the contention of the United States that such legislation was not binding upon fishermen coming from that country into Canadian or Newfoundland waters it is plain, of course, that there would have been no further question in relation to any of our future or existing legislation. Such legislation would have been the enactment of regulations with which the inhabitants of the United States would have no concern, and it would have been indifferent to them what regulations we or Newfoundland might see fit to pass. The decision of that question, however, was in favour of the British contention, maintaining the sovereign right of Britain and her colonies to legislate with regard to these territorial waters, and maintaining equally that such legislation, so long as it did not transgress the provisions of the treaty under which the United States fishermen claim their right of access to our waters, would be equally binding upon such fishermen as upon our own people. That decision having been pronounced, it at once became a practical question what disposition should be made of the existing legislation and regulations on the part of Canada and Newfoundland.

The United States had taken formal objection before the tribunal to practically the whole of both Canadian and Newfoundland fisheries legislation, taking the position that, for one reason or another, all of this legislation contravened the true intent and meaning of the Treaty of 1818 and therefore, ought to be pronounced as of no effect so far as the fishermen from the United States was concerned. The disposition of that question, which had been agreed to by the parties in coming to their arrangement for arbitration, was that it should be pronounced upon by the tribunal itself. It was for that we had stipulated, it was that which we expected; but

when the award was pronounced in September last, the tribunal, instead of proceeding to deal with these objections, made by the United States to existing Canadian and Newfoundland legislation, referred the whole of such legislation to a subordinate tribunal which the main tribunal then directed should be constituted, such subordinate tribunal to consist of one representative from the United States, one from Great Britain and one appointed by the tribunal. The government of the United States appointed as its representative, Dr. Smith, the leading official, I think, of their fisheries department ; the government of Great Britain appointed Mr. Morison, the Attorney General of Newfoundland ; and the tribunal itself appointed as the third member, Dr. Hoëk, professional adviser on the subject of fisheries of the government of the Netherlands. We were thus left in a position with regard to our existing Canadian legislation which was, to say the least, not a very satisfactory one. We had no representative from Canada upon this subordinate board which was to consider all of the Canadian legislation and regulations, and report to the main tribunal, leaving the parties, if dissatisfied with the conclusions of the subordinate board, to be heard before the main tribunal upon that tribunal reconvening at the Hague at some future time. For the reason that this disposition of the matter was not the one we had expected and which we thought we were entitled to by the stipulations of our agreement to arbitrate and not one which was in itself, satisfactory, it was thought that probably more could be accomplished by personal negotiation with representatives of the United States than by prolonging the litigation—more than could be hoped from any legal argument and examination in detail of the provisions before the subordinate board with a further appeal, if it should be necessary, to the principal tribunal; and because of the delay and the great expense which such a continuation of the litigation would necessarily involve, the course of amicable negotiation was very much preferred. Efforts were accordingly begun immediately after the announcing of the award in September last ; and by correspondence through the foreign office of Great Britain, an arrangement was made for a conference at Washington on the 9th of January last, at which representatives of the parties interested might meet and discuss the whole subject. Accordingly that conference was held on Monday of last week, at which there were present on the part of the United States government its Secretary of State, Mr. Knox, with his counsellor or assistant, Mr. Chandler Anderson, who had been the agent for the United States in the proceedings before the Hague tribunal, and Dr. Smith, the professional head or adviser of the Fisheries Department, along with Mr. Robert Lansing, one of the counsel for the United States during the proceedings at the Hague last summer. On the part of Great Britain, Mr. Ambassador Bryce and his secretary, Mr. Young, attended, accompanied by Sir Edward Morris, the Prime Minister of Newfoundland and Captain O'Reilly, a fisheries officer of Newfoundland, and on the part of Canada, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), and myself, with Dr. Wakeham, the fisheries officer in charge of operations in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Meetings were had twice each day during the week and as a result of these ten or a dozen meetings, I am very glad to be able to say, that I think all our existing difficulties with regard to the fisheries, up to the present known, have been satisfactorily cleared up.

We had not only to consider the legislation and regulations of Canada, but those of Newfoundland as well. And after going through in detail, section by section and clause by clause, the whole of these regulations, the difference between the views entertained on the part of the United States and those entertained in this country and in Newfoundland seemed pretty well to classify themselves under general heads. It became reasonably evident, in the course of discussion, that at present at any rate it would not be possible for Newfoundland and the United States to agree. All parties were agreed in disliking the disposition of the matter which had been made by the award of last September. Every person present was convinced that a great deal could be done by conference, by explanation, by possible modification of any objectionable provisions of the regulations and by reasonable effort to come to a friendly understanding. And it was thought that if such effort should fail a much better practical means of settling the difficulty than the one which the tribunal had directed, could be found in the constitution of an independent board or mixed commission, one for Newfoundland and one for Canada, on which boards the United States should in each instance have its representative, and Canada and Newfoundland respectively, have theirs, with the intervention of a third man, who should not be a native of either country, in the event of the presence of such a third man being necessary. Accordingly, after going over all of the positions which were in question and discussing the whole situation generally, an agreement was reached on Wednesday of last week and that agreement was incorporated into a Minute of these Conferences, by which Minute it is agreed that this disposition of the matter which I have described, should be substituted for that which is directed by the award of last

September. This Minute of Conference is a short memorandum on the subject signed by all of the gentlemen who were engaged in the negotiations, and it reads as follows:—

Minutes of conferences held at Washington the 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th of January, 1911, as to the application of the award delivered on the 7th September, 1910, in the North Atlantic coast fisheries arbitration to existing regulations of Canada and Newfoundland.

The undersigned having considered in detail and with expert assistance the steps to be taken in consequence of the award in connection with the objections of the United States government to existing regulations of the fisheries in Canadian and Newfoundland treaty waters, as recorded in protocol XXX. of the proceedings before the tribunal of arbitration, and having conferred as to the best means of dealing with these objections, have arrived at the following conclusion:—

It is unnecessary to refer any existing regulations to the commission of experts mentioned in the award in application of article III. of the special agreement of January 27, 1909, or to reconvene the tribunal of arbitration; but any difference in regard to the regulations specified in protocol XXX., which shall not have been disposed of by diplomatic methods, shall be referred to the Permanent Mixed Fishery Commissions to be constituted as recommended by the Hague award, under article IV. of the special agreement in the same manner as a difference in regard to future regulations would be so referred under the recommendations in the award, unless by mutual consent some other rules and method of procedure are adopted.

It will be observed that this minute recognizes as the most desirable method of getting rid of the existing difficulties, diplomatic negotiations, and provides that failing diplomatic negotiations, the next best way in the opinion of those who signed the minute was the constitution of the special mixed fisheries commissions which the tribunal had recommended for settling future differences, if future differences ever arose, and that disposition of the matter by reference to these permanent mixed commissions was the one which the minute recommends to be adopted, unless by mutual consent, some other rule or method of procedure should be devised and agreed to. On the part of Newfoundland, it was thought when this minute was signed on Thursday evening last, that no further progress could at present be made, and in that view Sir Edward Morris and Captain O'Reilly left Washington on Thursday night. On the part of my colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself the hope was entertained in view of the discussions which had then occupied four days of the week, that so far as Canadian legislation and regulations went, further conferences might not prove ineffective. Accordingly, before Sir Edward Morris left Washington, we discussed with him the whole situation, and our belief that an accommodation of all difficulties so far as Canada was concerned might be reached by further discussion, and with his full acquiescence and assent, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself remained at Washington with the object of renewing our conferences on the part of Canada alone during Friday and Saturday of last week. We had four meetings on those two days, morning and afternoon of each day, and as the result of these meetings we have reached such an agreement which, of course, applies to Canada and to Canada only. We found that the objections which were taken on the part of the United States to Canadian legislation with regard to the fisheries practically ranged themselves under four heads. They objected to our prohibition of purse seining, they objected to our prohibition of Sunday fishing, they objected to our system of issuing licenses to the individual fishermen, and they objected finally to the provision of our regulations authorizing the going on board of a United States vessel and searching her if she was suspected of any infraction of our regulations.

Mr. FOSTER. Would these infractions include customs regulations, or only fishery regulations, in the case of boarding and searching?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Customs regulations were not made the subject of discussion last week at all and no difficulty, I think, can arise in the future so far as customs regulations go, because the award of the tribunal has been quite clear in directing how far and just how far we have a right to impose customs regulations upon United States fishing vessels. However, probably some changes will require to be made in our customs regulations in consequence of the award. To mention one, I might point out that under the terms of the modus vivendi of 1888 a fishing vessel coming by reason of distress or for wood, water or repairs into a Canadian harbour was not required to report at customs unless she remained more than 24 hours. The tribunal at The Hague in its award last September changed that period to 48 hours so that under the award a United States fishing vessel so coming into a Canadian harbour has a right to remain without reporting for two days instead of one. No doubt that regulation will require to be changed and there will be some other details with respect to our customs regulations which will need to be made to conform to the directions of the award. Customs regulations, therefore, were not under discussion last week in any shape, but we limited ourselves to the fishery regulations applicable to the treaty waters on the shores of the Magdalen Islands, and on

the Labrador north coast of the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

To summarize—and I need not do more than summarize because the details of the discussion back and forward are not of interest—we have succeeded in persuading, in convincing the representatives of the United States that there is nothing wrong, that there is nothing unduly burdensome or discriminating against them in either our provision for boarding and searching a United States suspected vessel or in our prohibition of Sunday fishing or of purse seining. We, of course, called the attention of the representatives of the United States government to the fact that the provision for boarding or searching a vessel was a necessary regulation of police ; that it applied to any suspected vessel ; that the control and policing of these waters was necessarily with the Canadian government as they were Canadian territorial waters ; and that no one ought to object to reasonable investigation if the circumstances seemed to justify suspicion; and, at all events, in the result, their objection to that provision of our law has been withdrawn.

In regard to the fishing during prohibited hours on Sunday, we, of course, pointed out that it was in the interests of the fisheries themselves that a season of rest weekly should be given to the fish; that the water where they are should not be daily and hourly threshed and disturbed by the setting and hauling of nets, and the fish harried from place to place, so that, perhaps, they might ultimately be so disturbed as to induce them permanently to leave. We pointed out that these regulations applied equally to Canadian fishermen. The objection made to these regulations was that they bore more hardly upon the fishermen coming from the United States; that these men, coming long distances and desiring to obtain their cargo and return as speedily as possible, were prohibited from exercising their calling on Sunday, even though they might be alongside the largest school of mackerel or herring, but the Canadian fisherman might set his net on the Saturday night and leave it catching fish for him over Sunday against the time, on Monday morning, when he might go to get his haul, and that, in that respect, the fishermen from the United States were placed at a very substantial disadvantage if this prohibition of Sunday fishing were to be enforced. Our regulations, however, were in such a shape that they were not open to this objection, because it was provided in our regulations that no net which is set should be allowed to remain out over Sunday or during prohibited hours unless a sufficient means of escape for the fish was provided by some apparatus in the net; and, on pointing out these regulations which, up to that time, apparently, had not been appreciated on the part of the United States, it was practically conceded that the prohibition of Sunday fishing was a regulation in the interest of the preservation of the fisheries—in the common interest therefore,—and one to which reasonable objection ought not further to be pressed.

And so in regard to the purse seining. Although that was a subject of considerable difficulty and in regard to which the professional advisers of the Fisheries Department in the United States seemed to entertain the view that it is not unduly destructive as a means of fishing, ultimately at all events objections in that regard were not pressed. No change is made or agreed to be made in our regulations under either of these three heads.

Now, with regard to our system of licensing individual fishermen, peculiar difficulties presented themselves. Under the treaty of 1818 liberty is given forever to the inhabitants of the United States to take fish of every kind upon these defined portions of our coast, and it was urged: That liberty having been freely conceded by Great Britain ninety years ago, how can you now seek to impede its exercise by a regulation which requires the issuing of a license, and the payment of a fee to obtain that license? No matter though the fee charged may be small, the principle of the thing, it was urged upon us, is against that system, and it ought not to be required of inhabitants of the United States who already possess under the treaty the unrestricted liberty to exercise their calling at pleasure in these waters. And additional difficulty was occasioned by the circumstance that when, five years ago, Newfoundland was proposing to adopt a system of licenses, that proposition had been vigorously objected to by Mr. Root, then Secretary of State for the United States, in diplomatic correspondence with the Foreign Office of Great Britain; and, in answer to Mr. Root's objection, a letter was written by the British Foreign Office in 1906 in which it is categorically stated that licenses could not be supported. And, in view of that holding and that distinct expression of opinion on the part of Sir Edward Grey as Foreign Secretary, Newfoundland has not attempted to put into force the licensing system. Still, it has been in force in Canada, and the Department of Marine and Fisheries regard it as a most valuable system, as one which gives great advantages in the way of control over the individual fishermen and in the way of securing compliance with the regulations which may be made. Mr. Brodeur set himself to the task of convincing the representatives of the United States that it was in the interest of the fisheries—that it was in the interest of their own individual fishermen—

that a system of licenses should exist, and to the effort to prevail upon them to withdraw opposition to it and agree that it might be maintained. I am very glad, indeed, to be able to say that in that effort my hon. colleague has fully succeeded, and that by making concessions which he thinks are not of consequence practically, and which cannot do any injury to our own fishermen, to the fisheries, or to our system of maintaining licenses, he has been able to remove the objections which at the outset were very strongly entertained by the United States government to the continuation of these matters. In the result, we have agreed to recommend to council an alteration in three respects in our existing licensing regulations; and upon these alterations being made, the United States withdraws the continuation of its objections, not only to these features of our laws and regulations, but to the whole body of our existing fisheries legislation and regulations.

Of these three changes the first respects fishing for cod or herring by trap nets. Our existing regulation in that regard provided that such a thing should not be permitted in the Gulf of St. Lawrence without a license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The modification to which we have assented is that this requirement of a license shall not extend, either as to Canadian or United States fishermen, to the case of a trap net set for either cod or herring, at a distance of a thousand yards or more from shore, or from any similar net which is set from the shore. In others words, we modify our regulation in that respect, so that whenever a United States fisherman finds a position enabling him to set his cod or herring trap net a thousand yards or more away from the shore, and also the same distance away from any other herring or cod trap net which is set from the shore, he may take that unoccupied position a thousand yards distant without requiring first to get a license. We exempt him in those circumstances, and we exempt the Canadian in those circumstances, from the requirement to take a license.

The second modification was one that we assented to at once on the practical effect of the present regulation being pointed out. The present regulation requires the leader of any herring or trap net to extend in every case from the shore; and it was pointed out on the part of the United States that we at any rate questioned their right to land for the purpose of taking fish. They did not concede that our position in that regard was correct. But they pointed out to us that we took the position that they had no right to land on the shores, for instance, of the Magdalen islands, and they said: If your regulation as to trap nets, both for cod and for herring, requires that the leader shall in every case extend from the shore, how is our fisherman to plant his leader, his anchor? He cannot do it from the water, and your regulation therefore practically prohibits him from participating in that manner of fishing. We conceded the position without hesitation, and agreed to substitute for our present regulation in that regard a provision by which, if the leader of a cod trap or herring trap net extends from the shore, the fishery officer may determine, in writing or orally, the length of the leader that shall be used, leaving the regulation silent on the subject of trap nets set for cod or herring where the leader starts from a location below low water line, leaving, by implication, the right, to either a Canadian or a United States fisherman, to set a cod or herring trap net with a leader starting from a location, not on the shore, but below low water mark. With that modification the regulation in question was not further objected to.

Then the final change is the addition of a regulation applying equally to herring and cod trap nets, which the representatives of the United States asked for, and which seemed to us no more than their right. It will be remembered that under the terms of the treaty of 1818 the inhabitants of the United States are given liberty forever to take fish of every sort in these waters in common with British subjects. The use of the phrase 'in common with British subjects' seems to imply equality of right on the part of such inhabitants of the United States as may choose to come to those fishing waters, to ply their avocation there under the like conditions in every respect as might apply to British subjects. In that view, it was said on the part of the United States last week that if we were intending to maintain our licensing system, and they were tacitly acquiescing in it, there ought to be a recognition on the face of our regulations that an inhabitant of the United States applying for a license from our government should receive it under the ordinary rules and regulations, and in the like circumstances, as would govern if a British subject applied for such a license. I think the likely effect of such a regulation being accepted by the United States, or of their fishermen taking our licenses, would be the clearest possible recognition on their part of our system and of its propriety; and in that view, there being no objection to this proposal from the standpoint of our fishermen, it seemed to me, looking at it from a lawyer's point of view, that it would be rather an advantage to Canada that it should be present in our regulations than that it should not. Accordingly, we have

assented, and add to our existing regulations this third provision in regard to cod and herring trap nets:

Upon any inhabitant of the United States fishing with trap nets in Canadian waters in the exercise of his liberties under the treaty of 1818, applying for a berth site under the licensing provisions, such a license shall be issued in the usual course for any unoccupied berth site selected by the applicant upon the payment of the regular fee, in consideration of the exclusive use of such site, subject to the usual rules and regulations.

On our agreeing to make these three alterations in our existing regulations, a Minute was drawn up of the conferences of Friday and Saturday last by which Minute the understanding is recorded that in view of Canada's willingness to make these alterations, and in view of the present method of administering the Canadian laws and fishing regulations, the United States does not at present press its objections as recorded before the tribunal in the protocol I have already referred to. The United States representatives stipulated, however, that they could not at the present time close finally with Canada in view of the fact that the regulations of Newfoundland were still under consideration and that if they now concluded any final agreement in regard to the Canadian prohibition of purse seining or Sunday fishing it might prejudice their position in further discussion of like regulations which obtained in Newfoundland. In view of that difficulty it was agreed that this settlement with Canada, while it was confidently expected on both sides that it will be permanent and final, should not prejudice the United States, if, in future, conditions should so change that it became necessary for them to renew any of these objections. The Minute accordingly reads:

The undersigned, having considered the best means of dealing with the objections referred to, subject to the Minute of previous conferences signed January 12, have arrived at the following conclusion:—

Having regard to the present method of administering the Canadian laws and fishery regulations and to certain amendments which Canada is willing to make therein and to the present state of the fisheries and conditions under which they are carried on and places of fishing, the United States does not press at present any of the objections referred to in protocol XXX. which relate to Canadian laws and fishery regulations, it being understood that the right of the United States to renew such objections is not thereby in any way prejudiced should conditions change.

The amendments which were agreed to are set out in the Minute and the parties present signed this memorandum. The result of the whole matter then is that upon these changes which I have described being made in our regulations the United States agrees to drop, for the present, at all events, the litigation in which we were previously engaged. We have, by the arrangement agreed to with Newfoundland as well as with Canada, substituted a different means of disposing of these objections for the somewhat complicated and certainly expensive one which had been directed by the tribunal in September last, and we have, in so far as Canada is concerned, reached an agreement which will be final and permanent unless conditions change in the manner which I have tried to point out. It may be that conditions will so change and that some of these objections may at some future time be renewed. If that should be so we shall then be, at all events, no worse off than we are at present, or than we would be at present if this agreement had not been entered into. The probability that such a thing will take place is, I am sanguine to think, very remote. At the present time, at all events, those in charge of the administration of affairs in the United States express themselves as entirely satisfied. Misunderstandings with regard to the meaning and application of many of our regulations have been wholly removed by the thoroughly friendly and amicable discussion which took place last week, and I have to say with regard to the whole of the discussion that from beginning to end it was carried on in a manner which one would expect on the part of the representatives of a great and thoroughly friendly nation. The attitude of the representatives of the United States throughout was of a most reasonable character. I am satisfied that they most earnestly desired to reach, if it could be possible, a final settlement of these prolonged difficulties and on each side there was in every manner the desire manifested to put an end to these century-long troubles, to make concessions where concessions were necessary and to settle by friendly conference, if such a thing could be done, matters which otherwise would have to be litigated at great expense and at great length of time before the international tribunal which had been agreed upon. It is only due, it is only justice to the representatives of the United States that I should pay to their sincerity, in the effort which they made to meet us in our unwillingness to modify our regulations to any greater extent than possible, the tribute which I have sought to pay to-day and to found upon that belief my confidence in stating to this House that I think this arrangement has brought to a final end and determination all the difficulties which up to this time, at any rate, have presented themselves arising out of the fisheries treaty of ninety years ago.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I do not rise with the idea of debating the question, but there are two

or three remarks which I will make if I am permitted. One blot upon the award at the Hague, in my mind and indeed, I think, in the minds of Canadians generally, was the extremely unsatisfactory position in which the matter of the fishery regulations of Canada and Newfoundland was left and the extremely costly and far-away tribunal, or double tribunal, which was arranged for the final disposition of these disputes if disputes should occur. I, for my part, after listening to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) in his very clear exposition of the matter this afternoon, am very glad indeed that at the present time it seems we are likely to escape from both of these great inconveniences. There is no reason in the wide world why two countries lying side by side with similar interests in a great many respects and similar ideals should not get very close together and arrange on business methods and on a business basis such details of a great question as arise out of the reasonableness of the regulations framed by Canada and Newfoundland.

The result of such a meeting seems to prove that there was nothing inherently difficult in having it brought about. To take into consideration whatever might have occurred in the future in the making of fishery regulations by Canada and Newfoundland, and to feel that to every one of these regulations the United States had a right to object, and that in order to get a final determination of it there must be an appeal to a mixed tribunal and afterwards to the main tribunal itself, opened up a vista of confusion, trouble, and vexation. If by this method of agreement that has been avoided for the present, that is so much gained. As the minister pointed out, the United States retains for itself the right to object even with reference to present regulations, and, of course, retains the right to object as to future regulations. But, if once we have come together and reached an understanding upon what exists, I think a very large part of the difficulty is removed. What can be done in one case and which is shown to be both convenient and inexpensive will very likely be followed in all cases which may come thereafter. I do not think there was anything inherently wrong in the position taken on these four points by Canada. I could not help but admire, however, the perspicacity of our representatives in Washington on one of these points, namely, with reference to the Sunday fishing. Now, a bluff, common man, you know, would have said to these people down there: The Lord's day must be held in honour and your fishermen ought to be at their prayers on Sunday instead of fishing. But, perspicacious and far-seeing gentlemen such as we had there preferred to put the argument on different ground; a broad humanitarian principle applied to fisheries, a sort of piscatorial humanitarian basis. Instead of asking a day of rest, and often much needed, I think, for consideration and contemplation by those who pursue the fisheries, on the means of grace and of making their lives better, it was thought best in this case to base the appeal on the ground of humanity to the fishes. It may be that in the long course of evolution the cod and herring which abound on these coasts will come to understand what the seventh day means, and maybe they will show an appreciation of it which sometimes their more highly developed pursuers lack. However, the main thing is that, however, the argument was approached the result was obtained, and the fishes will have the advantage of that one day in seven of rest, in which they can recreate themselves and get up more vigour for the six days' fight with the nets which are their common and deadly menace. As far as the purse seine fishing is concerned, that, I think, has been properly settled, and I do not see how objection could be taken to a regulation of that kind. Boarding and searching has been also settled, which, I think, was perfectly proper, for I do not see how the law could have been carried out without that power. With reference to licenses, I am afraid I did not altogether catch the meaning of it. Do I understand that licenses are not required for either Canadians or Americans with reference to (a) and (b). Distances seem to have been set within which these nets should not come, and do I understand that regulation does away with the license in regard to the first and second of the three changes that were made? Under the third agreement the United States fisherman asks for a license and receives it on the same ground, other things being equal, as the Canadians. That leads me to think that in the other two cases the license is done away with entirely.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I am afraid I do not understand the question which the hon. gentleman has propounded well enough to answer it categorically, but possibly I can strike the difficulty by explaining exactly the position of the existing regulations. In our unamended regulation, as it stood last week, it was provided that fishing by means of herring trap nets without a license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is prohibited in the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The same regulation exactly existed in regard to cod trap nets. The effect, therefore, was that no one could fish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence for either herring or cod by trap nets unless he had obtained a license from the minister. Now, the change that has been

agreed to with regard to such fishing is simply to make the regulation read: That such fishing by means of cod trap nets or herring trap nets without a license from the minister is prohibited in the waters of the gulf except at a distance of 1,000 yards from shore or 1,000 yards from any similar nets set from the shore.

So that, if any Canadian or United States citizen can find a location where he can set such a trap net which would be both 1,000 yards from shore and 1,000 yards from any similar trap net he can do it without a license. That is the modification. Then, upon the other point, the unamended rule prior to last week was:—

That the leader of each herring or cod trap net shall in every case extend from the shore, and any fishery officer may determine in writing or orally the length of leader which shall be used.

The fee for license at so much per fathom depended on the length of the leader. Now the change made is to repeal that rule and substitute this one. If the leader of a cod or herring trap net extends from the shore, any fishery officer may determine, in writing or orally, the length of the leader which shall be used, implying that if it does not extend from the shore no such power is given the officer to determine the length and implying, also, that trap nets may now be set with a leader not extending from the shore, but from a point below low water mark.

As to the requirements for a license for such trap net, nothing special is provided. It will fall within the rule I have first read, namely that a license is always required except in the case of nets set 1,000 yards from the shore.

Mr. FOSTER. That clears up that point, and it seems that with reference to trap nets at this distance and under those conditions, a license is not required, but I am not sufficiently expert to know whether that will interfere very much with the primary idea in licensing, to keep those vessels under proper regulation and control. I should imagine, however, that up to a certain point it would do so, but may not to a very large extent. There is one point upon which I could not get a very clear idea. The minister spoke of a commission board for Newfoundland and one for Canada, or a board made up of one appointee from each—I am not sure which —and that before this board, if diplomatic methods did not avail in bringing the parties to an agreement, the disputed points could be taken before being taken to the Fishery Commission. Is that view correct?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Confusion no doubt has arisen from the manner in which I stated the situation under the award and the situation under the agreement of last week. The award directed that existing legislation be referred to a board of experts subject to an appeal to the full tribunal when that tribunal should be reconvened. The award also recommended, but it did not direct, that to dispose of any difficulties which might arise in the future at any time, the parties should agree to constitute two fixed, permanent commissions, each to be composed of one representative from the United States, one from Canada or Newfoundland, as the case might be, and a third neutral, and that such board should deal with future cases if any should arise, as a permanent and final board, without resort to the existing tribunal at all. That recommendation has not as yet been adopted. It has not as yet been considered probably by either country; and so far as Canada is concerned, unless future difficulties should arise, or some of these past difficulties should be renewed, there never will be any necessity for constituting such a board at all. But if one ever should be constituted, its decisions will be final.

Mr. DANIEL. Am I correct in understanding that the advantage which the American fisherman would get from the amended regulations is that whereas formerly he was not given a license at all to fish with a trap net attached to the shore, now he is entitled to a license to engage in this form of fishing.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. The provision with regard to the obtaining of a license by United States fishermen is quite distinct, that upon any American citizen applying for a berth site under the licensing provisions, such license shall be issued in the usual course for any unoccupied berth site selected by the applicant, subject to the usual rules and regulations. That is, he must go a certain distance away from an occupied berth. In a word, he must be put in exactly the same position as a British subject who applies for a license.

Mr. DANIEL. Did he have that privilege formerly?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I scarcely know how to answer that question. I do not think there is any instance in which such a license has been given to any inhabitant of the United States. I am not aware that any application for such a license was ever made; but as a matter of legal opinion, I would not hesitate to express my view that he was always entitled to it from the day the treaty was made just as much as a British subject.

Mr. CROSBY. Is it the intention of the government to divide the interests of Canadian fishermen and those of Newfoundland

fishermen, and let each make the best arrangement they can, independent the one of the other?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. There certainly was no intention on the part of either my colleague, Mr. Brodeur, or myself to desert Newfoundland in any way. On Thursday night last, when we had signed the agreement, to which, of course, Newfoundland is equally a party, substituting this new method, of dealing with existing objections for the method directed by the award, I thought and Mr. Brodeur thought, that it would be quite possible for Canada to settle, and we equally thought that there was no likelihood of any present settlement so far as Newfoundland was concerned, and before doing anything further we sat down and discussed the situation fully with Sir Edward Morris and it was with his full concurrence and assent that Mr. Brodeur and I remained behind, he leaving for Newfoundland on Thursday evening, and we remaining in the hope that by resuming our conferences on Friday or Saturday we might be able to arrange matters so far as Canada was concerned. In that hope we have been successful. I do not think we have prejudiced Newfoundland in the least degree by what we have done, but hope we have rather helped Newfoundland to a similar settlement of its own difficulties. There has been no idea on our part of in any way deserting our sister colony should further difficulties arise in regard to which there is any necessity for joint action.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose a copy of this memorandum will be laid on the table of the House?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. FRASER. Is there a definition of the point below water mark where the American fisherman would have a right to drop his anchor on the coastal waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. There is no indication in that respect in the amended regulation, it is not even stated that the leader may extend from a point below low water mark, but that is implied from the fact that the existing regulation which requires it to extend always from shore has been repealed and taken away.

ANGLO-JAPANESE TREATY.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I wish to ask the Prime Minister one or two questions respecting the Anglo-Japanese treaty which I understand came into force in July 1899 to remain in force for 12 years, but with the condition that after 11 years either of the contracting parties could give notice to terminate the treaty. Has any notice been given by either of the contracting parties to terminate that treaty and if so, will the termination of the original treaty between Japan and England also terminate the subsequent convention between Canada and Japan? Will parliament have an opportunity of discussing the matter before the treaty is renewed, if it is to be renewed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Some correspondence has passed on this subject, but I do not know whether it is in a position to be brought down. I will be able to tell my hon. friend on Monday.

WATER SUPPLY, PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the Prime Minister observed the statements in the Ottawa Press in regard to the contaminated state of the drinking water in this city? There is, of course, a good deal of water supplied in this building in various places, and I see that the medical health officer has advised the people of Ottawa that the city water before being consumed should be boiled in order to prevent typhoid. I do not know whether the government have taken any precautions in regard to the water supplied to this building or not, but I should think it would be a subject worthy of consideration. Have any steps been taken to prevent the supply of impure water in these buildings?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My attention has not been called to that, but I suppose when we come to Ottawa, we must take the bad with the good.

INQUIRIES FOR REPORTS AND RETURNS.

Mr. LAKE. Has the report of the Ottawa Improvement Commission been brought down? Under the statute it should be brought down within the first 15 days of session, but I have not been able to obtain a copy at the distribution office.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will have to inquire as to that. I am not aware that it has been brought down, the matter seems to have been overlooked.

Mr. FOSTER. I would again ask the Prime Minister about the despatch of Sir John Thompson, for which he was to make inquiry.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I had some communication with the under Secretary of State upon that point. I have not heard since.

GEORGIAN BAY SHIP CANAL.

Mr. WHITE (North Renfrew). I wish to call attention to an item appearing in the Montreal 'Star' and the Ottawa 'Citizen' of January 16. It is as follows:

ESTIMATES FOR GEORGIAN BAY CANAL READY.

Three Millions for Back River and French River Sections to be asked.

Special to the Montreal 'Star.'

Ottawa, January 16.—That the government has under consideration, as supplementary estimates, appropriations which really mean the commencement of work upon the Georgian bay canal system was learned to-day.

It is stated that in the supplementaries is likely to be included an item of about $3,000,000, half of it for deepening the Rivière des Prairies, the Back river at Montreal, and the rest for the French river section of the work.

When questioned about this to-day Hon. William Pugsley observed:

'The whole matter is under advisement. I can make no statement till it is dealt with by the cabinet upon the return of the Minister of Finance.'

Meanwhile it is learned that estimates with that end in view have been prepared and will be dealt with by the cabinet council.

The appropriations which are now proposed are for portions of the work which would be of utility even if the main scheme were not proceeded with, but at the same time they may rightfully be regarded as the beginning of the canal system.

The national character of the undertaking and its great importance as affording an additional outlet for the grain traffic of the west cannot, it is held, be over-estimated. It ranks with the Transcontinental railway as a huge undertaking of far-reaching consequences upon the transportation problem of the country.

Is it the intention of the government to place an estimate of this amount in the supplementary estimates and is it intended to have printed some additional copies of the report which was laid on the table of the House two sessions ago? This report is a very valuable one, and I have had several inquiries for it, but have been unable to procure copies, as it is out of print.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To the first question I could not give any other answer than that already given by the Minister of Public Works yesterday, that the matter is now under consideration. As to the other question, I see no reason why, if it is thought advisable, we should not have another edition of that report.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 47), to amend the immigration Act read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1, Canadian domicile—how acquired.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the nature and purpose of the change made by this section?

Mr. OLIVER. I will make a little general explanation, that the particular explanation may be better understood. As my hon. friend knows, last year we passed a new Immigration Act which did not alter the principles contained in the Act of 1906, but was drafted with a view to meet the exigencies arising out of the more strict administration of the Act. That is, the Act of last year was simply a more complete embodiment of the principles that had already been in force. One of the points that we found it very necessary to provide in the Act of last session was as to the rights of domicile acquired by those who were not citizens of Canada by residence in Canada. We went into that very carefully, and thought we had covered the point fairly well. But, since last session, one or two cases arose which brought the matter into question: and the two amendments which are contained in this section now before the committee are intended to meet the lack that, on the test being made, was found to exist in the section of the law as it stands. The section now before the committee is a reprint of the section passed last year with two exceptions, and the words making the change are contained in brackets. (Of course, if the amendments are agreed to, a motion will be made to strike out the brackets.) Except for these two alterations this section is word for word as it was last year. The first alteration is in the first line, and the words: 'can only be' are substituted for the word 'is'. The reason for the change is this: 'A judge held that, while it was perfectly clear under the reading of the Act as I had given it that Canadian domicile could be acquired in the way set out in the Act, he held that it could also be acquired in some other way which was not contemplated by the Act. Therefore, in order to meet that view of the case, we propose this change, the purpose being to restrict domicile in the operation of the Act to the definition we give in the Act. The second amendment is to provide for the case of a person who entered Canada previous to the passing of the Act of last year, but who had not resided in the country for three years. The Act of last session only contemplated that a person acquired domicile by residing in the country for three years. Now, the person who entered the country before the passing of the Act, who had not been three years in the country, under a strict reading of the Act as the judge applied it, was found by him not to have domicile, which, of course, was not the intent. So, this change is made to grant domicile to those who entered Canada before the passing of the Act of last year, but who had not been three years in the country at the time of the passing of the Act. These are the two amendments to the section, and the purpose is as I have stated, and the reason for the amendments is that the question has come up in court and the judge has

ruled to indicate a lack in the section as it was passed last year.

Mr. McKENZIE (Cape Breton). I desire to get some information from the minister in connection with the Immigration Act. I suppose that, as a lawyer, I should know something about the Act, but I do not know very much about it. There are cases in my constituency in regard to which I would like to get some information from the minister. For instance, if an Assyrian comes to Canada and buys a property and settles down as a resident of, say, the county of Cape Breton from which I come, and after a year or so of residence in the country wishes to bring his family from Assyria to settle with him in Canada, what are the conditions upon which he can take his family into Canada, provided they are free from any of the diseases that would prevent them from coming under the Act?

Mr. OLIVER. The conditions will be found in the order in council 926 passed under the terms of the Act. The requirement is that any Asiatic coming to Canada must have in his possession the sum of $200. So the members of the family of the Assyrian that my hon. friend mentions would need to have that amount of money in their possession before they would be entitled to land in Canada.

Mr. DOHERTY. If I understand the minister, his purpose in this section is to provide that there shall be no other method of acquiring a Canadian domicile except the method provided here.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the idea.

Mr. DOHERTY. What is the effect of that? If he attains the purpose he says he desires to attain, I would like to ask him whether a child that is born in Canada after the passing of this Act, of a father domiciled in Canada, will not by that fact have acquired a domicile here?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course he will.

Mr. DOHERTY. But your Act says that the only way by which a Canadian domicile can be acquired after the passing of this Act is by a residence of so many years after having been landed in Canada. Here is a man who was never landed in Canada at all, and it is a very serious thing if this statute is going to do away with all the methods by which domicile is acquired by common law. I would like to ask the minister, is it the intention to modify the salutary rule that a wife's domicile is where her husband's is? Because I think under the wording of this statute, if the husband comes to this country and complies with all the requirements that are laid down here, he will have acquired a domicile in Canada; is it the intention that his wife, who did not come with him at that time, shall have no domicile in Canada until she has done all these things?

Mr. OLIVER. That is the express intent of the Act.

Mr. DOHERTY. Does the minister think it is a desirable thing that we should enact, in contravention, I think, of the universally-accepted rule, not only of our own law but of international law, that the domicile of a wife shall no longer be where her husband's is?

Mr. OLIVER. That is a matter for the committee to consider. I am merely stating what the law is.

Mr. DOHERTY. The minister is putting this Bill before the committee, and he is asking us to endorse it, and I am pointing out to him the far-reaching effects of it; and I think we are entitled to a statement from him whether he thinks there are sufficient reasons, and what they are, that justify us in making such a great modification in the general rules of law, for the purpose of this special Act. Moreover, I confess that it seems to me that the wording is such as to do some things which the minister says he does not intend. For instance, he lays down that a domicile can only be acquired in a particular way. Now if you understand that according to the latter, I think a child who is born in Canada hereafter, who has never landed in this country, will never have a domicile here. Will not the fact of his being born here of parents domiciled here, not give him a domicile here?

Mr. BUREAU. He is a Canadian by birth.

Mr. DOHERTY. One of the ways by which, under the general law, one acquires a domicile, is that the domicile of the child is at the domicile of his father. The child when he is born acquires his domicile at the place where the father was domiciled. This Act says that a Canadian domicile can only be acquired by living here three years after you have landed here.

Mr. BUREAU. That means a foreigner. A British subject by birth does not come under this Act. Supposing he goes away to a foreign country and, without taking the oath of allegiance there, comes back here still a British subject, he would not come under that Act. He would enjoy his privilege just the same as if he had not gone away.

Mr. DOHERTY. That is what I want to get at. I understood that under the Act as it previously stood there were certain methods by which a domicile could be acquired, but that Act did not say that a domicile

acquired in any other way would not be a domicile under that Act. The wording of this Act now seems to say that a Canadian domicile can only be acquired by doing these particular things. It may be said in regard to a child born of parents domiciled here that it is not a question of acquiring a domicile, but a question of a domicile of origin. But I do insist upon the importance of the consideration that under the working of this Act you will do away with all the rules by which the domicile of classes of persons dependent upon or connected immediately with others, is determined; with the first result, that you will deny to the wife the domicile that shall be her husband's by right, because she personally has not done some things that he has done. In the same way, you interfere with the general rules for making domicile of minors with their guardians or tutors. Are all these rules going to be set aside, and when a tutor or a guardian has acquired domicile here in Canada, are you going to shut out the minor because he is not domiciled under this Act? Yet if you say that the only way by which domicile can be acquired is by an individual coming personally and residing here, you will produce that result.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to the objection of my hon. friend that the child born in Canada would not have acquired Canadian domicile, I may say that this section only applies to the definition of domicile as acquired by those who are not Canadian citizens. The Act provides what shall constitute a Canadian citizen, and that naturally provides that a person born in Canada shall be a Canadian citizen. The purpose of making a definition of the word 'domicile' and of the words 'Canadian citizen,' is to enable us to carry out the intent which I understood was in the mind of parliament at the time this Act was passed, so as to define clearly and drastically, if necessary, the rights which should be derived by relationships between people. My hon. friend finds fault with this clear and close, or drastic, definition of domicile. There is no definition of domicile set out in the statute law. My hon. friend is aware of that.

Mr. DOHERTY. As far as I know there is not.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no definition of domicile in the statutory law, except here, but we found that in the administration of this Act this drastic provision, being the expression of the mind of parliament as I believe, it was necessary that there should be a statutory definition of domicile so that we would know, and so that the immigrant would know exactly what his rights were and what they were not, and so that there would be no question about where the line was drawn. We have, of course, very extraordinary legislation. The whole Act is extraordinary, its purpose is extraordinary and this undertaking to define the meaning of domicile by statute is an extraordinary attempt, but we believe it is rendered necessary by the exigencies of the administration of the Act, that is the exigency of carrying out the will of parliament with regard to the restriction of undesirable immigration.

Mr. DOHERTY. As I understand, the purpose of this section is to create a situation where a man coming here and acquiring domicile under this Act and doing everything which he is called upon to do for that purpose, his wife and children, having been left behind him and coming on later, are liable to be excluded because they have not got a domicile.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely.

Mr. DOHERTY. If that is the purpose of the minister and he has it carried, of course, I have nothing further to say, but it seems to me that there are some pretty weighty considerations against our adopting a definition of domicile that will be found in every case to produce that position.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not defending the position in any way. I am merely explaining the position that was taken by parliament when the Act was passed and the position taken by parliament when the Act was passed, was that it was necessary and desirable, in order to exclude undesirable immigrants, that each immigrant should stand on his own merits and be considered as an individual and not as a member of a family.

Mr. DOHERTY. The hon. minister is seeking by this amendment to change the position that was taken by parliament in the previous Act. Otherwise, why is he amending the previous Act? I understand the minister to say that the holding of the courts was that the position that parliament took in the previous Act did not operate farther than to create a situation where any person who came within the definition of the Act was entitled to claim that he had a domicile, but that it did not operate to prevent people who, without aid of the previous Act had, under the provisions of the common law, a domicile, from claiming their domicile. That is the interpretation which the court put upon the declaration of parliament in the previous Act, and that, it seems to me, represents what the position of parliament was when it passed the previous Act. The minister is asking parliament to change its position on that subject for the purpose of excluding the idea that any body is domiciled in Canada except persons who have met the requirements laid down in this particular Act, although the effect of doing so will be to create a situ-

ation where you will forcibly separate husband and wife, parents and children. Of course, that is a new position that the minister is asking parliament to take. For myself, I cannot pretend to be as familiar with the difficulties that may arise with regard to excluding undesirable immigrants as the minister, or those who are engaged in the operation of this Act, but I must say that for my part I would require to be satisfied of some very urgent necessity indeed and to have demonstrated to me the practical impossibility of otherwise protecting us from undesirable immigration before I would deem it desirable to lay down a rule of this kind which is not only liable to produce, but which the minister tells us and which his words clearly show it is intended to produce, the position which I have pointed out.

Mr. DEVLIN. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman would suggest that there should be a subsection similar to that in the civil court of lower Canada that the domicile of the husband be the domicile of the wife?

Mr. DOHERTY. That would be suggesting the contrary of the provision. I am objecting to the provision because the effect of it is to make it absolutely clear that a wife who comes here as an immigrant will have no right whatever to claim, that because her husband is domiciled here she has a right to do what the law in most countries imposes upon her as an obligation, that is to follow her husband to the domicile that he has chosen. The idea of this Act is to step in and say: No, madam, you shall not do it. Of course, there will be very little purpose in the minister's provision if he were willing to state that it should be subject to the exception made by the general law. I understand that the minister's reason is that he wants to make this provision as a derogation from the general law.

Mr. BUREAU. My hon. friend says that this clause would prevent a wife from coming in after her husband had acquired domicile to enjoy the privileges which he only enjoyed.

In section 2 there is a definition of Canadian citizenship and it says: 'Canadian citizen' means (1) A person born in Canada who has not become an alien; (2) a British subject who has Canadian domicile; or (3) a person naturalized under the laws of Canada who has not subsequently become an alien or lost Canadian domicile.

Mr. DOHERTY. What is the section?

Mr. BUREAU. That is the old Act, section 2. There is a proviso:

Provided that for the purpose of this Act a woman who has not been landed in Canada shall not be held to have acquired Canadian citizenship by virtue of her husband being a Canadian citizen; neither shall a child who has not been landed in Canada be held to have acquired Canadian citizenship through its father or mother being a Canadian citizen.

Mr. DOHERTY. There a wife is excluded from claiming any right to Canadian citizenship. Here we are asked to go farther and declare that she is not entitled to claim to be a person having a Canadian domicile, though, as far as I know, not only by the general law of Canada, but, I do not think I am mistaken in saying, by the rules of private international law, or the conflict of laws, she will be, by the civilized countries of the world, denied the right to claim that she is domiciled anywhere else.

Mr. BUREAU. For the purpose of this Act.

Mr. DOHERTY. I quite concede that, but you are going to place that woman in a position where for no purpose, in the country of her original domicile, will she be recognized as domiciled there and for the purpose of coming into Canada in the fulfilment of her obligation to follow her husband wherever he is domiciled she will not be considered as domiciled here. I have said that I do not pretend to be familiar with the difficulties that present themselves in the operation of preventing undesirable immigration, but I do think that when this House is asked to go so far as that in contravention of a principle which is so generally accepted and one which is recognized throughout the civilized world as resting upon the highest considerations of public policy the minister should put before us what are the difficulties in the administration of this Act which make it impossible or exceedingly difficult to keep out undesirable immigration without the aid of a provision of this kind.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the mind of parliament can fairly be considered to have been expressed by the context rather than by the individual words.

Mr. DOHERTY. Does the minister contend that the court which interpreted this did not pay to the context the attention that ought to be paid to it? The authoritative determination of what was in the mind of parliament is shown by what the Act said, and the court is the only source from which you can get an authoritative determination of what the mind of parliament was. It is the first time I have ever heard the suggestion that there was any other method open to us for discovering the mind of parliament than by looking to what parliament expressed.

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend is very wide in his reasoning. I think there are sections of the most revered book in

the world that might be read literally without expressing the intention, unless the context were taken into consideration.

Mr. DOHERTY. Surely the minister does not mean to intimate that the judge did not take the context into consideration. The court that pronounced upon this is entitled to the assumption that it applied these rules of interpretation which enable us to ascertain precisely what parliament did express. Of course, one of the most elementary of these rules is that the court should look at the context, interpret the Act as a whole, and interpret each disposition of it by the other disposition. If the court did its duty, as we must assume it did, we have an authoritative determination that the mind of parliament expressed in the Act was in the sense that the court found. What the minister does now is to ask us to change our mind.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a matter of opinion. The court may have the opinion that the mind of parliament was expressed in the words contained in the statute, but if my hon. friend will permit me to give my opinion, it is that it did not express the idea as clearly as may be that the intention was that domicile should only be as defined by this Act. That is as I read the context, and as a member of parliament, perhaps my view of the matter is just as good as that of a judge on the bench.

Mr. DOHERTY. Then, if, as the minister says, the statute does express the idea, why not leave it as it is? If, on the other hand, there is need for this amendment, it is because, as the law stands to-day, a person can acquire domicile otherwise than as stated in this case. And the minister is before us asking to enact this section, which has no reason for existence at all, unless it is true that without it a person can acquire a domicile in some other way than that specified here. If the minister is entitled to have his judgment stand on a level with the judgment of the courts, perhaps the rest of us in parliament are entitled to claim that what we meant should be interpreted in accordance with what we said. The change does seem to me to involve such serious consequence with regard to the general law of domicile that those who propose it should lay before us very strong reasons, so that we may intelligently pronounce whether or not it is necessary to make such a change.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no other intention than to place all the reasons before the House. I agree with my hon. friend that the opinion of the judge is quite as much entitled to consideration as my opinion, or the opinion of any other member. But we are here to exercise our judgment and take our responsibility as to what we are doing. I am placing before the House the view that the proper carrying out of the intent of the Act, and taking into consideration the decision of the judge as to the meaning of the word, requires that this amendment shall be made. It is for the House to say whether it agrees with that view or not. As to the reasons; we have found it necessary in the administration of the Act, in carrying out what we believed to be the mind of parliament, and in order not to do any injustice to any person, that we should define 'Canadian citizenship,' which is something which is not defined anywhere else, and that we should define 'domicile,' which is something not defined anywhere else. The reason we have to make these definitions is that we may not do injustice in such cases as are dealt with in section 3 of the Immigration Act of last session, which is practically a re-enactment of the Act passed in 1906. My hon. friend will agree that that at any rate expresses the mind of parliament, and parliament says distinctly:—

> No immigrant, passenger or other person, unless he is a Canadian citizen or has Canadian domicile, shall be permitted to land in Canada, or in case of having landed in or entered Canada shall be permitted to remain there, or, who belongs to any of the following classes hereinafter called prohibited classes.

That expressed the mind of parliament since 1906. In the Act of last year, in order to limit the hitherto unlimited application of this we introduced this exception in regard to Canadian citizenship, and in regard to Canadian domicile. In order to limit the formerly unlimited application of this provision, we thought it was right that there should be these exceptions ; but in order that we should make exceptions and not contravene the principle which has been in the mind of parliament since 1906, we had to define both Canadian citizenship and Canadian domicile, and I submit that it was carrying out the intention of parliament that these should be defined in a restricted and limited sense, and it would not have been carrying out the mind of parliament had we defined domicile as the hon. gentleman has suggested.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not want to debate the question whether the mind of parliament last year should necessarily control absolutely the mind of parliament this year, particularly when we are asked to be controlled not by something expressed but by something that was in the mind of parliament and not expressed. The hon. minister says that his purpose is to avoid the injustice which would be done if we gave a less restrictive interpretation to section 3 of the old Act. The section applies only to persons who have neither Canadian citizenship nor Canadian domicile, and the minister admits that once that we pass this Bill, there are persons who have

Canadian domicile to-day who will not have it to-morrow. There are in that section certain provisions which exclude classes of persons whom it might be desirable to exclude even if they had a Canadian domicile ; but on the other hand, under this section, any person, who has not a Canadian domicile, is for instance excluded if he is blind. It is necessary for our protection that we should enact a law that if a man comes here and acquires a domicile and his wife unfortunately should be blind, we should shut her out for ever. Still that would be the effect of this measure.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. McKENZIE. Before six o'clock I was referring to some features of the immigration Act which I thought required an explanation. It is a well understood principle in British law that the head of the family to a very large extent regulates the rights of his children and his wife in any country. When the husband is entitled to a domicile or a settlement in this country, then I understand it follows that the wife is also entitled to a domicile, that the domicile of the father is the domicile of the children, at least until they are old enough to obtain a domicile or a settlement for themselves. That being the case, only with the greatest care and for the strongest reasons should any law be enacted in this country that would break up the family, that is that would enable the father to enter Canada and remain here, while preventing the mother and the children from following him. We can readily conceive a situation where a child might be born while the mother was in transit to this country and it would appear to me extraordinary that the mother, when arriving on our shores, would not be permitted to land with the infant, although under the existing regulations such a situation might readily arise.

I am not familiar with the reasons why Asiatics are singled out as different from other people coming into this country. There may be good reasons for making a special law for Asiatics. All I can say is that the great majority of the Asiatics in our country are about as desirable as any other foreigners who come into the country. We find them very industrious, clean, honest people, willing to earn a livelihood and taking part in any of the occupations offering in my part of the country. Personally it seems to me an exceedingly hard law that an Asiatic, an Assyrian for instance, comes to my country, stays for perhaps three years, is a naturalized British subject, has considerable property, running into the thousands of dollars, but when he wants to bring his wife and family here, they cannot be taken into the country, no matter how young they are unless each of them has $200 in cash. I do not say that children should be admitted if they are unhealthy or if there is anything the matter with them that should prevent them coming in, simply because the father is in this country, but when the father is a British subject and has ample property in Canada, it is a hardship that should not exist. If a man is to live in this country, if we give him the privilege of voting, and other rights of citizenship, I do not think we should prevent his wife and family from coming to live with him. Under our general naturalization Act it is stated that the domicile of the husband is the domicile of the wife and that the domicile of the father is the domicile of the children, at least until they are 21 years of age, and that if they have no father the domicile of the mother is that of the children. I have met several cases of this kind in my own county and I am not in a position to explain to these Assyrians and Asiatics why this hard rule is made against them as distinguished from other foreigners coming into this country. I would like to have some satisfactory explanation of this regulation from the minister, and if it be at all possible, I would like to see some amendment or some regulation by which the cases of which I speak could be taken away from the general rule so that a man who is given the privileges of British citizenship in Canada, should be allowed to bring his wife and family to live with him, if they are competent to enter Canada without violating any regulation except the requirement of $200 in cash. I think the enforcement of that law in the case of children who could not possibly earn it, is a hardship, that it should be applied only to those capable of earning it and who, if they were industrious, should have it.

Mr. OLIVER. It would seem from the remarks of the gentlemen who have spoken that there is a misapprehension as to the purpose of this law. This law is for the purpose of excluding certain classes of people for certain reasons and the desire is that this intent shall be carried out. If it is not the desire of the Committee that people should be excluded, the law could easily be amended, but as the case stands at present, we have a law which was passed last year, following up another law passed three years before, and we now propose to make certain minor amendments in detail in order to carry out more completely the intent of the law that was passed last session, and hon. members forthwith complain about the fundamental principle of the existing law. That is not the question

before the committee, the question is the amendment of this law on the lines suggested. If any hon. members think this exclusion law should not be on the statute-book, it would be fair for them to place themselves on record as of that mind. It is hardly fair to take the opportunity of a proposed amendment to the details of a certain law to go upon record as criticising and objecting to the fundamental principle of the law as it stands.

As to the point that my hon. friend mentions, he asks for information why certain requirements should be made in the case of Asiatics. I am bound to say that the question has nothing to do with the amendments that are before the committee, but as my hon. friend asks the question, it is perfectly right to give the answer. My hon. friend is well aware, as is every member of this House, of the difficulties that have faced the government of Canada in dealing with the question of Asiatic immigration. He knows that very, very drastic and very, very extreme measures have had to be taken to counteract that immigration. Those measures had to differ in regard to the different classes of people who came to the country. In regard to one nationality, the Japanese, an arrangement was made with the Japanese government. In regard to the Chinese, a head-tax of $500 was placed upon their coming into the country. And, in the case of another class of people whose coming to Canada was considered by the people of Canada—certainly by the people more especially affected by that immigration—to be a very serious detriment to the country, the condition was met by requiring the possession of $200 in cash by each Asiatic immigrant other than those arranged for as being Chinese or Japanese. It must be obvious to my hon. friend and the House that when we have made arrangements in regard to the Japanese and in regard to the Chinese it is not desirable that we should make a special prohibition or special impediment to the coming of certain other classes of Asiatics. It was not considered to be sound public policy. It was thought very much better that the requirements should embrace 'Asiatics' and unfortunately for the constituents of my hon. friends, Syrians are 'Asiatics.' It is a case in which a very important national policy was given effect to. It was necessary that effective action should be taken, and it is, in my judgment, just as necessary that there should not be any exceptions made to the action that was taken.

On section 2, duty of officer to send complaint to minister regarding undesirable immigrants.

Mr. OLIVER. The committee will notice that the only amendment is in the insertion of the words 'or entering.' The reason for this amendment also is a judicial decision. The decision was that the person who came into Canada before the passing of the Act of last year was not 'landed' within the meaning of the Act, and therefore, was prohibited from remaining in Canada. With all deference to my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Doherty) that was not the intent of the Act, and it is not considered to be fair or just. And it is to relieve that situation that we desire to have these words inserted.

Mr. DOHERTY. I appreciate the deference of the minister, but I was not aware that I had committed myself to any opinion with regard to the significance of the word 'entering' in this section.

On section 3, penalty for rejected or deported person remaining in or re-entering Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. This amendment is a change from the Act as it now stands. It was considered, in looking over the Act, that a fixed penalty of two years' imprisonment was not in proportion to the offence, that, in fact, it was clearly an error; and we desire to correct the error by making the punishment so that there shall be discretion in the hands of the magistrate and that the punishment shall not be more severe than the offence warrants. Therefore, we propose to insert in the section the words 'on summary conviction to a term of imprisonment not exceeding one year.'

Mr. JAMESON. This provides that any one rejected or deported under this Act who returns to Canada shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a term of imprisonment not exceeding one year? Would not that leave the person upon whom sentence was passed the option of paying a penalty or removing from the country? In other words, if he were convicted for a certain term, might not he remain in the country under restraint for the term of his conviction?

Mr. OLIVER. The idea is that having been ordered out and refusing to go, or coming back when he was forbidden, the only remedy was to punish him. The mere ordering him out again could hardly meet the case.

Mr. ROCHE. Has the minister had any such case as that?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that we have.

On section 4—deportation.

Mr. OLIVER. In this case we have not reprinted the whole section, as the proposal is merely to add certain words to provide that where a person is deported the de-

portation shall take place under such conditions as are ordered by the officer in charge. It is believed that, instead of the matter being in the discretion of the transportation company which is carrying out the deportation the transportation company should be under the direction of the officer in charge of immigration. The Act reads that he shall be reconveyed 'by the transportation company which carried him to the place in Canada where he was rejected, or where he is being retained for deportation, to the place in the country whence he was brought, or to the country of his birth or citizenship.' That leaves it discretionary with the transportation company as to the accommodation to be given to the returning immigrant, and, in order that that should not be entirely in the discretion of the transportation company, the words are added 'as may be directed by the officer in charge.'

On section 5,—penalty on transportation company refusing to return person ordered to be deported.

Mr. OLIVER. The first amendment is merely verbal but the second and third amendments in the section are important. As the explanation underneath points out, it is to make clear that the transportation company must take the deported person not only to the boundary of the country from which he came, but to the place in the country from whence he came. In order that there may be no question about it, the second amendment is made to read: 'As may be directed by the immigration officer.

Mr. DOHERTY. I understand the intention of the second amendment is to give the immigration official the right to decide whether the man shall be taken to the country he came from, or to the country of his birth or citizenship. Would it not be fair that the individual deported should have some choice in that matter?

Mr. OLIVER. The board directs that he shall be taken to the place in the country from whence he came, or to that of his birth or citizenship as may be directed by such order. It does leave discretion with the board. But I think it is right that it should be done, because we have difficulties with people who come through the United States from other countries, and some times it is possible to return them through the United States and sometimes it is not, according to the way the United States authorities administer their law.

Mr. DANIEL. Supposing a Ruthenian embarks at Liverpool for this country in one of the Allan or Canadian Pacific Railway steamers, and after having arrived here, he is ordered to be deported. Can this board order the steamship line, not only to take him back to Liverpool, but to make them see that he is conveyed as far as Ruthenia from whence he came in the first place?

Mr. OLIVER. If in Ruthenia or Galicia he bought a ticket to Canada from the agent of the steamship company, yes; but if he had only bought the ticket to Liverpool, and then bought another ticket from Liverpool, of course the company could be compelled to return him to Liverpool.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not suppose the board would be so unreasonable as to do that, but under the wording of the section they would apparently have a right in the case suggested to order that man to be taken back to Ruthenia from Liverpool.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think that the words bear that construction. But there is no doubt that in order to secure substantial justice, that authority has to be placed in the hands of the board. I do not think there is any other way but to give such discretion and authority to the board.

On section 6, subsection 1,—prosecutions,

Mr. OLIVER. The amendments here, as will be noted, provide for a rather greater responsibility on the judicial side than in the present Act; and also provide that proceedings may be taken not only against the transportation company, but against the individual. Under the former Act proceedings might only be taken against the company, and it was thought better, while that might cover all cases, specifically to state that proceedings could be taken against an individual as well as against a company.

On paragraph 4, lien on property of transportation companies.

Mr. OLIVER. These amendments are in the line of the amendment in the first section, that is to say to provide where it is either a person or a company.

Mr. JAMESON. Last year, when this section was under discussion, there was some little doubt in the minds at least of some hon. gentlemen as to whether there would be jurisdiction in certain cases against these transportation companies. I would like to ask the minister if, during the year which has just passed, any proceedings have been taken against any transportation companies under the Act?

Mr. OLIVER. No, we have not found it necessary. The transportation companies have conformed to the Act substantially.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall I report the Bill?

Mr. OLIVER. The amendments are marked by brackets. I do not know whether

a formal motion is necessary or not to have these brackets stricken out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand it is not necessary.

Mr. DANIEL. If you are going to take out the brackets you might correct the spelling of the word 'gaol' in the ninth line on the 2nd page. It is spelled 'goal' instead of 'gaol.'

Bill reported.

MANUFACTURE OF WHITE PHOSPHORUS MATCHES.

House in committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient, in connection with Bill 10 now before this House, to provide for the prohibition of the manufacture and importation of matches made with white phosphorus; to empower the commissioner of patents on petition to fix terms for the use of any process patented at the time of the passing of this Act for the manufacture of matches without white phosphorus, other than matches intended to strike only on a surface specially prepared for the purpose; to provide for the inspection of any place where it is suspected that matches made with white phosphorus may be found; to examine any receptacle or place in which it is suspected that such matches may be; to authorize the Governor in Council to make such orders and regulations as may be necessary; and to fix penalties for infractions of the Act.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). Mr. Speaker, as the members of the committee may not be familiar with the subject with which this resolution has to do, and with the provisions of the Bill which is based on the resolution, I hope the committee will allow me a little time to explain the objects of the proposed legislation, and to outline the purpose that it is hoped to serve. I should like to point out in the first place that this legislation is not intended to embarrass in any way any existing industry. It is rather aimed exclusively at the stamping out of a disease connected with a certain industry which has been found in other countries to be of a very serious and, I may say, hideous nature. The disease is spoken of popularly as 'phossy,' and scientifically as phosphorous necrosis or poisoning from phosphorous. This disease is one which has been known for a great many years in different countries ; in fact, for something like seventy years the countries of Europe have been familiar with it. One after the other, they have found it necessary to pass legislation to protect the workers who are engaged in the match-making industry from the evils of it. Perhaps I might in a casual way, indicate to the committee in my own words what the nature of this disease is. It has been found where matches have been made of phorphorous that in the making of these matches, the phosphorous fumes not infrequently attack the teeth of the workers and sometimes very minute particles of phosphorus also find their way to the teeth and, going through the cavaties of the teeth, work their way to the jawbones which become festered with the result that little by little they break away and the workers lose their jaws altogether. I can describe more fully the nature of this disease by reading to the committee the definition given of the malady by the chairman of a commission appointed in England some ten or eleven years ago to look into the matter. I have here the report of a commission which was appointed by the British government in 1899 to report to the Secretary of the Home Department on the use of phosphorous in the manufacture of lucifer matches. It is by Prof. T. E. Thorpe, principal chemist of the government laboratory; Prof. Thomas Oliver, physician to the Royal Infirmary, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and Dr. George Cunningham, Senior Dental Surgeon to the London Hospital. These gentlemen were appointed by the British government to look carefully into this industrial disease, and they reported at considerable length upon it in the volume which I have here. The definition of the disease given by Dr. Oliver, is as follows :

The malady that is dreaded is phosphorus necrosis. The presence of decayed teeth predisposes a match maker to the disease, for the phosphorus fumes penetrate carious teeth and readily induce a periostitis or acute inflammation of the covering of the jawbone. The gum becomes swollen, and both it and the jawbone painful. Sooner or later pus forms, and although the tooth, or the teeth, are extracted, the pain continues, but in a less severe form. The inflammation gradually extends to the bone, which undergoes a process of slow destruction. For months pus keeps oozing out into the mouth in minute quantities, some of which is swallowed, and tends to induce chronic toxaemia. By means of the use of antiseptic mouth washes the morbid process gradually ceases by a piece of dead bone being thrown off, or the decayed bone is removed by surgical operation, when the patient recovers with or without facial deformity.

The disease has recently been made the subject of a very full and complete investigation in the United States. It has been investigated there by Mr. John J. Andrews who is secretary of the American Association for Labour Legislation, and who is one of the best known of the younger economists of the United States. Mr. Andrews, in a pamphlet which was published a short time ago in regard to American industrial diseases, a pamphlet which has been distributed by the American Association of Labour Legislation, gives an account of the nature of this disease, and I will read it also to the committee because it is rather

important that the members should realize the full significance of the industrial ill to which the workers in match factories are liable in order to appreciate the necessity for this legislation. Mr. Andrews says:

Poisoning from phosphorus has many evil effects. Some are local, others general. The general effect most frequently noted in cases of chronic phosphorus poisoning is anaemia. The daily breathing of air laden with phosphorus fumes and continual contact with the particles of phosphorus result in a gradual lowering of vitality, which in turn invites other forms of disease. This is one of the most prevalent and most serious results of phosphorus poisoning. But such general effects are much more difficult of actual determination and consequently the local effects which are more conspicuous receive the greater attention.

Phosphorus necrosis, the peculiar local form of the disease, is caused by the absorption of phosphorus through the teeth or gums. The generally accepted theory is that minute particles of the poison enter, usually, through the cavities of decayed teeth, setting up an inflammation which, if not quickly arrested, extends along the jaws, causing the teeth to loosen and drop out, and that jawbones slowly decompose and pass away in the form of nauseating pus, which sometimes breaks through the neck in the form of an abcess or, if not almost continually washed out, oozes into the mouth where it mixes with the saliva and is swallowed.

Treatment is largely preventive, but when the disease is once established a serious surgical operation is often the only means of arresting the process of decay. In many instances of poisoning it is necessary to remove an entire jaw, and in several cases both jaws have been removed at a single operation. A number of cases of necrosis have resulted in death.

It is the awfulness of the disease and the ease with which it can be prevented that has led many countries where the effects of the disease and the means for its prevention have been studied, to do away with the disease forever.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there any cases in Canada such as the minister has described?

Mr. KING. There have been such cases and I intend to cite several of them. A few years ago the French government made a state monopoly of the match business, and it was found that a great many engaged in the making of matches contracted the disease and became a charge on the state. The authorities became anxious, and the government began to make inquiry to see if some substitute could not be found to take the place of phosphorus, and what is known as sesqui sulphite was discovered by two French chemists and was adopted by the French government. It is an interesting commentary on industrial conditions as regulated by public and private interests respectively that when the government found itself face to face with having to use part of the revenue which it was getting from the match industry to maintain some of the unfortunate workers in that industry, it undertook to provide a remedy, but that individual manufacturers, who had no responsibility for the loss occasioned to the worker, continued existing processes without seeking to adopt any substitute for the poisonous material. It was found by the French government that a material quite as good as phosphorus could be used in the making of matches, and having adopted it, other countries which had experience of this frightful disease later followed the example, and gradually enacted laws prohibiting altogether the making of matches with this poisonous substance.

In 1901 there was formed in Europe the International Labour Association, the purpose of which is to bring about, if possible, uniformity in the industrial laws of the different countries of Europe. Speaking on industrial affairs in this House, I have had occasion to point out that this is an age not merely of competition as between industry and industry and locality and locality within a country, but as between the industries of one country and the industries of another country, and that we are fast approaching the day when industrial competition will be not above that of one nation with another nation, but of one continent with another continent. Those who have looked deeply into industrial matters have come to see that any regulation to be really effective must spread over the entire area of competition, and that if one nation is going to improve the condition of its workers it can only do so effectively by the nation adjoining it, or competing with it, adopting the same standards. This association, founded in Paris, now has its headquarters in Switzerland, and it was founded in recognition of this fact. It was formed with a view of bringing about uniformity in the industrial laws of Europe and the industrial laws of the American continent as well. Branches have been established in the different countries of Europe and in the United States, and the association publishes from month to month bulletins in which the labour laws of the different countries are classified, and it holds annual meetings at which subjects of general interest are discussed. One of the main subjects taken up by the association at an early date was this question of phosphorus necrosis. Through the instrumentality of the government of Switzerland special meetings of the members of this association were called at Berne in 1905 and 1906 to consider the question of the several countries adopting uniform legislation on this occupational disease known as 'phosphorous necrosis,' and eleven different countries were repre-

sented at the latter gathering. On that occasion a convention was drawn up to which the different nations were asked to become parties, and which provided that each country should prevent the manufacture of matches from white phosphorus, and also prohibit the importation into it of any matches made from white phosphorus. I have here a memorandum on the international conference held at Berne in September, 1906. This memorandum was prepared by the British government, and it gives an account of the convention which was held to deal with this subject, and it points out that the following powers: France, Germany, Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Luxemburg and Italy decided to enter into an agreement on the subject between themselves and to sign the following convention:—

International Convention on the subject of the Prohibition of the use of White (Yellow) Phosphorus in the manufacture of matches.

His Majesty the German Emperor, King of Prussia; His Majesty the King of Denmark; the President of the French Republic; His Majesty the King of Italy; His Royal Highness the Grand Duke of Luxemburg, Duke of Nassau; Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands; the Swiss Federal Council,

desiring to facilitate the development of the industrial protection of work-people by the adoption of common provisions,

have resolved to conclude with this object a convention respecting the use of white (yellow) phosphorus in the manufacture of matches, and have appointed the following to be their plenipotentiaries; that is to say:—

(Here is given a list of the plenipotentiaries.)

who after having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:—

Article 1.

The high contracting parties bind themselves to prohibit in their respective territories, the manufacture, importation and sale of matches, which contain white (yellow) phosphorus.

Article 2.

It is incumbent upon each of the contracting states to take the administrative measures necessary to ensure the strict execution of the terms of the present convention within their respective territories.

Each government shall communicate to the others through the diplomatic channel the laws and regulations which exist or shall hereafter come into force in their country with regard to the subject matter of the present convention as well as the reports on the manner in which the said laws and regulations are applied.

Article 3.

The present convention shall only apply to a colony, possession or protectorate when a notice to this effect shall have been given on its behalf by the government of the mother country to the Swiss Federal Council.

Mr. CROCKET. Is Great Britain a party to the convention?

Mr. KING. I was just going to refer to the attitude of Great Britain. In 1899 the British government appointed a commission to go into the whole question. That commission is the one whose report I have referred to. That report recommended numerous regulations thought sufficient to meet the evil, and the British government adopted these regulations and had them put in force. When this association met in 1906, these regulations were on trial, and the British government did not then see its way, on that account, to become a party to the convention. However, in 1908, the British government, having found these regulations insufficient, decided to give its adherence to the convention and did join the other countries to which I have referred, later Austria followed the example of Britain, so that with the exception of Norway, Sweden and Russia, which have regulations of their own, all the principal countries of Europe have become parties to an agreement which prohibits the use of white phosphorus in the making of matches and which prohibits also the importation of matches made with white phosphorus. Not only that, but since the British government became a party to the convention, the following possessions of Britain have given their adherence to it: The Orange River Colony, Cyprus, British East Africa, Gibraltar, Malta, Mauritius, Scychelles, Southern Nigeria, Leeward Islands and Fiji. Also the following French possessions: The Somali Coast, Reunion, Madagascar and its dependencies, the French settlements in Oceania and New Caledonia, Tunis and the Netherlands Indies.

In this connection it may interest the House to know how this government came to consider this particular measure. When the British government became a party to this convention, the Secretary of State for the Colonies sent a communication to the Governor General of the Dominion, informing him of that fact, and asked the Canadian government whether this country would adhere to the convention. In January, 1909, the following despatch was sent to Lord Grey:—

I have the honour to request Your Excellency to inform your ministers that, an Act having been passed last session by the imperial parliament to prohibit the manufacture, sale and importation of matches made with white phosphorus, a copy of which is inclosed, His Majesty's government have now notified the adhesion of the United Kingdom to the Berne Convention of the 26th September, 1906, on the subject of the prohibition of the use of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches.

I shall be glad to learn in due course whe-

ther your government desire that a notification of their adhesion should be made under article 3 of the convention.

Another despatch was sent in August of this last year stating that the British government were anxious to know as soon as possible whether the Dominion government proposed to give its adhesion to the convention.

Before sending any reply, the government deemed it desirable to get the fullest information possible as to the necessity for any such legislation in this country. The first step taken was to communicate with the authorities in every province in order to ascertain whether any legislation for the purpose of protecting their workers in match factories existed therein and also what was the extent of the industry, and whether there was any need for further legislation on this matter. Mr. Ackland, Deputy Minister of the Department of Labour, communicated with the various provincial secretaries, and the replies he received indicated that in none of the provinces was there any legislation protecting workers against the particular disease, phosphorus necrosis. Having obtained these replies, the department directed two of its officers, Mr. Dubreuil and Mr. McNiven, to investigate and find out whether there were any instances of phosphorous necrosis in the Dominion; and later on I shall submit the substance of their report to the House.

I have given a short account of the various stages so that the House may see clearly the genesis of this measure. It had its beginning in the request of the British government to be informed as to whether Canada would become party to the convention. But the British government did not ask the Canadian government or parliament to consider a measure of this kind until it had itself passed an Act dealing with the evil. The Act of the British parliament is intituled: An Act to prohibit the manufacture and sale of matches made with white phosphorus, and was passed December 21, 1908.

And the Bill I have introduced, is, as nearly as possible, a reproduction of the British Act, which is the source from which this proposed legislation has been inspired.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there any demand from any of the health associations of Canada respecting this matter?

Mr. KING. Not that I am aware of, and the surprising feature of the whole business is the lack of knowledge which there seems to have been as to the extent of this evil in this country. Had the attention of the federal government not been drawn to it, this disease might have continued to spread in this country. Certainly one might have expected some of the provincial inspectors to have come across and reported upon cases of this kind, but not one seems to have done so.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the hon. minister any evidence that the disease does exist?

Mr. KING. I have; and as I said a moment ago, I shall give it to the House in a few minutes. The reason I have spoken at some length of the genesis of this measure, is because an entirely erroneous impression has been spread throughout this country as to its origin. No doubt hon. gentlemen opposite have seen in many of our daily papers the statement that this legislation, in some indirect way, was inspired by the Match Trust in the United States. As this seems to be the impression, and as something may be said to the same effect later, I want to refer for a moment to legislation in the United States and the alleged connection of the Match Trust in that country with this measure. I have here the article to which I have referred and which has been copied into the newspapers throughout Canada. It reads as follows:—

HON. MACKENZIE KING AND THE MATCH TRUST.

The Bill he introduced in Parliament looks suspicious.

The Minister has placed the Government in an Embarrassing Position—The Bill would Prohibt Manufacture of White Phosphorus Matches.

Hon. Mackenzie King, Minister of Labour, has, through inexperience, it is alleged, placed the government and himself in a most embarrassing position, from which they will have the greatest difficulty in extricating themselves. It is asserted that the Bill he has introduced into parliament to prohibit the manufacture and importation of matches made with white phosphorus is simply part of a scheme which had its origin in the United States to promote and aid the Match Trust. The Match Trust controls the patents governing the process of making matches with materials other than with white phosphorus.

Misplaced Zeal.

It seems that Mr. King, while looking around for legislation, stumbled across a Bill which has been introduced into the United States Congress, and which aims at putting out of business all firms that manufacture matches with white phosphorus. Of course, the real design of the United States Bill is to corner the market for the Match Trust. The Canadian Minister of Labour, without knowing all the facts of the case, clutched at the statement that white phosphorus was poisonous, and, thinking to gain eclat by similar legislation designed to save the workers from the cruel manufacturers, immediately introduced the measure mentioned into parliament.

Objects of Attack.

But in addition to charges from Washington that he is in league with the Match Trust, Mr. King and the government find themselves

the object of attack not only by several Canadian manufacturers of matches, but also by work people who will lose their occupations if the Bill becomes law and thus shuts down a number of factories.

And so on—

That is a somewhat serious indictment to be brought against any one person let alone against a government as a whole, and that report has been sent out from end to end of the Dominion as being the explanation of the Bill I have introduced. It is only fair to point out that the paper which published this article in the first instance, on the following day, in its editorial columns, published a complete repudiation of the article. The editorial was headed: 'Poisoned victims,' and it goes on to show that the paper which published the article does not share this view. Giving the name of the paper, it says:

This paper prefers to be on the side of the legislation suggested against a manufacturing curse which undoubtedly was at no recent date rife throughout civilization.

We beg, therefore, to repudiate sympathy with the opinions which appeared in this paper yesterday, and on the contrary to range ourselves among the supporters of the government Bill until good reasons are proved against it.

Mr. OWEN. Is any white phosphorus used in the manufacture of matches in Canada and if so where?

Mr. KING. White phosphorus is used in all the factories. The largest is the E. B. Eddy Company at Hull, there are also the J. and G. Flewelling at Hampton, New Brunswick, the Eureka Match Factory at Halifax, Nova Scotia, there is also one in the province of Quebec, and I think there is a factory beginning business in Deseronto, Ontario. In all these factories I understand white phosphorous is used in the manufacture of matches.

I may say that simultaneously with the introduction of this Bill in this House or a little before a Bill was introduced in the United States House of Representatives which is now before that body. I have copies of the different Bills which have been introduced, one on June 3, 1910, a Bill to provide for a tax upon white phosphorus matches and for other purposes; another on December 15, of the same name and one on December 19, 1910. All of these Bills have been introduced with a view to having the United States also become a party to the convention to which these other countries have become parties, and if that legislation passes, and this legislation passes in this House, and there is reason to believe that in each case it will pass, then the countries on this continent and the leading countries in Europe will have united together to absolutely put down the possibility of the spread of this disease in connection with the match making industry.

On December 6, 1910, Mr. Taft, President of the United States, sent the following message to Congress:

I invite attention to the very serious injury caused to all those who are engaged in the manufacture of phosphorus matches. The disease incident to this are frightful, and as matches can be made from other materials entirely innocuous, I believe that the injurious manufacture could be discouraged and ought to be discouraged by the imposition of a heavy federal tax. I recommend the adoption of this method of stamping out a very serious abuse.

The president's message, I should say, was not sent until after the whole matter had been very carefully investigated by officers of the Department of Labour and Commerce in the United States. I have here a copy of hearings before the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives on Bills relating to the health and activity of the general public, a report which deals with this one question alone, printed during the latter part of last year. It contains a complete account of the match making industry in the United States and cites cases of phosphorus necrosis which are known to be existent in the factories there. On the first page is a letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labour, Hon. Charles Nagel, stating different reasons why an Act of this kind should be passed in the United States. It contains, on page 390, a letter which was given by the then president of the Diamond Match Company, the concern which owns the patent of the substance to which I have referred—sesquisulphide—in which the president of that company states that in the event of an Act of this kind being passed in the United States his firm will be agreeable to allow all manufacturing concerns to have the use of its patented substance on equal terms with itself. The same kind of a charge that has been made here in Canada in the article to which I have referred has been made also in the United States namely that this legislation is being promoted by the Match Trust and the reason that is put forward is that the Match Trust, the Diamond Match Company in the United States happens to own the patent for this substance, sesquisulphide, and will not allow other concerns to use it so that its competitors will be at a disadvantage if legislation of this kind should be enacted. That makes this letter of considerable interest. It reads:

Akron, Ohio, March 15, 1909.

Charles E. McKenna,
Special Agent, Bureau of Labour.
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir,—The Diamond Match Company, owners of patents for the use of sesquisulphide

phosphorus for the manufacture of matches in America, believing this article to be a remedy for the prevailing trouble in manufacturing matches, namely, phosphorus necrosis, is willing to permit the use of sesquisulphide in the manufacture of matches in America if the government provided for the prohibition of the use of white phosphorus by other manufacturers of matches not owning an interest in the patent, they all to be put on equal terms with the Diamond Match Company as to the use of the patents. The government of England has this last winter passed a Bill prohibiting the use of white phosphorus and providing for the use of sesquisulphide on equal terms, as per copy of Bill inclosed.

O. C. BARBER.

On seeing this communication in the report it occurred to me that it might be well to communicate with the Diamond Match Company in the United States and find out whether this company would be willing to grant the use of the patented substance to manufacturing firms in Canada on as liberal terms as they propose to offer in the United States. I may say that this patent in Canada is at present owned by the same company, the Diamond Match Company, they having obtained possession of the patent last year. It was patented in Canada some years ago by two Frenchmen. I sent the following communication to the president of the Diamond Match Company on the last day of the old year.

Ottawa, Ont., December 31, 1910.

Sirs,—In a report of the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives on Bills relating to Health Activities of the general government, part VII, printed at Washington this year, I find quoted at page 390 the following communication:—

Here is set out the letter I have first read.

I understand from inquiry at the Patent Office of the Dominion that a patent for the use of sesquisulphide for the manufacture of matches in Canada was taken out in 1899 by Henri Sevens and E. D. Cahen, of Paris, France, and in 1910 assigned to the Diamond Match Company. I inclose for your information copy of a Bill which I have introduced in the House of Commons of Canada, and I am writing to ask if, in the event of this Bill becoming law, the Diamond Match Company is prepared to permit the use of sesquisulphide in the manufacture of matches in Canada on the same terms on which, according to the above quoted communication, it is prepared to allow its use under like circumstances in the United States, i.e., all manufacturers to be put on equal terms with the Diamond Match Company as to the use of the patents.

As this question is likely to be raised in the course of the debate on the second reading of the Bill which may take place very shortly after the reassembling of parliament on the 11th proximo, I would be obliged if your company would give me a statement which I might make public in this connection.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) W. L. MACKENZIE KING,
Minister of Labour.

The Diamond Match Company,
Akron, Ohio.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Has the Diamond Match Company manufactured in Canada under its patent?

Mr. KING. I am not aware that they have manufactured in Canada.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Then their patent is worthless.

Mr. KING. That would be all the better for the manufacturers in this country.

Mr. WRIGHT. What are these particular terms?

Mr. KING. The correspondence which I am about to read will probably answer that question.

January 11, 1911.

The Diamond Match Company,
111 Broadway, New York.

Sir,—We are in receipt of your letter of December 31, 1910.

In reply we beg to advise you that in the event of the passage of your Bill No. 10, entitled 'An Act to prohibit the Manufacture and Importation of Matches made with White Phosphorus,' we would be quite willing to permit the use of sesquisulphide of phosphorus in Canada on equitable terms.

The use of sesquisulphide of phosphorus as an ingredient in the composition of a match head as covered by letters patent of the Dominion of Canada granted December 5, 1899, to Henri Sevene and E. D. Cahen, of Paris, France, and assigned to this company.

The 4th section of the English White Phosphorus Act provides that any person who is manufacturing or proposing to manufacture matches may present a petition to the board of trade praying for the grant of a compulsory license, &c. So far as we, as owners of the Canadian patent are concerned, we would be quite satisfied with a similar provision in the Canadian law.

Yours truly,
The Diamond Match Co.,
EDW. R. STETTINIUS,
President.

W. L. Mackenzie King, Esq.,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Canada.

Since the receipt of that letter, a letter has reached me from Mr. Andrews, the secretary of the American Association for Labour Legislation which shows that the Diamond Match Company has gone a step further. As I have pointed out, the agitation in the United States, as in the manner attempted here, has been directed to make it appear that the match trust is really seeking to promote legislation of this kind and to use these patents to embarrass other concerns. This letter speaks for itself:

American Association for Labour Legislation.
Metropolitan Tower, New York City,
Jan. 10, 1911.

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Canada.

My dear Mr. King,—You will be interested to know that the bugaboo of monopoly raised by some disingenuous persons with reference to our national campaign to secure the prohibition of the use of poisonous phosphorus in the manufacture of matches in the United States has been squelched for all time in this connection. The Diamond Match Co. has assigned its patent for the sesquisulphide substitute to three trustees: Prof. E. R. A. Seligman, of Columbia University, Commissioner Charles P. Neill, of the United States Bureau of Labour, and Attorney Jackson Ralston, attorney for the American Federation of Labour, Washington, D.C., with full power to deal with future applicants for the patented formula on any basis they may think proper.

These three gentlemen have been given power to fix the terms according to what they think proper, they being trustees. I think that answers the question my hon. friend asked.

In the United States we believe we have now overcome every objection that can be honestly raised and we hope every suspicion, no matter how unjustified. We are holding a conference in Chicago to-morrow on this subject, and within the next week we hope to see the Esch Phosphorus Bill reported out of the committee and well on its way toward early enactment into law at this present short session of Congress.

With best wishes for the progress of similar legislation in Canada, I am,

Yours very sincerely,
JOHN B. ANDREWS,
Secretary.

What I would like to make plain to the House is that in all the countries of Europe where this legislation has been enacted, this substitute has taken the place of white phosphorus. As I understand it, it is a chemical mixture which contains phosphorus and sulphur, the two being mixed in retorts away from where the people are working, so that there is no danger, after the combination has been effected, from the effects of the substance. And that is another important feature—that there is no danger to children of poisoning by sucking the heads of matches. That danger is done away with as well as the danger of phosphorus poisoning while the match manufacture is going on.

As I have stated, the countries of Europe have adopted this substitute. They have been face to face with the same condition that the match manufacturers here will have to meet. They have acquiesced in the legislation that has been passed; in fact, the British match manufacturers, when the matter was up for consideration there, petitioned the Home Office to adopt this very legislation. It may seem extraordinary that they should have done so, but the explanation is, I understand that they found that the regulations under which the British government was placing them with a view to preventing this disease caused them more expense than the use of the substitute would cause, and they felt that if they were all put on an equal footing it would be in their own interests to acquiesce in the enactment of a law of this kind. On Tuesday, the 24th of March, 1908, Mr. Gilbert Bartholomew, chairman and managing director of Bryant & May, Limited, the largest manufacturers of matches in England, headed a deputation to the Home Secretary. I will not quote the whole of his remarks, but will read two paragraphs. Mr. Bartholomew said:

I have the honour to represent here the match manufacturers of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland who use poisonous phosphorus. There are at present only nine of such manufacturers of matches, and they are Bryant & May, Limited, London and Liverpool; R. Bell & Co., Limited, London; J. Palmer & Son, London; S. J. Moreland & Sons, Gloucester; Maguire, Miller & Co., Liverpool; Paterson & Co., Limited, Dublin; W. J. Morgan & Co., Limited, Manchester; Hargreaves & Clegg, Limited, Manchester; The Hulme Patent Advertising Match Co., Limited, Manchester. The nine manufacturers are unanimous in appealing to you, sir, to take such steps as may be necessary to prohibit, at the earliest possible date, the use of poisonous phosphorus in the manufacture of matches.

And after giving a number of reasons in support of this request, the chairman said:

I want to emphasize another feature which is very important, and that is, that so long as phosphorus matches remain in use, so long there will be occasional deaths among children poisoned by sucking the heads of such matches. These considerations alone should be sufficient to win a ready response to our proposal. Another grave feature which I need not particularize: it is doubtless familiar to the Home Office, has brought about the present condition of things in Sweden, and yet, while phosphorus matches are not allowed to be sold or consumed in that country, their manufacture in the country is still allowed for export to this and other countries where such matches are not yet prohibited.

In conclusion, our case may be briefly stated to be:—

1. The manufacturers are unanimous in favour of prohibition.

2. The employees will heartily welcome prohibition.

3. Quite a number of other countries have already adopted it, and we believe the rest will gladly do so when led in that direction by Great Britain.

4. Efficient substitutes for poisonous phosphorus are available. The efficiency cannot be better testified to than by mentioning the fact that for the last eight years all Bryant &

May's matches have been manufactured without poisonous phosphorus. It is true that the two efficient alternatives are patented; but the owners of the better known of the two have offered it to their brother manufacturers in the United Kingdom, who have readily accepted the terms offered, which, I may say, are practically but a nominal recognition of the patent rights. The other alternative is the joint property of the manufacturers, except one, and that one has accepted proposals enabling him to use whichever of the alternatives he may prefer.

5. There is consequently no reason whatever why the use of poisonous phosphorus should be continued, and I believe it is well known to the Home Office that in other countries there has been very much more injury to the health of the workers than in this, and it is to be expected, therefore, that very soon there will be unanimity in this matter throughout the match-making countries. But whether there is or not, or whether it comes sooner or later, we claim the time has come and should not be delayed, when Great Britain should be ready to give effect to a proposal which can have none but beneficial effects upon all concerned.

Now, the attitude of the British government in both Houses of parliament, when the subject came up for discussion there, may be stated in a few words. In the House of Commons the Hon. Herbert Gladstone, Secretary of State for the Home Department said in reference to this legislation:

So far as the general necessity for the Bill was concerned, it was desirable, though he admitted there had been few cases lately of necrosis poisoning, if they could do it, absolutely to eliminate the chance of this very dreadful and painful disease occurring. It was so dreadful that, even if only one case had occurred in the last few years, this Bill, which would involve no trouble or expense, would be justified.

These were the words of the present Governor of South Africa. Then in the House of Lords, the Lord Steward, Earl Beauchamp said:

Representations have been made to the Home Office, on behalf of all the manufacturers of matches in the United Kingdom, that if the importation of matches made abroad with white phosphorus is prohibited by law they would be willing that the use of that material in the manufacture of matches in this country should be forbidden.

. . .I do not think, therefore, that there will be any increase in the cost of manufacture of these 'strike anywhere' matches. In these circumstances and especially in view of the fact that this Bill will go far to prevent the danger of cases of phossy jaw occurring among match makers in the future, I hope your Lordship will agree to the motion for the second reading.

I have dwelt a little on the English legislation, because I feel that rightly the precedent of the British parliament will carry great weight in this country. We have first of all, the match manufacturers themselves in Britain uniting in a petition to have this legislation passed in the English house, recognizing that the best regulation possible to have, was ineffective, and we have both the House of Commons and the House of Lords agreeing to the legislation. Now I do not believe that in this country we shall encounter any more opposition from the match manufacturers than was encountered in Great Britain. I have had a talk with Mr. Rowley, general manager of the E. B. Eddy Company, which I think produces something like ninety per cent of the matches used in this country. Mr. Rowley has stated to me that while he does not see that there is any necessity for this legislation from his point of view, and while he thinks the regulations at present existing are quite effective, I am at liberty to state that his company does not propose to offer any opposition to this legislation. Then I have had an opportunity of talking with Mr. Flewelling, representing the match company in Hampton, and with Mr. Corbett, of Halifax, and also with Mr. McCarthy, who has to do with the business just starting in Deseronto, Ontario; and these gentlemen, while perhaps they would prefer to see no legislation, have told me that if sufficient time is given them in which to make the necessary changes, they do not intend to offer any active opposition to the measure. So parliament, in considering this legislation, may keep in mind, not merely the precedent of Great Britain, the example of all the countries in Europe, but I think may rely, if not upon co-operation, at least upon the tacit consent of the match manufacturers of this country.

I would point out to the House that if there were no reasons other than those I have already mentioned, they are quite sufficient to justify legislation of this kind. Great Britain and the European countries have all found this legislation necessary. Is there any reasonable ground for believing that in Canada the reasons are less strong than they have proven to be in those older countries? If we do not enact legislation of this kind while other countries do, we give a premium to the manufacturer who may desire to produce matches from white phosphorus, and hold out, as it were, an inducement to him to come here. On the other hand, all the countries which have enacted this legislation have also prohibited the importation of matches made with white phosphorus, Canada to-day cannot export matches to Britain made with white phosphorus, nor to Germany, nor to any other European country I have mentioned. We have further the prospect, the probability, of a similar enactment in the United States; so we would also be shut

out, if their Bill passes, from shipping matches into the United States. At any rate, one of the strong reasons why we should take part in this work is, that it is part of a great international movement for the purpose of suppressing a great industrial evil, and for Canada to stand apart in such a movement is equivalent to saying to these other countries that we are not prepared to do our share in bringing about a world reform of this magnitude.

But I can understand that members of the House might feel that while these reasons are good, they are not strong enough to warrant this legislation. A moment ago I referred to a report that officers of the Department of Labour were called upon to make, and this report relates to the question which I have been asked several times namely, as to whether in Canada we have any cases of phosphorus necrosis. I had hoped that it would not be necessary to make mention of any of these cases. It is not a pleasant task to cite instances which do not reflect credit upon industries or upon individuals, and I would much prefer being spared to make the statement I have now to make. On the other hand, if I do not cite instances, there are many who will say that the necessity does not exist, and that there is no sufficient reason for this legislation, notwithstanding all that has been said. However, in order to do as little injury to any one as possible, I have carefully eliminated from the report which was presented to me by the officers of the Department of Labour who investigated this matter, all the names of which the report makes mention. I can give the names to any member of the House and shall be glad to do so, if he wishes to have them, but for purposes of record and so far as the public generally is concerned, I think that the mere statement of the cases themselves will be sufficient.

The following statements are from the joint report of the two officers of the department who made the investigation. The first three cases cited relate to deaths from phosphorus poisoning which occurred during the past year.

Miss ———, aged between 22 and 23 years, resided with her parents at ——— street. Her death took place about a year ago. The following brief statement concerning her illness and death was made by her mother:—

She commenced work in the match factory at the age of 14. Her term of employment there lasted about 7 years, when she had to cease work. Her trouble commenced with toothache and extended to the jawbones, finally affecting the whole face. During the last stages of the disease she was completely blind. Her illness covered a period of 19 months. She was attended by Dr. ——— and Dr. ———. She was admitted to ——— Hospital on two occasions, where operations were performed, and was released from that institution shortly before her death. During the last few years she worked in the match factory she earned $1.25 per day.

Dr. ———, the first of the physicians referred to by the mother, states that phosphorus poisoning was the cause of this young woman's death. The other physician did not wish to be interviewed.

That is one case. I can supply the name of the physician who attended her, and who states that her death was due to phosphorus poisoning, and I can give the name of the hospital where hon. gentlemen themselves can see the records.

Mr. DANIEL. Was that given as the cause of death, or was it in the certificate of death ?

Mr. KING. It was given by the physician himself.

Miss ———, 38 years of age, resided at ———, died May ', 1910, after an illness of seven months.

The statement in connection with the illness and death of this woman was obtained at the home of her parents. She had worked in the match factory for eight or ten years before her teeth began to give her trouble. Dr. ——— then ordered her to have five teeth extracted, the operation being performed by Dr. ———. She continued to get worse, and Dr. ——— was consulted, who said that she had poisoning of the blood, caused by fumes. She was admitted to ——— Hospital on March 5, where she remained till May 3, two days before her death. While in the hospital she was operated upon several times, and portions of jawbone extracted. Each of the two physicians who attended this woman during her illness was seen in reference to this case, and both stated that the cause of death was phosphorus poisoning.

Miss ———, aged 25 years, resided with her parents at ———, died on April 17, 1910. The following facts were elicited in a conversation with her father, mother and sister:—

She died on April 17, 1910, after an illness of about a year, at the age of 25. She had worked in the match factory about five years before her troubles began. She was admitted to the ——— Hospital during the summer of 1909, and was under the care of Dr. ———, of ———. She had all her teeth extracted and portions of the jawbone removed. Was confined to bed for five months and endured terrible suffering from ulceration of the jaw and decay of the bone. In describing the cause of her death, the expression used by one of her parents was, 'She died of consumption, caused by swallowing pus from ulcerated jaw.'

The report next makes mention of several persons who are reported to have succumbed to the disease, but in regard to whose cases it was not possible to obtain reliable information.

The following are mentioned as examples of cases of phosphorus poisoning existing at the present time, but which have not proved fatal. Any of the particulars mentioned may be verified by persons who desire to see and converse with the parties:

Mrs. ——, residing at—— worked in match factory for some years, and left on the advice of Dr. —— fourteen years ago. Before leaving, she had fourteen teeth extracted, and was under medical and surgical treatment for a year. The doctor who attended this case states this woman contracted phosphorus poisoning in the match factory some years ago, but has been cured.

Miss ——, aged 28 years, residing with her parents at——.

The following brief statement was given by her mother.

She commenced to work in the match factory at the age of fourteen. Two years ago she had two teeth extracted by Dr. ——, when a piece of the jawbone was removed. Dr. —— was consulted and he advised 'that she discontinue working in the fumes, as she was too weak to counteract its influence.' Her face is still inflamed and swollen, but her mother does not anticipate any serious results.

The doctor who removed a portion of this young woman's jawbone states that the cause of her trouble was phosphorus poisoning.

Miss ——, aged 32 years, residing at ——, stated herself that she had worked in the match factory for eighteen years; that for four years she was sick and unable to work. During this time she was operated upon at —— and —— hospitals, ——, and at —— hospital, ——. She had worked only a few years in the match factory when her teeth began to loosen and ache. At one period of her illness her whole lower jawbone was removed. All her teeth have been extracted. It is twelve years since the last operation was performed, but the left side of her face is still inflamed and swollen. She has suffered more or less during all these years.'

Mr. ——, residing at — , states that he worked for twenty years in the match factory at ——; that he has had all his teeth extracted. About five or six years ago ulceration of the jaw commenced, and his teeth one after another, although perfectly sound, loosened and had to be removed. He was treated at —— hospital, ——, where he had five operations performed on the jawbones, and finally the entire lower jaw was removed. He was sick and unable to work for seven months. The surgeon who performed the operations told him that the cause of his trouble was due to phosphorus poisoning contracted in the match factory. He says he has great difficulty in masticating his food, being unable to eat anything of a solid substance. This man gave the names of three other men, employees of the same factory, whom he stated had been attacked with necrosis of the jaw. About four years ago a man had to have both upper and lower jawbones removed. Another man lost the left half of the lower jaw, including the ear. Another man named ——, died, he says, from the effects of phosphorus poisoning.

Miss ——, aged 41, residing at ——, stated that she was employed in the match factory for a great many years. About thirteen years ago her teeth began to loosen, and she had a number of them extracted. About the same time she had portions of the lower jawbone taken out. After that the ulceration continued, and affected her whole face. Dr. —— performed a number of operations, finally removing the whole lower jawbone. These operations were performed at her home. She was confined to bed for four years, and for two years the suffering was so intense that opiates had to be administered. She recovered sufficiently to return to work, although she suffered afterwards from inflammation of the jaw. About three months ago she had all the remaining teeth in the upper jaw, thirteen in number, removed, and her face is still swollen. Her health has suffered on account of her being unable to masticate her food. This woman stated that during her illness portions of her jawbone became so ulcerated that they were removed by herself without the aid of the surgeon.'

Miss ——, aged 46 years, residing at ——, states that she worked in the match factory for 17 years, though it is now six years since she worked there. She had worked in the factory for 10 years before she felt the effects of the poison. For two years before she finally ceased work there she had suffered a great deal from toothache and ulceration of the jaw, and was ignorant of the true nature of the disease she was suffering from. Dr. —— was her physician. She was confined to bed for two years. She had all her teeth extracted, and both upper and lower jawbones removed, necessitating many operations. She had never been admitted to a hospital, the operations being performed at her home. Her face is very much disfigured. As a result of the disease she has a hole under her chin which penetrates the mouth. Fluid taken into the mouth escapes through this hole unless prevented by holding the ball of the thumb under the chin, covering the hole. She says her health generally is poor; that at the time of her illness the pain was so great that she lost her reason for a while. She could remember cases of phosphorus poisoning in the match factory during her term of employment. She also stated that her mother had died from effects of blood poisoning while she was nursing her through her illness.

Dr. ——, who attended this woman, was interviewed in reference to this case. He said it was a bad case of phosphorus poisoning, and it was almost miraculous that the woman survived all the suffering she had endured.

The report concludes by making mention of one or two other recent cases of phosphorus poisoning, of which an account was given by the physicians who attended the same.

When I read that report I hardly believed the statements that were made in it, and I decided that before I would mention the subject in this House I would verify the statements myself. The two last cases, I think, were about as bad as any reported in the list, so I went to the homes of these people myself and had a conversation with them. I will vouch from personal observation for the truth of every statement that is contained in the account of the two last cases I have read. One of the women I talked with had both of her jaws removed entirely and had the abscesses in her mouth to which I made reference. The bones taken from that woman's face are at the present

moment in my office. That women is supported by a sister who has to earn the food required for each of them, and she has been rendered an invalid for the rest of her life. I went to the other home and I talked with this woman, who had lain in bed for four years. At the present time she is the only support of her mother, and she is able to earn $4 a week. She is without a lower jaw at all and she told me that during her illness she pulled her jaw out with her own hands, such was the condition of the bones at that time.

It is not a pleasant task to bring facts of this kind before the House, but I must say that when I came back from attending a conference at which this subject was being discussed and these facts were put before me, I felt I would be negligent in the duty I owed this country if I hesitated to bring into parliament for the sake of concealing facts of this kind similar legislation to that which has been enacted in Great Britain. We talk a great deal in these days about the conservation of natural resources, but I think that more important than the conservation of natural resources is the conservation of human resources, the conservation of human health and of human life. Resources are well enough; our lumber, forests, ore and minerals were given to us for a purpose, but they were given for the preservation and not the destruction of life. So in the Department of Labour we have taken as one of the objects before us, as part of the work which I trust it will be possible to carry on through the years to come, this important question of the preservation of health, the conservation of human life, the protection of the working people the great mass of the people of this country from occupational or other diseases which help to undermine the strength of the nation. If this country is to be what we wish it to be, a country of happy, contented and prosperous people, it will only be by safeguarding the lives and welfare of the many, and by protecting from injustice and ill the homes of the humble in the land.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Would the minister be good enough to state to the House on what grounds he claims this House has any jurisdiction to pass such a measure?

Mr. KING. I may mention to my hon. friend that when I wished to proceed the other day with the second reading of this Bill I was prevented from so doing by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) on account of the fact that I had not preceded this Bill with a resolution, as apparently I should have seeing that it related to trade and commerce, and measures respecting trade and commerce came within the jurisdiction of this House. I think, perhaps, my hon. friend will feel that the opinion expressed by the leader of the opposition is one which he will care to accept.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am afraid the minister who has just taken his seat is about as far astray in the facts he has stated to the House, in the inference he has drawn from these facts and in his general information as to the law giving jurisdiction to this House as he is in the conclusion that he has drawn from the objection stated by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition the other day. In this Bill there is one clause which forbids the importation of any of these matches into Canada. Beyond any question, apart from the rest of the Bill, eliminate every other word from the Bill, and there you have a clause forbidding the importation of matches into Canada which would bring the Bill under the rule which requires Bills relating to trade and commerce to be brought before the House first by way of resolution. But I venture to think, that when the minister considers the various heads under which jurisdiction is given to this parliament in clause 91 of the British North America Act, and the various heads in clause 92 under which jurisdiction is given to the provincial legislatures, he will find beyond peradventure that there is no clause there that in any way would give this House the jurisdiction he claims. Without going into that point, let me ask him to consider that the highest courts of the land have again and again held that the words: 'regulation of trade and commerce' must not be read in a literal sense. As the Lord Chancellor said: If we were to take these words literally giving the Dominion power to legislate on all subjects which related to trade and commerce, surely the Dominion would have the right to legislate with regard to bills and notes, and yet a head is given particularly for bills and notes; surely the Dominion would have the power right to legislate touching insolvency and yet a specific head is given under clause 91 for insolvency. Would not common sense lead the minister to the same conclusion that the Lord Chancellor of England has come to again and again, that when we take the words 'regulating trade and commerce they mean regulating our trade as between provinces, as between nations, regulating that trade which is existing. And, for the Minister of Labour to confuse the operations of an isolated factory, perhaps in a country town, with the trade and commerce referred to in the British North America Act, is hardly treating the subject with that respect which might be expected from him.

Mr. KING. I may say that I did not rely exclusively on the leader of the opposition, but before this matter was presented to

the House I asked Mr. Acland, the deputy Minister of Labour, to see the Justice Department and consult the Deputy Minister of Justice, to whom the Bill was referred, and get his opinion upon it. I have before me the statement which was given me at the time by Mr. Acland:

Mr. Newcombe took the ground that the Dominion had the fullest right to legislate on the matter, such legislation being intended for the obvious good of the entire community. The question of the protection of public health was not, he pointed out, specifically mentioned in the British North America Act, and it was no more than a matter of convenience that for local reasons it was left in the hands of the provinces. In his view the Dominion had a perfect right to enact legislation prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of matches made from white phosphorus.

I think one may also draw attention to the fact that this measure if passed would constitute part of the criminal law, and that it would come under the head of the class of measures which have to do with the peace, order and good government of Canada.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I do not think the House would be inclined to waste much time discussing the value of the opinion of a gentleman who writes that it is clear this House has jurisdiction over this matter in as much as it is for the obvious good of the community. Is it possible that in this House we have reached a stage when a minister of the Crown will calmly and coolly give as a reason for bringing legislation before it—which it is most doubtful to say the least whether or not this House has the power to pass—that such legislation is for the obvious good of the community. Inferentially the local legislature would have no power to pass any measures which are for the obvious good of the community, and inferentially also section 92 of the British North America Act is at once annulled by such a plea as this. I do not think the minister on calm reflection will be inclined to ask the House to place on the statute-book such an important law simply on the ground that it is for the obvious good of the community. Let me take the statement of facts given by the minister at some considerable length. I do not for a moment intend to contradict the truthfulness of any statement made by him, but I think I can add one or two equally true statements so that we may have, if not the whole truth, a litle nearer to the whole truth, than the statement the House is possessed of at the present time. It is perfectly true there was a conference in Berne, it is perfectly true that Great Britain declined at first to accede to the wishes of the other powers, and to sign an agreement such as she has practically come to in this statute of 1908.

The stand taken by Great Britain was that it was not necessary for Great Britain to enter into such an agreement because there had been a very careful investigation into the working of the match factories in that country and a report had been handed in, and I venture to read a few words from that report:

In 1900 regulations were made and enforced. These regulations have had the effect of almost wholly suppressing the disease in England. In the five years that have elapsed since the alterations which they required having been made, there have been only five cases of necrosis and three of these were mild, the persons affected recovering and finding employment. Of the other two cases, both of which were fatal, one was that of a woman who was employed in a factory where no white phosphorus had been used for four years,——

It is hardly fair to charge her case up to white phosphorus :

—and the other was that of a woman who had been guilty of direct infraction of one of the most important of the regulations.

The report concludes :

There have been no cases in 1906.

And so, the state of affairs in England was not such as to require Great Britain to agree to this convention, and so she declined to sign at that time. But, she went more than half way and she offered to sign if all the other nations concerned would sign. Sweden declined, Spain declined, Portugal declined, Japan declined, Norway declined even to send representatives to the convention, and Austro-Hungary and Belgium took the same stand as Great Britain. We find, therefore, that but a small portion of the continent of Europe had agreed to this convention, and when eventually, Great Britain offered to subscribe if the others would subscribe, the others still held out and are holding out to this day. The countries subscribing were : France, Germany, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, Wurtemburg, and Italy, and of these seven the first five already had this law on their statute-books, and so their signature bound them in no way to do more than they were doing. That left Luxemburg which had not a match factory within its boundary, and Italy. So, Great Britain's offer to the nations' of Europe was not accepted by the nations of Europe and Great Britain did not sign. A year or two later on, and as the Minister of Labour says, a deputation came to the government of England, a deputation of match manufacturers asking them to pass this legislation, and I will not go beyond the words of the minister himself who said there were nine manufacturers representing all the match manufacturers of England ; that one of them Bryant & May had a formula which they had arranged with

their colleagues to use. And so these gentlemen having the formula among the nine, being threatened by the importations from Sweden as referred to by the minister, calmly and coolly sacrificed themselves on the altar of patriotism by having an Act passed which gave them a monopoly for all time to come, shut out all competition on the part of others, and left these nine patriots in exclusive control of the English market. The minister has been so anxious that we should follow the English example that I think he had better study the circumstances under which England did consent, and see how the people of England were buncoed by the government when they passed such a Bill, and see that Canada delays, as England did, until all the match manufacturers come to the government and agree in asking this; then, perhaps, the government ought to consider their application. The minister pointed out that although on the face of this legislation it so invites criticism that the press throughout the land have been charging him with having been the recipient of a gold brick at the hands of the Diamond Match Company, the minister triumphantly pointed out this cannot be the case, because in the United States where the Diamond Match Trust stands side by side with the Standard Oil Company—a company that is morally certain to receive at least justice when it seeks legislation—the Diamond Match Company having applied for legislation in the United States was as the minister knows unable to obtain it from the federal power because as they admitted they had no jurisdiction, but indirectly they endeavoured to give the benefits the Diamond Match Company wished by imposing taxes. And, even then despite all the influence of the Diamond Match Company it was apparently unable to pass its Bill until it assigned to trustees the secret formula which places it in the position of making every other match manufacturer on the continent pay toll to it until a better formula is discovered. The minister places great stress on the fact that the formula has been assigned to three gentlemen whose names are above the possibility of reproach, giving them the power to do what is proper between the parties. Would the minister, or would I, would any man if the owner of a valuable formula of that kind assign it with authority to others to do what was proper and would he think it proper to hand that over without any consideration to any company who wished to use it. Surely the first element of proper conduct would be to do what is right by those who owned the formula. The first thing these trustees do is to exact a royalty ; and in the case of matches which sell by the million, it is a matter of no importance what the royalty is on each box, but the business is so immense that if the Diamond Match Company can secure that royalty, they will have secured something well worth having, and if they can obtain a monopoly in Canada that is surely something worthy of consideration, and one of those things which will add to the increased cost of living. Surely the Minister of Labour will not deny that by compelling every manufacturer in Canada to use a formula owned by an American trust company and pay that trust a royalty and by compelling him also to show the extent of the market he can supply, he will be putting the manufacturer here completely at the mercy of this powerful trust of the United States ; and in so doing the hon. minister will surely not say that he is thereby reducing the cost of living.

I have spoken of the report by the government commission in Great Britain which was appointed to inquire into the effects and ravages of necrosis in that country, and that report shows that practically by British legislation necrosis has become a thing of the past in the mother land. I think I have shown why the manufacturers of England might well ask for legislation which would give the nine manufacturers in that country a monopoly for all time to come.

I find by referring to the dictionary of chemistry by Thorpe—an authority which will not be questioned—that this whole matter was threshed out in England from 1840 to 1865, and that although necrosis was a very common and hideous disease there prior to that time, by recent regulations, the English authorities have practically stamped it out. Away back as far as 1879 in Germany, out of 5,724 workmen coming in contact with phosphorus, only nine cases of necrosis were observed and only three of deaths from this illness. But still, insignificant even as that number was, Germany made regulations in 1884 which practically stamped out the disease in that country.

The hon. minister has said that when his attention was called to this appalling state of affairs, when he learned of the ravages of necrosis, he took steps to ascertain by communication with the provincial authorities whether any legislation had been passed by any province bearing on this subject. Does not this strike you, Sir, as a singular commentary on the way our ministers carry on the public business? Instead of employing clerks to write letters to provincial secretaries, would it not have been much simpler to have turned up the revised statutes of each province and find out if they contained any legislation on this subject? All the minister would have to do would be to look at the statutes and thus save himself the trouble of dictating bombastic letters to the various provincial secretaries.

In the statutes of Ontario, there is a Factory Act, and he would probably find such an Act in the statutes of every province in the Dominion. In the Ontario Factory Act, chapter 256, he will find sanitary conditions imposed on all factories. He will find that ventilation, which in England was considered the principal remedy, is insisted on in the Ontario Act besides other regulations for the prevention of disease which have been found very effective. In the schedule at the end of that Act, page 3119 of the statutes, are included all those factories to which it applies, and I find match factories specifically named.

Mr. KING. Can the hon. gentleman give a reference to legislation by any of the provinces on this subject of phosphorus necrosis?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Does my hon. friend suppose for a moment that if the province of Ontario were to pass an Act to suppress necrosis, they could suppress it by giving the courts jurisdiction to grant an injunction against the presence of necrosis or to order its deportation? Does it not strike him that a practical government would pass an Act requiring the factories to do what would put an end to necrosis and would not require to mention the word at all. It is perfectly true that there is not a word in the statutes against necrosis, and I am not aware that there is a word in it against any disease known to the medical faculty, but the Act provides regulations which will prevent disease, and if this government, which takes such an interest in this matter, would draw the attention of the various provincial authorities to the information it has at hand, and point out any proper precautions that could be taken to prevent this disease, no doubt the provincial authorities would be ready to adopt any regulation which would have this effect. It would be very unfair to them to suppose for a moment that they would refuse to do so. The fact that this Ontario Act has been before the courts frequently and has always been declared intra vires, the fact that it provides sanitary regulations to protect the public health against all disease—these surely show that every province has the right to legislate with regard to sanitary conditions in its factories, and the fact that this Act to which I have referred is on the Ontario statutes is another argument against this House having the right to pass what is practically a factory Act.

The question of public health has been dealt with by our provinces again and again, and the right of the provinces to deal with them has been held in the case of Rinfret vs. Pope in the province of Quebec. That question has been held to be a matter for provincial jurisdiction, and consequently this House has no jurisdiction to deal with it.

A word or two as to the question of jurisdiction under the head of trade and commerce. If the hon. minister will look at the British North America Act, he will find that, on the one hand, the Dominion parliament has the power to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada, in relation to all matters not coming within the class of subjects assigned to the provincial legislatures. So the minister is quite mistaken and the Deputy Minister of Justice is quite mistaken if he thinks there is any clause in the British North America Act that gives this House power to legislate, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada. There is a long list of subjects assigned to this parliament and a long list assigned to the legislatures. Besides this, we have power to pass laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada in relation to all matters that do not come within the class of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of each province. Each province is allowed to legislate in regard to local works and undertakings, to property and civil rights and generally in relation to all matters of a merely local or private nature in the province. Did the minister ever stop to consider what the meaning of these words, 'the regulation of trade and commerce' would be? They have received a judicial interpretation and I venture to say that any one's common sense would teach him just what the Lord Chancellor of England concluded, that is that if this parliament is given power to regulate the trade and commerce of Canada, the power to regulate implied a continued opportunity to regulate; there is all the difference in the world betwen regulation and prohibition. In case there is any doubt, we have the opinion of the Privy Council in the case of the city of Toronto and Virgo in VII. Appeal Cases in these terms:—

> Their lordships think there is marked distinction to be drawn between the prohibition or prevention of a trade and the regulation or governance of it, and indeed a power to regulate and govern seems to imply the continued existence of that which is to be regulated or governed.

In the case of the Attorney General of Ontario vs. the Attorney General of the Dominion, the courts held that:

> A power to regulate, naturally, if not necessarily, assumes, unless it is enlarged by the context, the conservation of the thing which is to be made the subject of regulation.

So the Minister of Labour, when he speaks of regulating trade, is in reality proposing to prohibit trade. This sta-

tute prohibits the manufacture of a certain kind of matches in Canada. I contend that when we speak of trade, the manufacturer is not a trader; the decisions are clear on that point, in the same way that the man who issues an insurance policy, an indemnity against fire, is not a trader, and the courts have so held. The manufacturer may become a trader when he comes to sell what is manufactured, but this Act does not deal with the selling, but with the manufacture, and so even on that narrow ground, you really do not touch trade and commerce and cannot properly regulate the manufacture.

In Todd there is a very full discussion based on some cases in the House of Lords, particularly the Citizens Insurance case, 7 House of Lords. I quote from Todd's Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies, second edition. The remarks he makes are based on the Citizens Insurance Company, 7 Law Reports Appeal, page 118. I am reading only Todd's comment which is interspersed with extracts from the case:—

In the interpretation of the words 'trade and commerce', in section 91 of the British North America Act, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in rendering judgment in Citizens' Insurance Company's case, construed the words 'regulation of trade and commerce' by the various aids to their interpretation above suggested, they would include political arrangements in regard to trade requiring the sanction of parliament, regulation of trade in matters of interprovincial concern, and it may be that they would include general regulation of trade affecting the whole Dominion. Their lordships abstain on the present occasion from any attempt to define the limits, the authority of the Dominion parliament in this direction. It is enough for the decision of the present case to say that, in their view its authority to legislate for the regulation of trade and commerce does not comprehend the power to regulate by legislation the contracts of a particular business or trade, such as the business of fire insurance in a single province, and, therefore, that its legislative authority does not in the present case conflict or compete with the power over property and civil rights assigned to the legislature of Ontario by No. 13 of section 92.

Although that was an insurance case, the principle laid down seems the same, that the Dominion has no power to regulate the contracts of a particular business or trade, and so here I say the Dominion has no power to say to a particular trade: You must cease to manufacture. I have here the particular case to which Todd was referring:—

In the head note to this same case the Citizens' Insurance Company of Canada, the reporter gives this summary:

In No. 2 of section 91, the words 'regulation of trade and commerce' include political arrangements in regard to trade requiring the sanction of parliament, regulation of trade in matters of interprovincial concern, and, it may be, general regulation of trade affecting the whole Dominion.

I think these few extracts from the various judgments show clearly that the meaning was to regulate trade and commerce, not to regulate this and that other little matter but to regulate trade in the interests of the whole country.

The minister, and I think the deputy Minister of Justice, in his opinion, spoke of the right to pass the legislation on the ground that it is for the peace, order and good government of Canada. In one of these cases the same argument was used by counsel as by the minister that the Dominion had a perfect right to pass certain legislation because it was for the peace, order and good government of Canada, and their Lordships taking that up, showed its absurdity on this ground that there was really no possible class of cases submitted to the local legislature that you could not change from their jurisdiction and hand them over to the jurisdiction of the Dominion if that wide meaning was given that the Dominion could legislate for anything touching the peace, order and good government of Canada; and then their Lordships pointed out that there were no such words in the British North America Act, but that we could legislate for the peace, order and good government of Canada only in relation to all matters not coming within the class of subjects assigned by this statute to the local legislature. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) seems to have a slightly different view from the Minister of Labour, because I notice that last year when the question of tuberculosis was before the House and the Minister of Agriculture was urged to take steps to suppress tuberculosis in our schools, he replied, at 'Hansard, 1909,' page 1438:

There is another point I would suggest, although it is a matter coming under the domain of the provincial authorities, and that is the problem of dealing with tuberculosis in public schools.

So the Minister of Agriculture last year admitted the contention I make to-night that so far as health is concerned, he had no right to deal with tuberculosis in public schools, because education was left to the provinces. Precisely the same argument will apply in this case, that you have no right to deal with necrosis in a factory because that is a matter coming under the Factories Act, which is under the provincial authorities. As showing how far the local authorities have power in one of the liquor cases their Lordships of the Privy Council have said, dealing with regard to the manufacture of liquor,

and I merely give this, not as legal proof that the province has power to pass prohibition, but as showing the distance to which their Lordships of the Privy Council went on the very point I urge before this House to-night, that is the power of the provinces to deal with manufacture where it is a provincial and in no sense a Dominion matter. They say:

> In the absence of conflicting legislation by the parliament of Canada, their lordships are of opinion that the provincial legislatures would have jurisdiction to that effect (to prohibit the manufacture of intoxicating liquors) if it were shown that the manufacture was carried on under such circumstances and conditions as to make its prohibition a merely local matter in the province.

They point out that the parliament of Canada had certain rights to pass laws touching liquor from the standpoint of revenue and of trade and commerce, but where, as was pointed out, it was merely a question of manufacturing, then the province itself would have power to prohibit if it was only a local matter.

Take the case of a match factory. I quite understand that if the danger from matches lay in their use by the public at large, possibly an argument might be raised by the Minister of Labour that it was a matter with which this House could deal, because it was a matter of Dominion concern, but there is no pretense that the danger is to the public; the danger is to the manufacturers themselves, to the people working in the factory in Deseronto, or Hull, or Halifax, or wherever it may be. The people working in that local factory are the people this House is asked to protect. I submit with all deference, and ask the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to consider the question: Is it reasonably clear that this House has jurisdiction to interfere in the management of this local factory, whose whole business of manufacture is carried on within the small space of half an acre or so of ground? There is no question of trade or commerce involved; they have the right to manufacture under provincial law.

I do not wish to occupy the time of the House longer, but I hope I have convinced the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) that if he is to follow the example he asks us to follow, that of the mother land, he will have to get a requisition from the manufacturers themselves. Then it will be his duty to see whether there is any ulterior motive, or what it was that may have influenced the manufacturers of that country. He will have to consider whether this is a gold brick that is handed out—as I think it clearly is—by the Diamond Match Company. Then he will have to consider whether this legislation is in the interests of the country as a whole. And, while he is making such ample inquiries, he might seek to learn who this Diamond Match Company are. I know nothing about the matter personally, but my information is that this is, beyond comparison, the largest match company in the United States. I do not think the minister will contradict that statement. I speak subject to correction, and have had no means of learning the facts, because our trade and navigation returns are made up in such a way that it is impossible to learn what the importation of matches really is, but I am informed, and would like to know whether it is a fact, that not a dollar's worth of matches manufactured by the Diamond Match Company has come into Canada, except in the short time that elapsed between the burning down of the Eddy Company's factory and the rebuilding thereof. If these are facts they are very significant. Supposing that this House has jurisdiction, I hope the minister will consider what he is submitting our manufacturers of matches to. He is asking the small manufacturers to put themselves within the grasp of a mighty trust by compelling them to manufacture under a formula which this trust allows them to use, and to use, of course, on the trust's own terms. If they manufacture under a fixed royalty, it must be made known to the trust where the business is being done, and so the manufacturer must make known to a competitor who is strong enough to crush him in a week the very facts that it is necessary for the success of his business that he should withhold. And so the victim is subject to conditions for the calculation of the royalty that are more onerous and dangerous than the payment of the royalty itself. I trust the Minister of Labour will satisfy himself whether he has the right to pass this legislation, and also whether it will be beneficial to this country, and, after that, whether the evils of which he speaks cannot be prevented by the provincial authorities. I trust he will do this before he asks this House to pass this legislation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I followed very closely the argument of my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). For this evening, at all events, it would be sufficient, I am sure, if, without going into the merits of the question of the advisability of passing this legislation, which may be more fully considered when we come to the second reading of the Bill. I confine myself to considering whether we have, or have not, the right to pass this proposed legislation. The hon. gentleman has argued that it is beyond our powers, and that such legislation, if it can be passed at all, can only be passed by the provinces. Perhaps it will be sufficient for the present purposes for me to state, as

stated already by my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), that, before introducing this Bill, he consulted the Department of Justice, and the Department of Justice assured him that he had authority to pass this legislation. The Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), is a good lawyer; my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), is a good lawyer. This is not the first time when good lawyers have differed in opinion. Perhaps my hon. friend will permit me to say that when we find the Minister of Justice on one side of a question and an eminent member of the House and of the legal profession on the other side, it will be safer for us to follow the view of the Minister of Justice. If the Minister of Justice is astray in his opinion, and, following that opinion, we pass legislation which is beyond our authority, the worst that can happen will be that the manufacturers of matches who, my hon. friend says, would be oppressed by that enactment, will not obey it, but will go on manufacturing, as they are doing to-day,—that is, the Bill will be a dead letter. But what are we to do when eminent members of the legal profession differ? I think we can safely trust to the legal advisor of the government and the House, until his opinion is set aside by the courts of law. In the opinion of the Minister of Justice, if it has been properly stated, we have the power to pass this law. But my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup), as a member of the legal profession, will agree with me that no legal opinion should be criticised unless we have it in writing before us. If the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice has been correctly stated, that we have jurisdiction in this matter, because this is a proposed law for the good of the country, I can only say that, that does not commend itself to my judgment. But for other reasons, I think the hon. Minister of Justice is quite correct, and in this respect I differ with my hon. friend. This is a Bill to prohibit the manufacture and importation of matches made with white phosphorus. We have discussed simply the prohibition as to manufacture. But, if it be the opinion of the people of this country that the use of matches manufactured with white phosphorus is injurious to health, the power to prevent the importation of such matches must reside somewhere.

It either resides in the Dominion parliament or in the local legislature. Now, my hon. friend will not differ with me when I assert that the power to prohibit the importation of matches resides with this parliament, and does not reside with the local legislatures. So far, therefore, we have jurisdiction in this parliament to prevent the importation or manufacture. That is enough to give us jurisdiction here. Later on in the Bill we shall have to consider whether we can prevent the manufacture as well as the importation. It seems to me that if we have power in this parliament to prohibit the importation of matches, therefore we have in this parliament power to say: You shall not manufacture matches in this country. It seems to me that the authority to prohibit importation carries with it the authority to prohibit the manufacture. At all events, I would take that ground. But I will go a step further. My hon. friend has stated that whilst we have jurisdiction in this matter on all matters of trade, the manufacturer is not a trader. Well, my hon. friend will agree that this is a very technical view to take of the matter. It is true, he says, that the manufacturer becomes a trader when he sells. But let me observe that the manufacture is made to be sold, the manufacturer has no other object than to sell his goods; therefore, if that is the object of his business, he is a trader in the broad sense of the term. The manufacturer being certainly a trader, therefore we have power in this Bill to regulate this operation of making matches. My hon. friend said, also, that we could not consider the question in this way, because, whilst we have power to regulate trade and commerce, this is a law to regulate a manufacture. It is simply a law to prohibit the manufacture of matches in a certain way. This also seems to me highly technical. It is very true that the object of the law is to prevent a certain kind of manufacture, but it is also true that it is a regulation which would compel the manufacturer to use certain ingredients instead of others, and would prohibit him from manufacturing them with phosphorus and force him to manufacture with something else. Therefore, it seems to me that from this point of view, also, the matter is one which comes properly within our purview. The object of the present Bill is to prevent the sale of certain matches, which is enough to give us jurisdiction, and I think that alone would warrant us in passing this resolution. The Bill will come again before us for a second reading, and for my part I shall read again the argument of my hon. friend to see whether my more deliberate judgment confirms me in this view. One other observation upon the merits of this Bill. My hon. friend said that this was a measure which would result in profit to a certain manufacturing company which holds a patent in the United States. But I think that point has been answered already by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who has said that this company, which has a patent under the laws of Ontario, has not used its patent, and therefore it has lost its power, and we have the right to use the patent. So, on the whole.

I think we can proceed with this legislation.

Mr. DOHERTY. Let me say, first, that I think the Minister of Labour fell into error when he cited the leader of the opposition as an authority for the proposition that this was a Bill for the regulation of trade and commerce. It is true that in so far as the Bill does prohibit the importation of these matches, it is dealing with the regulation of trade and commerce, and is to that extent within our jurisdiction. But I would like to point out that the leader of the opposition did not express any opinion upon the question of our jurisdiction to deal with this matter the other day, and that although rule 50 of the House required Bills relating to trade to be introduced by a resolution, that did not imply that it was a Bill for the regulation of trade and commerce, because the rule prescribes that any Bill that relates to trade and commerce shall be introduced through a resolution. Now, you may have many Bills that relate to trade and commerce, the purpose whereof will not be the regulation of trade and commerce. For my part, I would be disposed to think, differing in that respect from the Prime Minister, that in so far as this legislation going further than dealing with the question of prohibition of importation, it can be justified as being within the jurisdiction of this parliament, it would be in virtue of the general clauses which give the jurisdiction to legislate in regard to the peace, order and good government of Canada, and more especially the clause at the end, which gives jurisdiction in all matters not specially reserved to the provinces. But it would seem to me clear that this legislation cannot be justified as being a regulation of trade and commerce. Now, I am not without knowing that when we were first called upon to apply the British North America Act there was a pretty general impression that the regulation of trade and commerce meant the regulation of the carrying on of all the operations of buying and selling, so much so that it was urged in our province that the legislature could not deal with laws limiting the location in which a butcher's stall could be established, because it was said that that was a regulation of trade and commerce. Now, as my hon. friend from Hasting (Mr. Northrup) has pointed out, I think their lordships of the Privy Council have made it clear that what is meant by a regulation of trade and commerce is a regulation of trade and commerce in general, not the making of laws to govern one particular trade. In the case of the insurance company, I think they made it clear that though the carrying on for profit of the business of insurance was a trade, or commercial business, it was within the power of the provinces to legislate as to what sort of contract should be made in the prosecution of that business. The objection made was precisely this: You are regulating trade and commerce. Their lordships said: No, such legislation is not regulating trade and commerce in general; it is not regulating interprovincial trade, nor trade with other countries, nor making any regulation with regard to trade in general applicable throughout the Dominion. I think here, if we are dealing with trade at all, we are clearly dealing with what is going to be prohibited in one particular manufacture, and if a manufacture is to be considered a trade, then we are making a law for one trade. Now, how it can be said that in doing that we are regulating trade and commerce in the general way in which the Privy Council says the provision that we have power to regulate trade and commerce is to be interpreted, I fail to see. Now, the Prime Minister has justified this Bill by saying that it was a Bill to prohibit the selling of those matches, and that it has been conceded by the hon. member for Hastings that the operation of buying and selling was an operation of trade, whether a manufacture or not.

I have looked at the Bill and the resolution, and I have been rather struck with the fact that the clause of the English Bill does prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale, while neither the resolution nor the Bill, as I read them and I think I have read them correctly, prohibits the sale of these articles. Even if this Bill should be passed, although there would be a prohibition in it against the importation and manufacture there would be no prohibition against the sale of matches of this kind. As far as the argument in favour of our jurisdiction rests upon prohibition of the sale it necessarily falls because we are not trying to prohibit the sale by the Bill. I would not perhaps like to be quite as positive as my hon. friend from East Hastings, but it would seem to me that if we have jurisdiction it must be because of the fact that you do not find in the subjects exclusively allotted to the provinces the subject matter of the protection of health. In that connection a very serious question arises whether you do not find this within the subjects exclusively allotted to the provinces by reason of the fact that after the particular things that are found in section 92 enumerating the powers of the provinces you have the last one which is general, 'All matters of a merely local or private nature in the province,' and as has been pointed out by the hon. member for East Hastings what this Bill, outside of the question of importation, deals with is purely and simply a question in the interest of health and in the interest of the health of a limited

class of people employed in a factory in a particular locality or in a number of factories in different localities. It seems to me, prima facie, that there is a very serious question whether in undertaking to do this we are not undertaking to determine what, from the point of view of the protection of the health of a certain number of individuals belonging to a certain class of the community, shall be permitted in a factory in a particular locality. I do not want to go into the merits of the matter, but it would seem to me that the decision of this question, whether this is to be prohibited or not, depends upon a careful investigation of the manner in which particular manufactories are carried on, so much so, that I would conclude from what I have listened to from the Minister of Labour—and listened to with a great deal of admiration—that it might be a perfectly true thing that while in one factory the using of white phosphorus under certain conditions would be extremely dangerous, in another factory by taking proper precautions it might be perfectly safe. If that is a correct view of it we are undertaking to determine whether or not a thing should be permitted when whether it would be proper to permit it depends to a large extent on the particular conditions of the different factories. I am not speaking of this for the purpose of discussing the merits at all, but I mention it because it seems to me to give considerable force to the proposition that the regulating of things of this kind is dealing with things of a purely local nature within the province. I do not flatter myself that any greater weight would be attached to my own opinion than to the opinion of my hon. friend from East Hastings, and of course I do not expect to outweigh in the scale the opinion of my right hon. friend the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or that of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), but I did gather, and I do not say it at all by way of depreciating the opinion, but merely for the sake of correctness, that the opinion which the hon. Minister of Labour had received was that of the Deputy Minister of Justice. I do not want to depreciate that opinion in any way because that gentleman is one for whom I have the very highest respect and I would treat any opinion given by him with a great deal of deference. But while I am quite sure that this House would feel justified, as the leader of the House has pointed out this evening, in following the advice of the Minister of Justice, I think it is a perfectly proper thing, when there does exist what I think after what has been said by both sides may fairly be conceded to be a grave doubt as to our jurisdiction in this matter, that the Minister of Justice, should give consideration to what has been submitted. None of us pretends to infallibility on these matters. It is a general saying that doctors differ, some people say that lawyers could not live at all if they did not differ, and I suppose it is expected that they shall differ. With the merits of the question I understand that we will have occasion to deal when the Bill comes up. Upon those merits I have only to say that in so far as the purpose which is sought to be attained by this legislation is concerned the minister would have the hearty sympathy of every member of this House. I am sure that we are all desirous of assisting the Department of Labour in doing everything not only that may be absolutely necessary, but that may be substantially useful for the protection of the health of all classes of this community and more particularly I think it is fair to say of those classes who are more exposed and have the least within their own hands, the power to control the conditions under which they live. Upon that I think there will be no possible difference in this House. But the matter when we come to deal with it upon its merits, resolves itself into the question: Is it necessary to go as far as to absolutely prohibit this manufacture in order to attain the results sought to be attained? If it is so, I, for my part, would not hesitate to adopt it. On the other hand, I think we ought to look into the matter carefully because it is possible that the facts would bear out the conclusion of the Royal Commission in England, cited by my hon. friend from East Hastings and also by the Minister of Labour, that by taking proper precautions, which might properly form the subject matter of factory Acts within the provinces, this material could be safely utilized, and if so I think we ought to hesitate before making an absolute prohibition.

Mr. A. B. CROSBY (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word in regard to this Bill. We have a match factory at Halifax. I listened to the very able manner in which the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. King) introduced his resolution, and his presentation of the matter would almost persuade anybody that the Bill was such a one as we should adopt at once. But, having heard the lawyers on this side, and the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), whom I always believed was a lawyer, on the other side, there seems to be some trouble as to the constitutionality of this Bill. Of that I have no desire to speak at all. But, I want to say a word with regard to the sickness said to have been brought about by the use of white phosphorus in the making of matches. In the city of Halifax we have a factory that, I think, has been engaged for some sixty or seventy years in the manufacture of matches and, as far as I can discover, there has never been any person who has been

afflicted by the use of phosphorus. The foreman of that factory is 55 years of age, I think he has worked in the factory for 40 years, and he is quite a healthy man. In fact he is so healthy that he is actively engaged in politics and he is about to run an election, which is the best evidence you can get that there is nothing the matter with his jaws. I am afraid that if you are to take it that the want of teeth indicates that a man has worked in a match factory, you will come to the conclusion that some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have been engaged in the business. In Nova Scotia we have had a Factories Act for many years, and as the inspector resides near the match factory, I am quite confident that if there was anything in that factory detrimental to the health of the employees the inspector would have reported it. The Minister of Labour laboured hard to give us evidence in support of his theory, and he told us that of the five factories in the Dominion there had been only three fatal cases of necrosis.

Mr. KING. The three fatal cases were within the last year.

Mr. CROSBY. If the Minister of Labour was going to make an argument on that point he should have traced the matter back to former years, and given us fuller information about it. I want it to be understood that the use of white phosphorus has not affected our employees in the match factory at Halifax. I understood the Minister of Labour to say that Mr. Rowley, manager of the Eddy factory was perfectly satisfied with this Bill.

Mr. KING. I did not say he was satisfied, but that he authorized me to say that the Eddy Company did not intend to offer any opposition.

Mr. CROSBY. I also understood from the minister that Mr. Corbett of Halifax, and Mr. Flewelling of New Brunswick did not intend to oppose it, and while I am not always sure that the desire of the manufacturers should be followed, I am specially here to speak for the people who work in the factory. Now, suppose we find that the substitute for white phosphorus is such an expensive article that the manufacturer in Halifax could not continue in the business it would mean that 15 or 20 hands skilled in this kind of work would be thrown out of employment and might not be able to find a means of livelihood elsewhere. I am not so much concerned about the company who own the match factory, because like most manufacturers, they are fairly well off—at least so the farmers say, and we are sometimes inclined to believe what the farmers say when it suits us. This Bill, according to its terms will not come into force until 1912, and unless we can find that the substitute for white phosphorus is going to put Canadian match manufacturers in as good a position to hold the market as they are in at present, I think, seeing that we have been for years and years operating under the present mode of manufacture, it would not do any harm to defer the coming into force of the Bill until 1913, when we might be able to obtain further information on the subject. I am one of those who believe that everything that is used in Canada should be manufactured in Canada, and we should be careful not to take any step that would in any possible way interfere with our existing industries. Of course, I would not advocate the manufacture of anything that would be detrimental to the health of our people, but I have a strong belief that in the city of Halifax and in the province of Nova Scotia, under our Factories Act no injurious process of manufacture would be allowed. The entire argument of the Minister of Labour was based on conditions which were found to exist in other countries and not because of any evil condition existing in Canada, so that even if the Bill is found to be constitutional by the Department of Justice, we might at least postpone its operation until the year 1913.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I asked the Minister of Labour if the Diamond Match Company had complied with the Patent Act and commenced manufacturing in Canada and he answered that he was not aware that they had. I understand from him that this patent was taken out nine years ago by two Frenchmen who assigned it to the Diamond people a year or two ago. Under our patent law the patentee must commence manufacture within two years, and before the minister proceeds with the second reading of the Bill I ask him to inquire at the patent office as to when this patent was obtained, and if they have complied with the law.

Mr. KING. I am informed that the patent is held under section 44 of the Patent Act which does not insist upon the manufacture of the patented article, but only on the payment of certain prescribed fees. These fees have been paid I believe, and the patents will not expire until 1917.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). As I understand it they must commence the manufacture of the patented article within two years after the issue of the patent, and unless that law has been complied with this government ought not to pass an Act to compel the manufacturers of Canada to pay a royalty to some citizens of the United States. The government are in possession of the formula, and if they have not complied with the law the government can give

that formula to the manufacturers of this country.

Mr. KING. Section 44 of the Patent Act gives the power I have reference to.

Mr. DANIEL. The hon. minister, in his introduction, mentioned the fact that what is called sesquisulphide might be used instead of white phosphorus; but if my information is correct sesquisulphide itself contains white phosphorus, so that under this resolution and the Bill founded on it, this very sulphite could not be used at all and matches could not be manufactured with it or imported. How are you going to manufacture matches in this country if white phosphorus is not to be used at all? With regard to the horrible disease sometimes caused by the use of phosphorus, I remember very well seeing cases of it in London when I was a medical student, and I quite recollect the discussion and agitation that took place there with regard to it. I have not heard much about it lately, but new regulations were enforced in the old country to put a stop to the disease, and from what was said to-night regarding the report of the Royal Commission, no doubt these regulations had the effect of largely, if not entirely, stamping it out. I did not know, until this matter came up, that there were any cases of this disease in Canada. We have had for a number of years a match factory at Hampton, 20 miles from St. John, where they have been using phosphorus, and there has never been a case of this phosphorus necrosis that I know of among the employees there. Has the minister any different information?

Mr. KING. I am not aware of any.

Mr. DANIEL. I have been connected with the hospital of St. John a good many years, and if there had been any cases of phosphorus necrosis in the Hampton factory they would have been taken to that hospital, so that I feel quite satisfied there has been none ; and judging by the report of the Royal Commission it would seem that the disease can be eradicated from our factories, if it exists in any, by the enforcement of proper regulations. No doubt in by gone times, in these large factories where phosphorus was used, and there was very little ventilation, the fumes of the phosphorus occasioned this disease ; but down with us, under better circumstances, this disease is unknown. I quite agree that even if in one factory in Canada there has been found a case of this disease, the danger should be put a stop to by legislation if possible ; but at the same time I would like the minister to state if he has information whether the sesquisulphide does not itself contain white phosphorus, and therefore, would be interdicted by the passing of this resolution.

Mr. KING. I will just read a memo. I have from one of the examiners, in the Patent Branch, Mr. Charleton, who has given me much useful and helpful information in connection with the preparation of this measure. He has been experimenting in the government laboratory and has manufactured sesquisulphide himself; the past few days he has succeeded in making matches from it. In the memo. he says:

Sesquisulphide of phosphorus may be made by mixing, in the proper proportions, red phosphorus and sulphur and heating carefully to 260°C. The sesquisulphide, if properly made, contains no phosphorus, and is not poisonous if taken internally. The manufacture of the sesquisulphide on a large scale appears to be an unusually simple process in comparison with other chemicals of this class. It could probably be made as cheaply here in Canada as any place in the world. Perhaps more cheaply in the future when the country is further developed and the sulphur and iron pyrites are utilized.

White phosphorus enters into the compound but the compound is made away from the factory altogether, and apparently the fumes of the phosphorus are given off in the preparation with the result that in the case of the compound when used by the match workers the poison has disappeared altogether.

Mr. DANIEL. But it is made with white phosphorus all the same.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

Mr. KING moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 96, to prohibit the Manufacture and Importation of Matches made with White Phosphorus.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROHIBITION OF OPIUM.

House in committee to consider the following proposed resolution:—

Resolved, that it is expedient, in connection with Bill 22 now before this House, to provide for the prohibition of the importation, manufacture, sale and use of opium for other than scientific and medicinal purposes; to empower magistrates to grant warrants, to search for opium in any place in which it is suspected that opium may be found, and to authorize the destruction thereof; to provide penalties for violations of the Act; and to empower the Governor in Council to make such regulations as are necessary.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

Mr. KING moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 97, to prohibit the Importation,

Manufacture, Sale and Use of Opium for other than Scientific or Medicinal purposes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROHIBITION OF COCAINE AND MORPHINE.

House in committee to consider the following proposed resolution:—

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide for the prohibition of the sale and use of cocaine and morphine for other than medicinal or scientific purposes.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DOHERTY. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Supply, continuing the estimates of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley).

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 20, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

LOAD LINES ON SHIPS.

Mr. LEWIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 98) respecting load lines on ships. He said: Mr. Speaker, in 1905 I introduced a Bill in reference to load lines on ships. Last session the Bill was referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries. The committee objected to the Bill on one ground apparently, that it did not conform to the English Act. I have had this Bill drawn to conform exactly with the English Merchant Shipping Act of 1876, called the principal Act. The sections of this Bill are based on sections 25, 26, 27 and 28 of the English Act, and the wording of that Act is followed as closely as is consistent with the conditions. I can perhaps best explain the Bill by reading an editorial from the 'Globe' of Toronto, which quotes from a paper at Vancouver. The 'Globe' says:

The 'Globe,' Toronto, Friday, January 6, 1911.

A LOAD LINE NEEDED.

The wreck of the steamer 'St. Denis' on the shore of Vancouver Island has called forth many protests against the tendency toward overloading, and many demands for stringent laws such as are associated in Britain with the name of the late Mr. Plimsoll. The Plimsoll line on a British vessel determines her summer load, her winter load, and her winter load in the North Atlantic, and no captain is allowed to clear if the line which designates his vessel's carrying capacity is submerged. On the Great Lakes there are frequent demands for load-line regulations, and it is notorious that many vessel owners take serious risks by overloading every season. Occasionally there is a disaster, and the matter after a brief discussion is forgotten. But there is a growing reaction against the indifference that risks and sometimes sacrifices lives for the gathering of profits.

According to the Victoria 'Times,' the captain of the 'St. Denis,' a young and ambitious officer, was eager to take a record cargo from the Vancouver mines to Central America. In spite of protests from experienced officers and seamen more cargo was crammed into the vessel's hold than she sould carry with safety through the storms of the Pacific. In the shelter of the straits of Georgia or Puget Sound such a load could have been taken with comparative safety. But in the storms of the open sea the vessel was helpless. Just how she foundered will never be known. Her twenty-one men are lost, and only the wreckage on shore gives any indication of where the disaster occurred.

It is safe to conclude that with a proper load-line regulation strictly enforced the vessel would have been prepared for all emergencies, and she and her crew would now be safe. It is only when disaster occurs that the evil of overloading can effectively be attacked. Scores of instances occur in which risks are taken and by fortunate accidents the trips are finished in safety. The profit and prestige of such achievements are temptations to repeat them. When the inevitable happens there is an outcry. This lamentable experience should not be wasted, but should be held before the public until more efficient means are devised to prevent the sailing of unseaworthy craft.

I take it for granted that these facts are correct, coming from papers of such standing as these. There are many more instances which should cause this House to put on the statute-books of this country an Act covering the loading of vessels, especially in the winter. It is now 35 years since Plimsoll passed his Shipping Act. It took him eight years to accomplish that. This Bill has now been before this House for five years. I trust that this parliament will not require eight years to pass a Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. LEWIS. Might I point out to the Prime Minister that under the rules four days are allowed for public Bills and Orders, the first four Thursdays of the session. The first Thursday was taken up by the opening of the House, the second and third by the Address, and the

last Thursday by a public holiday, leaving no day on which public orders would have precedence. There are many Bills important to and in the interest of the people thus held back. Could the minister set aside a day on which public Bills would have precedence?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would have to look into the matter. Of course if that were the general wish of the House, it would be my duty to comply with that wish.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that a good many of the letters in a return which was brought down at my request relating to dredging in the Napanee river, are transmitted by Mr. Warburton. I do not see how Mr. Warburton could transmit these letters to the department without writing, and I would like to have his letters produced.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will look into it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I desire to ask when I may expect a return ordered by this House on December 15, 1909, with reference to a government weir at the port of Montreal?

RECIPROCITY NEGOTIATIONS AT WASHINGTON.

Mr. PERLEY. There is a report in the press that a draft of the proposed trade reciprocity treaty that is being negotiated at Washington between representatives of the Canadian and United States governments, has been forwarded to Ottawa for consideration. Will the Prime Minister say if that report is correct?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That report is premature.

SUPPLY—CLOTHING OF DISCHARGED CONVICTS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. EDWARDS. Before this motion is put I desire again to call the attention of the government to a matter referred to by the Minister of Justice yesterday, when I did not happen to be present. The Kingston 'Standard' stated some day last week that more than one prisoner had been released from the Kingston penitentiary without sufficient clothing for this season of the year. With regard to the particular case referred to as having been deported to the United States, I happened to be on the same train with the officer who was taking that ex-convict to Ogdensburg for deportation; and he assured me that the ex-convict was not provided with any overcoat. I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to a statement which he made, referring to this matter yesterday. He said, in laying the facts before the House in regard to this particular case, that he thought the substance of it ought to be made public in justice to the warden. Now one would naturally infer from that language that any prisoner leaving the penitentiary without an overcoat, or leaving in the condition described the other day, was an isolated case, that in fact the warden would have instructions to provide the prisoners with clothing sufficient for this time of the year; and I take it for granted that in order to have sufficient clothing for this time of the year every man going out now should have an overcoat. I notice that all the members of parliament coming into this House think it necessary to have an overcoat, consequently it seems to be considered a necessary part of clothing at this time. But the particular case I referred to of the prisoner being deported was not an isolated one. A few days later an ex-convict whose home was in the province of Ontario left that institution without any overcoat, and with the thermometer on that day registering ten or twelve degrees below zero. Now I desire to place on the 'Hansard' a letter I received this morning from a gentleman who is in a position to speak with regard to this matter. The letter is dated Montreal, January 19, and is addressed to myself:

> I desire to thank you personally for drawing attention in parliament to the need of more clothing for discharged prisoners from the Dominion penitentiaries in mid-winter. I have been working with released prisoners from the various jails and penitentiaries for sixteen years, and it has been the rule to discharge men in mid-winter without an overcoat during the whole of that time, from the Dominion penitentiaries. The Prisoners' Aid Association of Montreal have written on various occasions to the Minister of Justice, mostly I think when the Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick was minister, but were generally put off with some excuse from a minor official. Perhaps some time, if needed, I could give you more particulars, but I can state positively that I myself, on different occasions, have purchased twenty or thirty overcoats for men discharged from St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary in winter.
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> JAMES ELLIOTT,
> Sec'y, Montreal Prisoners' Aid Assn.

Now I say this letter, in addition to the facts which have come to the notice of people living in the city of Kingston, very near the penitentiary, should be sufficient to cause this government to take action, and to prevent this sort of thing from occurring in the future. I am informed that the guards at the Kingston penitentiary are during this bitter weather pacing up and

down on their beats—and they are working more than eight hours a day—with overcoats which cost this government the magnificent sum of $2.50 apiece. It is also stated in regard to the supplies, and food for prisoners who happen to be on the sick list, that they are cut down in that penitentiary, a cheeseparing policy is pursued to save a few cents, for what purpose I do not know. We all know that the idea of saving money in any direction is entirely foreign to this government, ever since they came into office in 1896. But when a prisoner is liberated from a government institution, the government of this country who found it necessary to place him there, ought to take sufficient interest in him to provide him at least with an overcoat against the severe weather which we have in this country during the winter. It has been stated that man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn, and I think that truth is exemplified in the government's treatment of these ex-convicts. A man who finds himself set at liberty without any overcoat, with the thermometer registering from ten to fifteen degrees below zero, cannot have a very kindly feeling in his heart towards his fellow men; he must rebel at that sort of thing. To be sent away without a few dollars in his pocket and insufficiently clad, it seems to me, would be enough to arouse in that man a feeling of resentment and hatred towards government authority and would go far towards preventing him from living in the right way. I do not know why the government should adopt the policy of not giving overcoats out to men who are liberated at this season of the year. I think that if the warden of Kingston, St. Vincent de Paul or any other penitentiary in Canada were simply given authority by this government to provide an overcoat for a man who was liberated in winter that is all the warrant he would require to see that men went out properly clothed. There is no fault attached to the warden of the penitentiary in this matter. The fault is with an authority higher than the wardens because it rests on the head of the department who permits regulations of this kind to exist.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, in what I said on this subject yesterday and the day before I was principally concerned to satisfy the House by repeating publicly the statement which had been made to me by the warden of the penitentiary that so far as he and the officials of the institution were concerned they had not been guilty of any conduct which properly could be characterized as inhuman, and had not permitted any departure from the rules which are established in reference to the matters concerned. The question of what these rules ought to be is, of course, a larger matter and one in respect to which the officials of the penitentiary are perhaps not so immediately concerned as we ourselves in this House, because these things are matters of regulation by law, and the law, as laid down in the Penitentiaries Act, is, I need not say, binding on the wardens and the officials of the penitentiary equally as it is binding on the minister in charge of the department. Our Penitentiaries Act evidently was passed with consideration of the circumstance that the winter season in this country is one when low temperature can be expected and for that reason, instead of giving an overcoat at public expense to each prisoner discharged, the statute provides that any prisoner whose sentence, either by effluxion of time or otherwise, expires during the months of December, January or February in any year, may at his option remain in the penitentiary at public expense where he will, at any rate, be sheltered from the severities of the Canadian winter climate, if he chooses to do so. It is only at a prisoner's own desire that he is discharged from the penitentiary at any time during any of these three months. If he prefers to remain where he is until the bitterness of the winter cold has to that extent abated, he has the right, or privilege, whichever you please to call it, to do so and in the particular instance which has led to this discussion, as I pointed out yesterday, the option was given to the man to remain for a few days, if he chose, if not until the first of March; at any rate, to remain long enough to communicate with friends or relatives if there was any source from which he could hope to receive assistance.

With regard to clothing, of course, a prisoner has the clothing which he is wearing when he comes to the penitentiary gates kept for him until his sentence expires. That clothing is returned to him whether it is expensive or whether it is cheap. Whatever it is, subject to such deterioration as time may have caused in it while the sentence has been current, that clothing is returned to the man. But, our law is not quite so merciless as to send a prisoner out of the penitentiary clothed only as he was when he came to its doors. Each prisoner, upon his discharge, is given the regulation suit of clothing, both underwear and outerwear, and not only a complete suit of serviceable new clothing, but also a sum of money, not a large sum, it is true, but something which is, at any rate, sufficient to keep him from absolute want for the few days that, in this country, ought ordinarily to be the limit which would intervene before he would be able to earn at least his own maintenance and support.

Now, whether or not our law in that

respect ought to be changed is for the consideration of this House. Until now I had certainly not heard any complaint about it, and until now I had thought that we were not dealing inhumanly with our prisoners when we gave to them what I have described—the option of shelter and maintenance until the winter is over. If it is thought that there ought to be something different done, or something more done, that is a matter in regard to which, while I perfectly concede that the principal responsibility rests upon myself, still I do submit that a responsibility rests also to some extent upon each and every individual member of this House.

Just one word with regard to the allusion which was made to the cost of the overcoats which the guards wear. I do not know whether or not it was intended to suggest that because these coats cost $2.50 apiece they were insufficient for the purpose, or that the guards were compelled to be upon duty in bitter winter weather insufficiently clothed. No complaint has come to my knowledge from any guard in any of our institutions upon that subject, and I cannot think that there is any complaint. The price of the garment which has been stated seems, of course, the merest bagatelle, but hon. gentlemen should remember that with regard to all of our penitentiary supplies which we are able to manufacture within the walls of the institution, the cost to the public is simply that of the material used. I heard the figure $2.50 with a little mild astonishment, I must admit. I should not have supposed that the mere cloth contained in the outer garment could be produced for that figure, and I think there is probably some mistake in supposing that overcoats can be supplied for that cost, although I have no doubt, as such clothing is certainly made in the penitentiary by convict labour, that the cost to the country of each overcoat for the guards is a comparatively small sum. But, with regard to the question of prisoners clothing I have only to repeat what I have said already that the warden is governed by the Penitentiaries Act and that in so far as I am able to see he has not, in the matters referred to in this case at any rate, been in any degree to blame

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the observations of the minister yesterday to have been made in defence of the conduct of the warden in sending out in winter time this prisoner not properly provided with clothing to keep him comfortable. The Minister of Justice said that the man had been supplied, not only with an extra suit, but with $5 in cash, and, therefore, he considered him well provided for. In answer to the observations made to-day by my hon. friend in regard to several prisoners who have been discharged in winter without having been provided with an overcoat, the hon. minister said that they had the option to remain in the penitentiary for the winter, and, therefore, there was no reasonable ground for complaint. Now, it is natural to suppose that a man who has been incarcerated in the penitentiary for a considerable length of time would desire to obtain his liberty at the earliest possible moment, for two reasons: One is the unsatisfactory situation in which he is placed, and the other is the fear that his detention for a few days longer might result in his being kept there for many months longer. Therefore, he would take the option of going out, even though the conditions of the weather might be such that it would be almost inhuman to send him out. We are told that the overcoats supplied to the officials cost only $2.75. At that price it might be much more economical to give a discharged prisoner an overcoat than to keep him in the prison for a month or two longer, until he could go with lighter clothing. It seems to me that it is a penny-wise-pound-foolish policy that is being pursued. There is another point that appeals to my mind. A discharged prisoner is going out to the world with a brand on him, which makes it very difficult for him to get either employment or shelter, especially in the winter time, when labour is not plentiful and many are unemployed, unless he denied his previous history, and the small amount of money given to him on leaving the penitentiary would soon be used up. Therefore, it does seem to me that there is a little more inhumanity in sending out a discharged prisoner without sufficient clothing to keep him warm than the Minister of Justice tries to make out.

THE WASHINGTON NEGOTIATIONS.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Prime Minister say when he expects the Minister of Finance back again?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no positive information, but I think he will leave Washington to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to explain a little more definitely than was done yesterday the point in the tentative arrangement between Canada and the United States as to the licensing of American fishermen and Canadian fishermen using trap nets for cod and herring. In what cases are licenses not required and therefore the licensing system is not kept up?

Mr. BRODEUR. As my hon. friend is aware, by the former regulations concerning the Gulf of St. Lawrence it was provided in all cases licenses were required for cod trap and herring trap nets. By the amendments which have been

agreed to it is provided that where a trap net is set 1,000 yards from the shore or from another trap net already set, a license is not required.

Mr. FOSTER. To what extent does that go against the principle which was considered very essential, that we cannot control the fishermen properly unless we put them under license?

Mr. BRODEUR. I was advised by the Inspector of Fisheries, who was with us at the time, that in the case of a trap net set 1,000 yards from the shore, a license was not absolutely necessary. Besides, I am informed that a trap net is very seldom set at such a distance from the shore or from another trap net already set.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I understand that certain negotiations took place between the representatives of Canada and the representatives of the United States subsequent to the time the representative of Newfoundland left. Was the latter aware of the nature of the negotiations that were about to take place, and did he leave because he did not agree with those negotiations?

Mr. BRODEUR. Before we entered into negotiations with the United States as to our regulations, we discussed the matter fully with the Prime Minister of Newfoundland, and was satisfied that we should try to settle the question so far as Canada was concerned. Those regulations had been discussed in his presence in the previous conferences, so that he was fully aware of the objections which were being made by the United States authorities.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like to know whether the Prime Minister of Newfoundland expressed his dissent from accepting the further proposal which the Canadian representatives afterwards accepted?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, quite the reverse. He was very willing that we should settle the question on the basis on which it was settled.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Was he satisfied with reference to Newfoundland?

Mr. BRODEUR. There were points affecting both Newfoundland and Canada; there were other points affecting Newfoundland only, which he was, perhaps, not ready to settle, but he was absolutely satisfied that we should settle the Canadian regulations in the manner in which they have been settled.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Did he express his dissent from the proposals which were subsequently accepted by the Canadian government as to those points which were common to both Newfoundland and Canada?

Mr. BRODEUR. The two points which concerned Newfoundland and Canada were the question of purse seines and the question of Sunday fishing. There was another point which did not concern Newfoundland but which concerned us, and that was the question of licenses. In Newfoundland they have no licensing system; but as regards the other questions, which are almost similar, the Prime Minister of Newfoundland was perfectly satisfied that we should try to come to a settlement with the United States authorities.

VACANCIES IN SENATE AND SUPREME COURT, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to call attention to one or two matters affecting the province from which I come. I shall refer in the first place to the vacancy in the Senate. This vacancy occurred almost two years ago, and was caused by the death of the late Senator Ferguson, who died in August or September, 1909, and whose seat remains yet unfilled. This lack of representation of Prince Edward island in the Senate is accentuated by the absence through regrettable illness, of Senator Robertson from that province. The people of Prince Edward Island are beginning to complain about the neglect of their rights to representation in our second chamber. I have here an extract from a newspaper, which is not a Conservative organ either, which I wish to read:—

> Parliament is at work again at Ottawa with most important matters to deal with, trade, transportation, banking, extension of provincial boundaries, tariff reduction, the new navy, preparation for the coming imperial conference and maritime representation, are some of the questions of prime importance to be reviewed and dealt with. At such a juncture our province is surely entitled to be fully represented in both Houses, but while we have lost one-third of our former representation in the Commons, those responsible for the patronage persist in keeping vacant one seat in the Senate. Patronage is managed with little regard to public right and the wishes of the public. If it is the earnest desire of the government to throw this province wholly into the opposition column at next election nothing more is needed than to follow on the present course.

Another newspaper, also published in Charlottetown, has this to say of the failure of the government to fulfil its duty towards the island province:—

> Prince Edward Island is entitled to four seats in the Senate of Canada, the senators may be members of the executive; they may be heads of the great departments of the government. But notwithstanding the fact that one of her three present senators has been kept at home by illness and that the others find their strength giving way to the natural infirmities of age, one of Prince Edward Island's four seats has been arbitrarily kept vacant for two whole years, at

a time that her need of effective representation in parliament was never half so great.

I do not think that I need dwell any longer on this matter. All I wish to do, was to call the attention of the government to the injustice being done the province from which I come, in allowing this seat in the Senate to remain so long vacant.

There is another vacancy which occurred some time ago in the province, and that is a vacancy on the Supreme Court Bench. This was caused by the resignation of Mr. Justice Hodgson, Master of Rolls, who resigned some time ago, and whose place is also left unfilled. Before his resignation, Mr. Justice Hodgson had been ill some time, and owing to his illness the Courts of Appeal in Equity has not been able to meet for fully two years. Yet this government has not seen fit to make the necessary appointment and allow the work of that important court to go on. The press in my province have a good deal to say on this matter, so that I am not here merely expressing my own opinion. Here is what I find in one of our newspapers:—

Why is it that no appointment is made to the vacant Prince Edward Island judgeship?

Certainly it is not because the federal government wants to save the salaries which appertain to these positions. No, it's not due to economy.

And just as certainly, it is because there is dispute as to who are to have the positions and to what 'party' advantage is to be had or lost in making the appointments.

The burden of work which falls upon the two remaining judges is excessive and will probably overwhelm them, while appeal cases in chancery involving large interests cannot be disposed of until the vacancy is filled.

Justice delayed is justice denied; and there is no shadow of excuse for a continuance of the wrong.

There was a time in ancient Rome when offices such as this judgeship were set up at auction and knocked down to the highest bidder. Have we reached that stage of degradation here?

If the delay is caused by the desire of the government to prostitute the administration of justice in order to serve personal or political ends, then* * * * *

And if the delay is not in order to serve personal or political ends then* * * * *

Another paper referring to this matter says:—

One of three seats on the Supreme Court Bench of this province vacant for a year past. Two of four chairs allotted to this province in the Senate now empty. One-third of our representation in the Commons gone. Of course, this is good enough for Prince Edward Island! Any other province would not take it.

I do not think it is good enough for the island. I appeal to fair minded men in this House, and country, if the government is not derelict in its duty in not having made these appointments promptly. It is unfair, it is a violation of the constitutional principles of government that, in order to serve party or personal ends, or because of party exigencies, the government should allow these two seats, one in the Senate, and one on the Supreme Court Bench, to remain vacant. I appeal to this government to at once attend to this matter, and I make this appeal, not as a matter of favour, but as one of right, to which the people of Prince Edward Island are entitled. These vacancies should be at once filled, and no party end should be allowed to interfere with this imperative and immediate duty. I sincerely trust that I shall not have to bring this matter up again, but that the government will see fit to put an end to a condition of things in my province which is simply disgraceful.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not catch the name of the newspaper which my hon. friend quoted, but I noticed it said that at present the government were very busy with very large questions affecting the tariff, reciprocity, the preparation of the naval service and so on. All this is true, and therefore, my hon. friend should not be surprised that when the government has to deal with such important questions, the appointment to the Senate should have been overlooked.

Mr. FRASER. But it is nearly two years since.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The delay has been long, and my hon. friend, therefore, may have some cause for his remarks. So far as the Supreme Court vacancy is concerned it is only within the last few weeks that the resignation of Judge Hodgson has deprived the province of the valuable services of so able a judge. I can assure my hon. friend that the appointment will be made at a very early date.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that for many years I have heard a more effective, a more sensible, and in a way a more cutting appeal made to the leader of the government than that made by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island. In language well chosen, and simple in its form, without any shadow of exaggeration or party bias, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) placed the grievances of one of the provinces of this country before the House and the Prime Minister. If the purpose of having a Senate in this country is the one generally supposed, namely, to protect the minority provinces, all the greater care should be taken not to deprive the smaller provinces of that protection which the constitution meant to guarantee them. And, yet in the province of Prince Edward Island its senatorial force has been cut in two, and the place of one of its ablest

senators taken away nearly two years ago has not been filled by the government. The services of the late Senator Ferguson were of great value to the island,, and the services of a worthy successor to him would also be of great value. The Prime Minister read his own condemnation when he said that the best reason that was given why the vacancy had not been filled was that important and weighty questions were before the government. That excuse might avail if he thinks that the government has to do altogether with legislation, and that the House of parliament have no part in it. But the greater the gravity of the questions before the government, and which must afterwards come before the House, the greater the reason why the provinces should not be shorn of their rightful representation. That was a very suggestive paragraph in the extracts read by my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser) which stated that in the days of Rome seats in the Senate were put up at auction, and the question was asked how much better is it to-day? Has the Prime Minister given any good reason why the senatorship has not been filled in the province of Prince Edward Island? If for instance you have a battalion, and a certain part of it is for any reason shorn of a portion of its strength, and there are vacancies in another part of the battalion is not the weakness in one part an added reason why the vacancies in the other part should be filled. So it is with this present case. Prince Edward Island is vitally interested in the question of the fisheries and vitally interested in the question of our trade policy, and yet its representation in parliament is depleted. The Prime Minister was appealed to by my hon. friend and no answer has been given by the Prime Minister for neglect of his constitutional duty. He has a little more reason in the matter of the judgeship because the resignation of Justice Hodgson is recent, but in the matter of the senatorship, is there any other reason at all than that the warring elements in Prince Edward Island have not yet come to a conclusion as to whom the spoil should be given. Is not that the reason, and is there any other reason at all?

Mr. FRASER. I wish to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the government to also appoint the senator in a very short time?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

NEW DEPARTMENTAL BUILDINGS.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). The following item appeared in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of yesterday which I think is worthy of consideration, and as to which I wish to ask for some information :

Mr. FOSTER.

The work of demolishing the buildings on Sussex street where the new departmental block is to be located is progressing. It was stated at the Department of Public Works today that the new plans are practically finished and at present the specifications are in course of preparation. It is intended to call for bids within a few weeks or in good time to allow for the commencement of operations in the spring. A substantial vote for the purpose appears in the main estimates. The plan has been altered materially through a story being taken off the building, while it has also been made narrower. The tower and top ornamentation has also been changed. The total cost will likely be about three and a half millions and big contractors from all over the Dominion have been making inquiries with a view of submitting tenders.

This indicates most important alterations in the new plans for the new departmental buildings. I do not profess to have any particular knowledge on a question of this kind, but I think we all look upon these public buildings in Ottawa as a national asset, and desire to see them worthy of this great Dominion. We are very proud of the buildings in which we sit at the present moment ; they constitute a beautiful block, and are well worthy their position as the seat of legislation for this Dominion. But, since the days in which these buildings were erected it appears to me there has been a gradual deterioration. The Langevin block is a dignified structure although it is not in harmony with the other buildings on these grounds, but from the parliamentary block down to the mint, and the archives buildings there is a very great descent indeed. The archives building with its cardboard battlements, and its altogether flimsy appearance is in no way worthy of the Dominion. Even the Victoria museum, although it has considerable dignity on account of its size, appears to lack many details which might have been supplied had competent expert architects passed upon the designs. I consider that the architects of the present day, generally speaking, are on just as high a level as those of the past, and we have a pretty good example of modern architecture in the splendid building which is being erected by the Grand Trunk Railway Company in Ottawa. I cannot help but think that with a proper effort the new departmental buildings could be made just as well suited to occupy the position they will hold in the Capital of the Dominion, as are the parliamentary buildings. Some years ago when this question was first brought up the House understood that following the precedent adopted elsewhere a competition was to be held for the purpose of obtaining the best designs possible from architects all over the world, but the prizes offered were hardly large enough to bring out the very best efforts of able architects. A year or two ago when the Lon-

don county council purposed erecting new buildings they offered an enormous prize, and I understand the designs submitted provide for buildings quite worthy of the purposes for which they are intended. What has been done in connection with this competition? Have the prizes been awarded, and is the successful competitor to be entrusted with the new building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Prizes were awarded by the committee entrusted with the consideration of the plans and awarding of prizes, but the department did not decide to accept any of the plans, and plans have been prepared by the architectural staff of the department under the direction of the chief architect.

Mr. LAKE. Are these designs to be submitted to a body of experts before tenders are called for, as indicated by this article?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, except to the experts of the department.

Mr. LAKE. This is a most important matter, and it is due to this House and this country that some more inspection should be made of these plans than apparently is proposed by the Minister of Public Works. However good, and however able his architects may be, I do not think it is sufficient simply to put this matter into the hands of one body of men, we ought to have these plans on exhibition, so that the public at large may see them, may criticise them and a body of experts should be appointed to look into them. The members should also have an opportunity of seeing the plans and understanding the nature of the building for which they are asked to appropriate this enormous sum of money. As I said, it seems to me, that the last buildings constructed in this city entirely from the designs of the department are not of such a character as in my humble judgment the great public departmental buildings of the Capital of Canada should be.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As I have explained, some years ago, before I became minister, competitive designs were invited from Canadian architects. A number of designs were submitted and the committee of architects to whom the plans were referred, decided upon three sets of plans to which the first, second and third prizes were awarded. The plans were all exhibited in the Railway Committee room. After careful consideration, the department decided to adopt none of these plans for reasons which seemed good to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that on the question of style or of cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the question of style of the plans. In the opinion of the department, and I and other members of the government who saw the plans, entertained the same view, none of these plans were the best that could be devised and it was decided to direct the chief architect to prepare new plans. These plans were exhibited last session.

My hon. friend has referred to an article in the 'Citizen' about an alteration in the plans. An alteration has been made, and I regretted this, but it was necessary, in view of certain improvements in the nature of a driveway by the Ottawa Improvement Commission. Owing to this driveway it was thought better to preserve Mackenzie avenue as a public highway. In the previous plans, a building was provided to encroach upon or entirely take up Mackenzie avenue. Upon consideration and after hearing the views of the Ottawa Improvement Commission, the government decided that it would be better to leave Mackenzie avenue open as a public highway, as a part of the driveway. That necessitated narrowing the building. Then came the question whether we should leave the building of the same height. It will be understood that in erecting a departmental building of that size, it was desirable to have a well in the centre to afford light to the inner offices.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the width from Mackenzie avenue to Sussex street ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 200 feet. As we had to narrow the building by about 40 feet in order to leave Mackenzie avenue vacant, it became necessary, in order to give sufficient light to the offices on the well, to reduce the height of the buildings by at least one story. This will greatly improve the building so far as the lighting of the inner offices is concerned. The original plan provided for 7 stories on Sussex street and 6 on Mackenzie avenue. Under the changed plans there will be 6 stories on Sussex street and 5 on Mackenzie avenue.

A word in regard to the architecture of the buildings recently erected by the government. I do not profess to be any more skilled in architecture than by hon. friend, but I think I can safely say that opinions differ very much if my hon. friend's opinion reflects the views of any considerable number of people, because I have heard a good many people speak in terms of high praise of the Archives Building, of the Mint, and more especially of the Victoria Memorial Museum, which is spoken of as being of very beautiful design and one of which the country may well feel proud. My hon. friend speaks of the Grand Trunk hotel, which I think is a very fine building. But I am sure that if it were a public building it would receive a lot of criticism. Many people would say that there is not sufficient ornamentation about it, that it is too plain, and altogether unattractive, and yet

it is a very fine building. I can point my hon. friend to many buildings around the city which are being erected by private individuals under architects of skill and experience, and yet if these were public buildings I am sure they would be strongly criticised. I will not mention any one, but hon. gentlemen who have been about the city will no doubt have remarked some of them. At all events, we have thought it best, under all the circumstances, to place the responsibility for this work in the hands of our own staff. I may say to my hon. friend that before we reach the items for public buildings chargeable to capital account, I hope to place the plans upon the table for the inspection of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might give us an idea of the style of architecture.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not seen the plans as finally adopted by the chief architect. He has promised to have them ready for me in the course of a few days, when I will bring them before the House.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The Minister of Public Works has promised to perform all that is required of him by this House. Heretofore the plans of the various public buildings in the city of Ottawa have always been laid on the table of the House for our inspection. We are all, as the hon. member states, proud of the public buildings here in Ottawa, and we have always exercised the right to see the plans and to know what the Minister of Public Works intends to do in reference to them. Sometimes it has happened that opinions expressed in the House have had the effect of altering the plans. There is no blame to be attached to the Minister of Public Works because he did not adopt the plans he advertised for; he had prepared amended plans, which, he says, he will lay on the table of the House. He intends, before a vote is taken, submitting them to the House for our inspection.

THE FISCAL POLICY OF CANADA.

Mr. NEELY. I wish to ask a question which concerns the Postmaster General, and which refers to a report which appears in this morning's issue of the Ottawa 'Citizen,' and also of the Montreal 'Gazette.' The Postmaster General, speaking last night at the annual banquet of the Montreal branch of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, is credited with the following statement regarding the fiscal policy of this country:—

> Our commercial ascendency, thanks to the wise fiscal policy adopted by this country twenty-five years ago, is the admiration of the world to-day.

I rise to ask the Postmaster General if he did make that statement, and if he does consider that this country has had but one fiscal policy during the last twenty-five years.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My attention has been drawn to the report published in the Montreal 'Gazette,' and in the Ottawa 'Citizen.' I notice there is a difference between the report published in the French papers and that published in the English papers. In the Montreal French papers of this morning I am quoted as having said that it was the policy adopted fifteen years ago; and that is in fact what I said. There is only a difference in figures, the English papers have a two instead of a one. Besides I may say that there was no fiscal policy adopted twenty-five years ago, the policy of protection was adopted thirty-two years ago, and the only other policy since adopted was the Fielding tariff of 1897. If my hon. friend will read the remarks made by the leader of the opposition on the same occasion, he will find that the leader of the opposition spoke of my reference to the fiscal policy of fifteen years ago, and he said I should have gone a little further back to get at the origin of our fiscal policy—these are about his words—they have practised what we have been preaching.

Mr. FOSTER. When my hon. friend said fifteen years ago he was nearer right than he thought he was.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not wish to express any opinion, but merely to correct the statement.

WITHDRAWAL OF GOVERNMENT BILLS.

Mr. HENDERSON. A few moments ago the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) placed before you a motion to withdraw from the Order Paper two Bills, one relating to the manufacture of matches and the other relating to the importation of opium. We are not very sure whether these are the Bills he introduced last evening or whether they are the Bills that were introduced prior to his placing on the Order Paper the resolution on which they were based.

Mr. KING. The Bills I asked to have withdrawn were those placed on the Order Paper prior to giving notice of the resolutions which were passed last night.

FISH POACHERS ON PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. BARNARD. I would like to call the attention once more of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the depredations, regular and constant, of American poachers upon the fisheries on the coast of the province of British Columbia, and more particularly on the west coast of Vancouver island. I brought this matter to his attention on the 16th of December last, and

called attention to an article which had just appeared in the Victoria Daily 'Colonist,' in which it was stated that officers and passengers of a passing vessel were surprised to see a string of light extending from Raphael Point to Estevan.

These lights belonged to a number of American fishing vessels engaged in poaching. The minister at that time betrayed such lamentable ignorance of the geography of the locus in quo that he got the fisheries of Hecate Straits confounded with those on the west coast of Vancouver island. It is in hope that the minister has since become better acquainted with the question during the recess, and has further posted himself upon the topography of the country and of the condition of the fisheries out there, that I venture to bring this matter up again to-day. I may say that the game still goes on. I have extracts from our own press and from the press in the United States, showing that what is complained of is not an occasional raid by these fishermen, but is a systematic business carried on by a number of Americans who are robbing us of our fisheries contrary to law. I propose to read a few extracts which will substantiate this position. I quote now from the 'Colonist' of the 29th December:

The steamer 'Tees' which returned from Quatsino Sound and way ports of the west coast yesterday morning with 25 passengers and a small cargo, including gillbone and fertilizer from the whaling stations, brought news that poaching by United States vessels is being continued off the west coast of Vancouver island, where the poachers use the harbours freely. One of the fishing vessels was tied up near the whaling station at Kyuquot when the steamer 'Tees' passed, and another was in Sidney Inlet.

The Seattle 'Times,' a newspaper published in the city of Seattle says:—

Part of the anxiety felt over the safety of the individual vessels of the Seattle halibut fleet this morning——

Mark you, Mr. Speaker, 'the Seattle halibut fleet'; that is the Seattle halibut fleet that poaches on the west coast of Vancouver island.

—was relieved by news brought by Captain Sam Larsen of the steamship 'Standard No. 2' that the gasoline fishing schooners, 'Lief E.,' 'Woodbury,' 'La Paloma' and 'Malola' were safe and sound when he left the grounds near Sidney Inlet Monday.

For the information of my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in case he does not know, I will tell him that Sidney Inlet is on the west coast of Vancouver Island.

The report made by the captain of the Standard Oil steamship, 'Col. E. L. Drake,' that he had seen the wreck of a halibut fishing vessel near Cape Flattery some days ago has caused anxiety about all vessels now absent from port.

I would like his attention to be given for a moment to this too:

Preparations now are being made for a number of gasoline schooners to leave within the next few days. Among those about to start are the 'Corona,' 'Roosevelt,' 'Northland,' 'Daisy' and 'Ida May.' The 'Ida May' possibly will be detained in getting away, as she has to have a new engine installed.

That is from a Seattle newspaper and is dated the 29th December. Again, on the 7th January, the following appears in the same paper, the Seattle 'Times'. I quote from the 'Colonist' of January 7, 1911:—

The Seattle 'Times' of yesterday tells of the departure of another fleet for Sidney Inlet.' The 'Times' says: The schooner 'Wiedling Bros.' arrived in port last night with 45,000 pounds of halibut, one of the largest catches recently reported. Together with the 'Northland,'——

The 'Northland' is one of the boats mentioned in the 'Times' of the 29th December.

—'Annie Larsen' and 'Sophie Jones,' the 'Wiedling Bros.' is preparing to sail again for the fishing banks. It is expected that the four vessels will get away from port sometime to-night. An attempt will be made first to fish off Cape Flattery, but if the weather will not permit the vessels will proceed to Sidney Inlet.

I submit that these reports show that there are two fleets maintained in Seattle for the purpose of exploiting these fisheries, and the complaint I make is not of an occasional raid which my friends of the fishery protection service might possibly find it difficult to deal with, but of the systematic and organized business in which there is a number of schooners employed all the year around. It is an outrage upon the people of British Columbia to think that this government is absolutely unable to cope with the situation. Some little explanation may be given of this. We have the explanation of Captain Newcombe of the 'Kestrel.' I may say, as I have before stated in this House, that the 'Kestrel' is an ordinary fishery cruiser that Captain Newcombe has time and time and time again told the department of Marine and Fisheries is absolutely unfit for the service. She is too slow, she is not properly equipped and is absolutely useless for the service in which she is engaged. Captain Newcombe explains the reason why he did not go to the west coast of Vancouver island. According to his own statement, if he had gone there, he would not have got any of these pirates, but probably he would have driven them away, because his boat is too slow to catch them. He says, according to a report in the 'Colonist' newspaper.

The 'Kestrel's' orders have been to cruise in Hecate straits, and although the depredations of the poaching vessels on the west coast of Vancouver island was known to her officers they were unable to proceed there, because in the first place their orders were explicit to remain in the north despite the fact that the poachers had changed their sphere of operations, and in the second place, the 'Kestrel' is not considered a suitable vessel for winter weather off the west coast of Vancouver island.

It cannot exactly be news to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to hear that the poachers were not to be expected in Hecate straits, but notwithstanding that fact, he ordered his cruiser to stay there and catch the poachers in a place where no poachers would go. I say that because I find in the report of the fisheries protection service of this year at page 353 that it is stated:

During the present season halibut has been extremely scarce in Hecate straits, and consequently the competition between fishermen very keen.

The fact of the matter is, that the Hecate straits fishing grounds have been seriously depleted by the depredations of the American fishermen. In the report of the department for the year 1908, I think, the minister, or his officers, states that halibut to the extent of 1,500,000 lbs, the value of which I have forgotten, was illegally taken from the banks of Hecate straits by American fishermen. That thing has been going on for a long time with the result that to-day the size of the halibut in Hecate straits has decreased to such an extent that it is no longer a desirable fishing ground, and fishermen have transferred their operations to the new banks which have been discovered on the west coast of Vancouver island. This matter is not new. We have, this year, Mr. John J. Williams, Inspector of Fisheries, complaining that the 'Falcon' which was going to be kept on the ground, was inadequate for the purpose. We have had this matter taken up in this House at various times and we had a most admirable speech made by Mr. Sloan, then member for Comox-Atlin, in which he went fully into this matter. We also had a speech from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself, on the subject, which will be found in 'Hansard' of 1906-7, page 1777. He states there:—

I have found that there is a great deal of poaching done, especially on the western coast of Vancouver and within the three mile limit. If, however, we have not the right to go outside the three mile limit in Hecate strait and Dixon entrance, I think we should adopt the policy of protecting our Canadian fisheries. We are very glad to see the American fishermen taking so much interest in our fisheries, but at the same time it is the duty of the government to protect those fisheries and keep them for our Canadian citizens. As they belong to us, they should be exploited by us; and if American fishermen go there they should at least—as has been done in the case of a New Washington company—give us as much benefit as possible. But we must do on the Pacific coast what I have said should be done with regard to the Atlantic coast. I am free to admit, however, that there seems to be more business activity shown by Canadians on the British Columbia coast. Our financial institutions have been investing large sums there, which is a condition of affairs I am glad to see. For my part, I am ready to take all the necessary steps to protect our fisheries along that coast. I have asked my colleagues to put at the disposal of my department another boat, a cruiser, which should be devoted almost exclusively to the protection of our fisheries. A sum is in the estimates for that purpose on which the House will be asked to vote; but I am sure, from the tenor of this discussion, that all the hon. members will be glad to co-operate with the government in that respect and give us the means of protecting our fisheries in the west, as we are doing in the east.

That was in 1906. In 1907, just before the general elections, the same vote was put in the estimates, but there is no cruiser yet. In 1909, shortly after the general election, I was informed by the minister that plans had been prepared for a cruiser, and I think he said that tenders had been called for. We have not got that cruiser yet, and apparently we are no nearer to having her than we were before. The hon. gentleman may say that the 'Rainbow' is adapted for this purpose, and I understand that there was some kind of an arrangement that in addition to being used as a training ship the 'Rainbow' was to be engaged in this service. However, the facts appear to be that these fishing boats lie so close inshore that the 'Rainbow,' with her heavy draught, would be useless for the service. The most suitable craft is a speedy gasoline boat of 20 or 25 knots, because these American fishing boats are all equipped with high power gasoline engines, and they can get out of the way of a steamer whose smoke they can see a great distance off. The fisheries of British Columbia to-day lead in productiveness the fisheries of the rest of the Dominion, and it is only in British Columbia that the revenues received by the Dominion from the fisheries far exceeds the expenditure. Prof. Prince, in his report, states that the British Columbia fisheries are probably the finest in the world, and it is the undoubted right of the people of that province to demand from this government that these fisheries shall be protected from depletion by the depredations which are now going on. I ask that the government shall provide, in the estimates this year, an appropriation for one or two gasoline boats to be used in this protective service.

Mr. BRODEUR. Some time ago my hon. friend (Mr. Barnard) read an article from a paper published in Victoria, and stated that there were depredations on the fisheries of British Columbia, and particularly on the west coast of Vancouver island. The hon. gentleman has been trying to poke fun at me, because, as he hints, I am not familiar with the geography of the country, but I would point out to the hon. gentleman that he read the newspaper article in such a low voice that I could not hear it, and then, after reading the article, he referred especially to Hecate straits, which lead me to think that his remarks were directed particularly to these waters.

Mr. BARNARD. I am afraid the hon. gentleman was not listening.

Mr. BRODEUR. On the contrary, I was paying every attention, but unfortunately, I could not hear the hon. gentleman's reading, and so, while part of my answers was directed to what I did hear, the other part may not have been appropriate to his question. If, when the hon. gentleman wishes to question me in future, he would give notice, I shall bring with me all the papers in the matter and be better equipped to answer him than I can possibly be speaking on the spur of the moment. However, the hon. gentleman will find, from the public documents, that we have largely increased, in recent years, the fishery protective service on the British Columbia coast. Perhaps it is not yet as efficient as it should be in view of the very active development of the fisheries there and the necessity for properly protecting them. I think, however, that the new addition made to the fleet will enable us to cope with the situation more effectively. It is true, as stated by the hon. gentleman, that some years ago we had a vote in the estimates for the purchase of a vessel, but although we did not purchase a vessel then we did charter one for the special purpose of looking after the fisheries.

Mr. BARNARD. Was that the 'Wm. Jolliffe?'

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember the name of the vessel.

Mr. BARNARD. Is she not released from charter now?

Mr. BRODEUR. If it was the 'Jolliffe' I do not think she is now chartered.

Mr. BARNARD. Was there any other vessel chartered for that purpose?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not keep all these details in my memory, and I cannot now recall. I may say that after the vote appeared in the estimates the plans had to be prepared, and we afterwards thought that we could purchase the 'Rainbow' Notwithstanding what my hon. friend says, I think the 'Rainbow' is suitable for doing a large part of this work. She may not be able to enter certain waters where poachers are likely to be found, I do not think it advisable that poachers should be informed as to what our plans are, but I can assure my hon. friend that we are taking all the necessary steps to protect adequately the fisheries of the British Columbia coast.

Mr. LOGGIE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether there is a close season when herring traps cannot be used, or does the season extend over the whole year? I desire also to ask him, what is the maximum length of the leader from the shore to the bowl of the trap? As I understand, the herring trap is one which takes all kinds of fish frequenting our waters, including mackerel and salmon, which are fish of great commercial value to Canada. With respect to salmon, there is a close season, when Canadians fishing in purely Canadian waters cannot take them even under license, and I would like to ask the minister, can the American or Canadian, as the case may be, fish for salmon on the Labrador coast, or the Magdalen Islands coast at a season when it is not legal to take salmon in the other coastal waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence? This is a very important matter which may very seriously affect the fishing interests in purely Canadian waters. I quite realize that the concessions given to our United States friends are equal to those given to Canadians who go to fish in those dual waters; but at the same time I would draw the minister's attention to the fact that licensing the American citizen gives him a prior right in placing his trap, and, as I understand, the leader of this trap extends practically to the shore, so that to all intents and purposes he has privileges which a Canadian has not in purely Canadian waters. For example, I understand that mackerel traps are practically prohibited along the St. Lawrence coast. There is one on the north coast of Prince Edward Island, but it is the only one, so far as I am aware, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. It is under a heavy license fee, and it was there for many years before the licensing plan was in vogue. So that mackerel traps are practically not allowed in the purely Canadian coastal waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, whereas we are now licensing, in the coast waters of Labrador and the Magdalen Islands, a trap which is to all intents and purposes a mackerel trap, and which will also take salmon, which I believe frequent those waters, especially the Labrador coast, in large quantities, and at a season when our own fishermen are not allowed to take them. I think it only fair that the minister's attention should be brought to these facts.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether my hon. friend has seen the regulations

which have been adopted as a result of the negotiations with the United States authorities; but I can assure him that all the fears he expresses as to rights being given to Americans which are not going to be enjoyed by Canadians, may be discarded. There has been no change in the regulations which will in any shape or form be prejudicial to the salmon industry or to Canadian fishermen. The regulations which provide for a close season for salmon are still maintained, and the regulations which provide that traps must be made in such a way as not to affect the ascent of the salmon are also maintained. The changes, which are not of great importance, my hon. friend calls concessions to the Americans. The right we have given to Americans to get licenses is not a concession granted by us. It is a right which they had under the treaty of 1818. As a matter of fact, they were claiming that they had an absolute right to fish in those waters without any license at all. The hon. Minister of Justice quoted yesterday a despatch sent by the Foreign Office in 1906 to the effect that Newfoundland, and it applied also to Canada, had no right under that treaty to impose any license fee on American fishermen. That treaty gives them the right to fish on the Labrador coast and the Magdalen Islands coast in common with British subjects, and it was contended by the American authorities that we could not impose upon them a restriction in the form of a license. This claim certainly deserves a great deal of consideration, and, as the Minister of Justice said yesterday, was accepted by the Foreign Office. So I thought the other day, when the American authorities were willing to accept a license from us, thus virtually recognizing our right to issue a license, it was something of the utmost importance to Canada, because our licensing system is of great value for the preservation of our fisheries. The American experts who were there, after hearing the reasons adduced in favour of maintaining our licensing system, considered it a very fair one which is tantamount to their admission that the way we have been managing our fisheries is certainly commendable. My hon. friend asks what length will be the leaders. It was provided in the regulations, previous to the agreement made the other day, that all the leaders should start from the shore. The American authorities contended with a great deal of reason—I think they were right in that respect—that this was prejudicial to their rights on the treaty coast, because if our regulations provided that all the leaders should start from the shore, and if they had no right to go to the shore under the treaty, they meant that they could not put traps there where Canadians were permitted to put them, which would be discriminating. This struck me as a fair contention, and we tried to meet it by declaring that if the leader should start from the shore, then the length would be determined by our fishery officers and not by anybody else, and our officers determine the length of the leader by the depth of the water. I think that by all these changes which have been made my hon. friend may feel assured that we have not departed in any shape or form from the principle underlying our regulations, and that the mackerel as well as the salmon fisheries will be just as well preserved under the changes made as they were under the regulations which existed before.

Mr. LOGGIE. The minister has said that the length of the leader is to be determined by the fishery officer. Should the applicant say I want a leader only 100 yards from the shore, then the trap must be at the end of the leader, which would be simply one hundred yards from the shore. That is a point worthy of consideration. Regarding the protection of our salmon, the minister tells us that the close season will not be changed. That is not the question with me, as I understand it. The season for fishing the herring traps is all the year round, if the owner could fish all the year in spite of the weather. Therefore, if a trap catches salmon, and the owner is allowed to use the salmon, there is practically no close season for the salmon caught in the trap.

Mr. BRODEUR. Any fish caught in the close season contrary to the regulations is supposed to be caught illegally, and has to be thrown away.

Mr. JAMESON. I understood the minister to say that certain regulations had been framed as the result of this memo entered into by the American and Canadian authorities. If that is the case, may I ask whether those will be available to members and when we can have them?

Mr. BRODEUR. They will be brought down Monday.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) asked that the item relating to the Montreal barracks should stand, so we will pass to the Ontario items.

Public Works—Buildings, Ontario—Athens public building, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I find that the postal revenue of this town last year was $2,152.63, money orders issued, $17,482.56, money orders paid $9,630.94. The population two years ago was 1,000. It is quite a rapidly growing town, has six churches, fourteen stores, two hotels, lumber mill and two planing mills and woollen factory among other industries. This will not complete.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Is this just for a post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. My instructions to the chief architect are to keep the cost of this building in the vicinity of $13,000 or $14,000. It will not exceed $15,000.

Mr. CROSBY. Does that include the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. Has the hon. minister had any requisition from the Post Office Department for this building as being required for the work of the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not from the Post Office Department. I may say, however, that my attention was called by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), in whose constituency this town is situated, to the very great need of post office accommodation there. My hon. friend no doubt is aware that the department allows a small amount to the postmaster to enable him to secure accommodation. The people of Athens have been urging, so the Minister of Railways informs me, that increased accommodation be given them, and he hoped it would be possible to make an arrangement with a banking company which was going to erect a building there so that my department should pay a portion of the rent necessary to get increased accommodation. However, the matter fell through, and I decided to ask for a vote for a building not to cost a great deal of money but one that would be suitable to the needs of the town.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is a post office erected solely for the business of the Post Office Department. After it is erected who pays for the renting expenses of that building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Department of Public Works.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the case all through ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The Department of Public Works does not require a building, but the minister, without consultation with the Postmaster General erects a post office building for post office business and then assumes the cost of that building after its erection. Does the rental now paid for post office accommodation there fall into the revenue of the post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that rental will cease. I have sometimes thought it might not be undesirable, certainly it would not be from the standpoint of my department, if the other departments would pay the Public Works Department a rental for buildings which we erect for them.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the present system when the Postmaster General goes before the country and presents his accounts, saying this is my revenue, and this my expenditure, he is not making a fair exhibit to the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not like to say that.

Mr. FOSTER. He is shouldering a portion of the expense of his department on another department, and concealing it, in effect, in that other department. I have no hesitation in saying that, in my mind, the Minister of Public Works ought not to undertake to erect a building for another department until requisitioned by that department. This slipshod method is carried on simply for patronage purposes. Two ministers who have nothing to do with the post office decide to build a building for the Postmaster General and the carrying out of his business.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Rather for the public accommodation.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is bad policy

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, in this case, it is for the public accommodation.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Minister of Railways should some morning find the Minister of Public Works building a station somewhere on the Intercolonial railway, and on its completion this should relieve the Minister of Railways of the cost of maintaining that station, and then when the Minister of Railways presented his balance sheet to the country, he omitted the cost of that station, he would be giving a wrong account of part of the expenses of his department. I think the minister of post offices, the Postmaster General, ought to pursue exactly the same course as the Minister of Railways in this matter, and that he should not have the Minister of Public Works bearing the cost of part of the accommodation required by his department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend makes two points, one that we should not erect a building for another department without a requisition from the minister of that department, and the other, that if we do erect a post office the Postmaster General should pay a rental for it. Since when did my hon. friend entertain these views.

Mr. FOSTER. For a good many years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly not before 1896.

Mr. FOSTER. For the last 7 or 8 years I have advocated them steadily in the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I used to have a good deal of respect for the views of my hon. friend and have now, but I cannot find

that when my hon. friend was Minister of Finance, and had a powerful influence in the disposition of public moneys, he ever advocated any such idea as he is now putting forward. There is much to be said in favour of the views he has advanced and if he were coming here for the first time to get us to lay down a course to be pursued, irrespective of what has been done in the past, I think he would find me favourable to his views, but the difficulty is, that if we are to compel the ministers of the different departments to pay rentals for the buildings occupied by them, it would greatly disturb the accounts of the departments and for purposes of comparison with previous years, the accounts would become valueless. I would be very glad if something of the kind could be done, because it would show my department as a good revenue producer. For instance, if I could get a rental of even 3 per cent on the Montreal post office, which cost $1,000,000, it would be $30,000 a year which would be quite a revenue of itself for my department, and if that were multiplied by the revenues of post offices, &c., all over the country, it would make a very good showing. The difficulty is, that that has been contrary to the principle which has been pursued, not only ever since confederation, but ever since the provinces of Canada were inhabited, ever since we had public buildings. The erection and maintenance of public buildings has always been cast upon the Department of Public Works, and it is very difficult to make these changes. I have suggested to my hon. friend the Postmaster General that it would not be a bad idea if he would take into consideration, and pay for the use of the post offices throughout the country, a fair rental, based upon the interest on cost. So far, he has not been able to agree with the suggestion I have made, only made in a tentative manner. If the member for North Toronto could persuade the Postmaster General and the Minister of Customs to adopt his view, certainly I would not object. But after all, it would not make much difference to the country, because it would be simply taking the cost out of one branch and paying it on behalf of other branches.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Postmaster General is anxious to give to the people of this country the very best postal service he can, and in the most economical way, he will study the question a good deal before he would requisition the Minister of Public Works to build a large number of these post offices, which the Minister of Public Works is now building for merely patronage reasons. Consequently, this country would be saved a very large amount of money, which the Postmaster General might well use to extend and improve the postal service. If a building is to be erected for the purpose of a post office the Postmaster General and the postal authorities ought to be the judges whether it is necessary or not. What does the Postmaster General want to give to the people of Athens? He wants to give them facilities for getting their mails in and out, he is doing it and can still do it, as they do on principle in the United States, in ninety-nine out of one hundred cases. He can give it to them by way of rental rather than by way of spending a large amount of money in expensive public buildings, and the people will get as good service, and the department will have the revenue to enlarge and cheapen the service of the country generally.

Mr. LEMIEUX. These public buildings are also used for other purposes. Generally, when the construction of a public building is decided upon by the Minister of Public Works, we select our space, we give our opinion of the space we will require in that building and that locality. The Minister of Inland Revenue is consulted likewise. I may mention, for illustration, the case of Nicolet, where I myself advocated the construction of the post office. Whilst the revenue of the town of Nicolet would not justify the construction of a building for a post office alone, yet we had to consider that there was a regiment stationed there, and they wanted a certain amount of space for armoury purposes. Then there was the customs and excise office to be provided for. Therefore, my hon. friend must not apply his remarks to the post office alone; he must consider all the other departments that use the building.

Mr. FOSTER. If you have in view economy alone, you could house half a dozen departments in the same building. The fact in this case is that the Postmaster General has never requisitioned for the purpose of his department to have a public building put up at Athens.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The name of the place is familiar to me as being a historical name, and I remember well that the request has often been made by the people of the locality for a post office. I do not want to bring politics into this matter, but I think Athens is in a county represented by an hon. gentleman of the opposition. I mention this to show that politics have nothing to do with the erection of this building.

Mr. FOSTER. What I am trying to bring out is the method on which these buildings are erected. Here is a minister who has nothing to do with the Post Office Department, and who is putting up a building without the request of the Postmaster General, with no hint from the Post Office Department that the work is necessary for that department. Now, I say that is not a proper principle. Take another and a more

signal instance, the instance of Hampton, N.B., in the county of Kings, that I formerly represented. I was surprised, the other morning, in reading the 'Hansard,' to find a vote had been given for a public building in Hampton, and that the minister had declared that Hampton had a population of 2,000, that it was a remarkably live place, and a growing place, and so he persuaded the House to give him a vote of $5,000 as a starter for a post office.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, $3,000 as a starter, the whole thing to cost not more than $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I was anxious to know whether the Postmaster General had represented to the Minister of Public Works that for the purpose of his work it was necessary to have a $5,000 building put up in Hampton.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This may have occurred during my absence. But I am sure the department must have been consulted.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the minister to find out and bring down the information. I would like to know whether the minister, who is, I think, disposed to be economical, requisitioned that building, or whether he thought it was necessary.

Mr. EDWARDS. May I ask the Minister of Public Works if the Minister of Railways and Canals did not consult him in regard to this matter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. And it is also in the constituency of the Minister of Railways and Canals?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, it is in the county of Leeds, but I think a part of Leeds forms a portion of the constituency of Brockville. My impression is that it is in the constituency of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is not the minister perfectly aware that there is a portion of Leeds in the constituency of Brockville?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No I am not, but that is my belief.

Mr. EDWARDS. Of course, there is no politics in this.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Part of it is in Brockville.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what I understand.

Mr. EDWARDS. This $5,000 is for a constituency represented by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and it is to be followed with another vote of $10,000 making about $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not exceeding that.

Mr. EDWARDS. It appears that the Postmaster General is not interested in what post office buildings are erected. He is not consulted when a post office is to be erected although it would only seem natural that he would be the very first person that would be consulted.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am.

Mr. EDWARDS. You were not consulted in this case?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Many sessions ago.

Mr. EDWARDS. I understood the Minister of Public Works to say that this vote was asked for this particular building without consulting the Postmaster General, and without any requisition from the Postmaster General for the building. The Minister of Public Works explicitly stated the other night that it would not be expected that the Department of Public Works should consult the Postmaster General with regard to the erection of post offices in this country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is wrong. As to the accommodation required for post offices I stated that we did consult the Post Office Department.

Mr. EDWARDS. I said nothing with regard to the accommodation for post offices at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX. With regard to the architecture and the building of the office—no. Of course, that is a matter which comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Works, but the first requisition always comes from the Post Office Department.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, that is perfectly contrary to the statement made by the Minister of Public Works the other night because he said that he was endeavouring to get the Postmaster General to consider these matters with him. Does the Postmaster General think it is dealing fairly with the people of this country for $15,000 to be spent for the erection of a post office in Athens, or in any other village the size of Athens when there are whole townships in Ontario that have no post office within their bounds? Does he think it is fair today to spend $15,000 for a post office for a village the size of this when there are people in country places who have to travel all the way from five miles to twelve and fifteen miles to get their mail? He must agree that it is not fair play, and if he is not consulted in regard to the money being spent for the erection of post offices he should be and he should use his influence to see that the public get the postal facilities of which they stand in need. He should take a special interest in this because he is the man to whom they look for redress in these matters.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In answer to my hon. friend's question, I would say that there is no analogy whatever in my judgment between the case of a town and that of a whole township. In the town the population is concentrated at a given spot. There may be 2,000 or 3,000 or 5,000 people congregated together, but in a whole township the population is scattered. You could not erect one building for a whole township while you could for a town even though the population might be less than that of the whole township. As regards postal facilities in a whole township, I do not know that there is any reason why the people should not be provided with these postal facilities where the distance is about five miles from a post office. It is certainly the policy of the Post Office Department to grant any request which is made with such a distance in view. Whenever my hon. friend on behalf of his own township in Frontenac or any other non. gentleman makes a request to provide postal facilities, where there is a distance of about five miles, the Post Office Department cannot but accede to that request, and I appeal to him and to members of the House on both sides whether, whenever a request of that kind is made to the Post Office Department, it is not granted.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am very glad indeed that I intervened in this discussion, because I have got a very important statement in so far as my constituency is concerned from the Postmaster General. I am very glad he has made that statement, and I can assure him that the time will be exceedingly short when I shall appear before him and ask him to carry out to the letter the statement which he has placed on 'Hansard' this afternoon.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Did we not live up to it in the past?

Mr. EDWARDS. No, the Post Office Department has not lived up to it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Can my hon. friend cite an instance in his county, where, within a distance of five or six miles, there are no postal facilities?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes, I will cite an instance. Last year, or the year before——

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know this case; be very careful.

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes, I will be careful. Thus far I have made no statement which I have had to retract. I made a request for a post office between Sharbot Lake and Maberly. I have in my possession now the answer which I obtained from the Postmaster General in regard to that matter. There was a settlement of 20 or 22 families. The nearest any of them lived to a post office was from 5 to 8 miles.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Five to eight miles.

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes, five to eight miles. They asked for a bi-weekly service. They were satisfied with a mail twice a week. I have the letter in my possession from the Postmaster General, in which he said that it would cost $70 to deliver the mail twice a week to this settlement, that it would cost $35 for the postmaster's salary, making a total of $105, that the revenue would not possibly exceed $10 or $15 a year, and that he did not feel that his department would be justified in expending the sum of $90 a year since there were only 20 or 22 families interested. That is a case in point to which I refer, and I am glad that the Postmaster General has put himself on record on 'Hansard' here to-day to the effect that his department is willing to grant postal facilities in country places where they have to go five miles or more for their mail.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is it a case of infrequency of service or the need of an office?

Mr. EDWARDS. They want an office; they have no service at all. They would be satisfied with a service twice a week which, I think, is a very mild request on their part. I do not want to simply criticise these items when they come up but I do think I would not be fair to my constituents if I allowed votes of large sums of money for post offices in cities and towns to go through here and put up no protest on behalf of the country districts where they have very meagre, and in some cases, no postal facilities whatever. I recognize that in large cities like Montreal and Toronto and some others, and in very large and enterprising towns it would be expected that there should be better facilities than in country districts, but I believe it is entirely unwarranted that large sums of money should be spent in these smaller towns while the country districts, where the people have to go five and ten and twelve miles to get their mail, have to come here begging for a twice-a-week service.

Mr. SPROULE. I have several times expressed it in this House as my opinion that in a place where no reasonable accommodation for a post office can be obtained by renting it may become necessary for the government to provide that accommodation, by erecting a building, but where a building can be rented, as in this case, at a moderate cost of $125 a year, including fuel and light, to incur an annual expenditure of $1,300 is altogether wrong. I do not think such a policy can be justified before any intelligent people. The minister told us that Athens was a rapidly growing place and that the population is

1,000, but the fact is that while it is a good business centre the revenue there is only $2,151. Now, in looking down this list I find that there are many places which contribute a much larger revenue to the government and which have not a post office building and are not asking for one. Acton gives a revenue of $3,600 a year and it has no post office; Allison gives a revenue of $2,365 a year and we get a building there for $175 per annum, fuel and light included. Alvinston gives a revenue of over $2,000, Arthur a revenue of $2,600, Aurora a revenue of $4,000 (nearly twice as large as Athens), and Aylmer West a revenue of $6,800, and none of these places have post offices.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Aylmer is strongly urging for one.

Mr. SPROULE. In view of the fact that there are so many of these towns that give a larger revenue than Athens and which have no post offices, there must be some reason for building a post office at Athens other than the needs of the public service. At one time Athens was in the constituency of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), and then we never heard anything about erecting a post office there, but it is taken into the constituency of the Minister of Railways and immediately a post office is to be erected. It would look as if the government had determined that only in favoured spots represented by their supporters will they erect these public buildings.

Mr. CROSBY. What department now pays the $125 a year rent for the present post office at Athens?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Post Office Department.

Mr. CROSBY. And when this building is erected the Post Office Department will pay nothing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROSBY. It is no wonder the Postmaster General would like to see post office buildings erected by the government, because he is relieved of paying rent, and his revenue is consequently increased. Since I have been in the House I have never heard of a post office building being erected anywhere except through the influence of some members supporting the government, and I suppose it is hardly any use to condemn that bad principle now. The Minister of Public Works must have been misled when he told us that Athens was in the riding of the hon. member for Leeds, because, as a matter of fact, it is in the constituency represented by the Minister of Railways. I have no doubt it is the same in this case as in many others. The Minister of Railways wants to have a post office in that particular district, and some other day the Minister of Public Works may want to get something in his department, and so he gives a post office. In that way there is reciprocity between the ministers, and sometimes with members. As far as I am personally concerned, I would be glad to see a post office built in every village in the Dominion of Canada if we could afford it, but there is no policy laid down by the government in this matter, as we find post offices built in places much smaller in population and in revenue than other places which have no post office building. It is gratifying to find the Postmaster General stating that no request will be refused by him, so that we are in hopes of getting all the post offices we require.

Mr. CROTHERS. I would like to give the Postmaster General an opportunity to make clear one or two points with reference to the new post office built at Athens. Did the Post Office Inspector for that district report complaining of the inadequacy of the accommodation already provided at that village, or suggesting that better accommodation should be provided? If he did make such a report, was any attempt made to rent a more commodious place?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not the papers to enable me to give my hon. friend the answer to-day. I may give it to him at the next sitting of the House.

Brantford drill hall—Government share of cost of bitulithic pavement to be laid and storm sewers to be built by the municipal authorities, $900.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to pay what we think is a fair proportion of the cost of the pavement and the storm sewers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand that the hon. minister promised to build a drill hall in the town of Forest. Does he intend to do so?

Mr. PARDEE. I may answer the hon gentleman. All arrangements have been made to build it, and the matter is in the hands of the Militia Department. The minister has consented to it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I merely want to know from the minister whether it will be carried out or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will be in the Militia Department.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like the minister to inform me what the original contract price was for the Brantford drill hall, and what the final cost will be, including the amount now asked for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not be supposed to have that information, because the Brantford drill hall was built some years ago. All I am now asking for is a small

amount as a contribution to the city of Brantford for a pavement and storm sewers, one-half of each.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would say, for the information of the hon. minister, that the Brantford drill hall is not a building of ancient date. The first building, a wooden structure, dates back to 1868, but in 1895 some $10,000 was contributed to enable local parties to erect a new drill hall, and in 1904 a contract was let for the construction of this building, amounting to $25,750, with further contracts for heating and electric wiring of $2,600 and $2,450 respectively. The total expenditure on the building from 1903-4 to 1910 was $49,311.43, to which add the $900 asked for in this item, and you have a cost of $50,200, or pretty nearly double the contract price. A few days ago my hon. friend spoke of the final cost of these drill halls and armouries compared with the contract price. On that occasion I said, on page 1628 of 'Hansard':—

If you take up the whole list of armouries from one end of the country to the other you will see that the actual cost, when the buildings are completed, runs from 25 to 75 per cent higher than the contract price, so that the estimated cost does not cut any figure at all.

For the information of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, I am prepared to substantiate the statement I made on that occasion, and to prove that the cost of the drill halls and armouries constructed in this country since 1896—the final cost—has been from twenty-five to seventy-five per cent higher than the contract price, not only in one or two but in dozens of cases, and not in one province alone, but in every province. Let me give him one or two instances, I might refer to the drill hall at Baddeck, N.S. Contract price was $3,750, and the cost $5,795.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For what portion of the work?

Mr. EDWARDS. If the hon. minister wants to take it in that way, it makes it all the worse for himself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the only way in which you can take it.

Mr. EDWARDS. When I take the contract price, I mean the price of the contractor for the main part of the work, and the additional contracts for heating, lighting, &c. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. With regard to Baddeck I find that the final cost was some 59 per cent higher than the contract price.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course I have not here the details of the building at Baddeck, and it is very inconvenient to have to go into matters with regard to which I cannot be supposed to have the information with me. My hon. friend says the contract includes the building, heating, plumbing, fittings and everything of that kind. How is the additional amount made up?

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. minister is certainly putting a conundrum to me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought so.

Mr. EDWARDS. He asked me to tell how the additional price is made up. We have had a good many instances—I have one in my mind now, the construction of a building near Kingston—in which I venture to say it would puzzle the hon. gentleman himself to find out how the additional cost was made up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What was the total amount paid for Baddeck drill hall?

Mr. EDWARDS. According to a return dated the 8th April, 1910, and which was ordered on the 15th December, 1909, the total cost was $5,975.62. I presume that return gave the cost down to the 8th April, 1910. What has been expended since I cannot say.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Lancaster.

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—Mr. Currie (Prince Edward).

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Lafortune.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Indian River Railway Company.—Mr. Turcotte (Quebec).

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Pacific and Peace Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We were considering an item of $900 to be paid to the city of Brantford for a portion of the cost of bitulithic pavement and storm sewers to be built by the municipal authorities. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) was speaking. I would ask him to consider whether, particularly under the new rules, of the House, in discussing an item for the payment of an amount to Brantford for one-half the cost of a bitulithic pavement it is competent for my hon. friend to go into the cost of public buildings for a number of years. I would think that possibly on motion for supply, would be the proper time to discuss a subject of that kind.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman raises this as a point of order I shall endeavour to give a ruling, otherwise I shall not rule on the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman might consider it himself.

Mr. EDWARDS. We are considering the appropriation of some money towards a drill hall.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Towards paying the town for the cost of a pavement and storm sewers.

Mr. EDWARDS. No, the item was Brantford drill hall. The government's share of the cost of that pavement will be charged up to the total expenditure on Brantford drill hall.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection to discussing the Brantford drill hall.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think it is quite pertinent to discuss any items connected with drill halls and armouries under this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend is desirous of going into a general discussion I will not raise the point of order. Perhaps he might as well do it now.

Mr. EDWARDS. I certainly intend to put some facts on 'Hansard' in connection with drill halls and armouries some time this session, and, perhaps, it might be as well to do it now as later. However, if the Chairman says I shall not go on now I will defer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There appears to be, not a point of order, but an appeal to me for either a rule or a word of guidance. The item is that for a pavement and storm sewers at Brantford. The discussion should be as relevant to that as it well can be made. But in a matter of supply I would not feel like drawing that rule very closely. In considering an expenditure for storm sewers and pavements, I think it is justifiable to ask for the expenditure on the whole building, and in doing so to refer, if necessary, to other buildings by comparison. But an extended debate on drill halls generally, rather for their own sake than this item, would scarcely be relevant, and if the hon. member can conveniently bring his remarks to bear upon some other items of drill halls yet to come up it would be more appropriate than at this moment.

Mr. SPROULE. There are other items for drill halls lower down on the list. But I respectfully submit that we are within our right to engage even in a general discussion on a question of policy when the government is asking for a vote in connection with any drill hall. They are all under this branch of public works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It ought to be borne in mind that both sides of the House last session joined together to endeavour to shorten the discussions. Now, it seems to me that if we are to be at all relevant in our remarks on the question as to whether we should contribute $900 to recoup the city of Brantford for one-half the cost of bithulithic pavement and storm sewers, it is clearly irrelevant to do what my hon. friend wishes to do, to go into a general discussion of the cost of drill halls and public buildings in order to show that the cost is more than contract price. I think consideration will show my hon. friend that such a discussion would not be relevant to that particular item.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a portion of the cost of this drill hall.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At all events, his honour has expressed his view with regard to it.

Mr. EDWARDS. I notice, in the first place, in reading this item 140, that you gave the total amount we are asked to vote, and that item includes several drill halls. This is an item pertaining to only one of these drill halls. Further down, there is another item for a drill hall. It seems to me that in considering the matter of expenditure in connection with drill halls this is a proper time to have a discussion bearing upon drill halls and armouries generally.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The committee has two ways of taking up each resolution as laid down by the rules. It may take up the whole resolution for $930,000 bodily, and in that case any item would be open for discussion. But if it chooses to take the other method of discussing each of the items separately, then each item must stand alone according to the rules of the House. In adition, in revising the rules last session, this was added to rule 13:—

Speeches in Committee of the House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

That is the rule that I am endeavouring to enforce with reasonable care. In Committee of Supply, I believe, the House is entitled to the widest information that can be given, with due regard to its rules. I have not ruled the hon. gentleman out of order, but I have suggested to him that extended remarks on drill halls generally would be more appropriate on a later item. If he desires to proceed under this item I will allow him to do so, and judge, as he advances in his argument, whether he is relevant or not.

Mr. EDWARDS. I infer from your remarks that any extended discussion on drill halls now should be deferred to a later item.

Chesley public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the erection of a public building in the town of Chesley. I may say that the land has been purchased. It consists of a lot 104 by 104 on the west side of Main street, in the town of Chesley. The estimated cost of the building is not to exceed $15,000, that is, apart from the site, but including heating, plumbing and fittings. In 1901 the town had a population of 1,734. The information I have is that the town consists of 8 churches, 2 bank agencies, a woollen mill, sash and door factory, grist mill, saw mill, furniture factory, 3 hotels, 28 stores and a printing office. The revenue last year was $5,106, being a good increase on the year before. The building is required for a post office and custom house, also to afford accommodation as an armoury for the local militia company.

Mr. DONNELLY. Have plans been prepared?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Plans have been prepared, and are now with the Post Office Department for consideration, and, we trust, approval.

Mr. DONNELLY. Permit me to suggest that the contract should be let at as early a date as possible, so that the work may be proceeded with during the coming summer. In the year 1908, $5,000 was put in the estimates for the erection of this building, so the minister cannot be accused of any undue haste in the matter. Speaking on this subject in 1909, the minister assured me that the work of erecting the building would be proceeded with as soon as possible. In view of the large increase in the public revenue during the past year I expect that the minister will proceed with the work of erecting the building at an early date.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very glad that my hon. friend differs from many hon. gentlemen opposite in thinking that it is entirely right and proper to erect a public building in a town of 1,700 population. I quite agree with him and that is why I put the item in. I believe it will be in the public interest, the town is a good one, and I am entirely prepared to completely justify the erection of a public building there.

Mr. DONNELLY. In what year was the population 1,700?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 1901.

Mr. DONNELLY. The town of Chesley has increased in population very rapidly. That was ten years ago and the population may be a thousand more now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very glad to know that. It agrees entirely with my own information, and it is typical of hundreds of other towns and cities throughout Canada I am glad to say that there is great growth going on all over the country from east to west which makes the demands for public buildings very much greater than they otherwise would be.

Mr. CROTHERS. In order to appreciate fully the minister's remarks I think we should have an answer submitted to the question from my hon. friend from Grey as to when the first vote in connection with this public building was asked from parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to give my hon. friend that; I have no memorandum of it.

Mr. DONNELLY. In 1908 $5,000 was included in the estimates.

Mr. CROTHERS. I am told that the first vote was taken in 1908, when the constituency was not represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Donnelly) but by a supporter of the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, let me say to my hon. friend that it is never too late to assert one's views upon the floor of the House, and if my hon. friend thinks we would be doing wrong in going ahead with this building it is quite open to him to make a motion that the item be struck out.

Mr. CROSBY. If that is the case will it be open to strike out every other item?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, to move to do so.

Mr. CROSBY. Am I to understand that the minister will support every motion we make in regard to every other public building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but it is open to any hon. gentleman to make a motion.

Mr. CROSBY. But the minister will not be open to do that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not say that the hon. gentleman will succeed in carrying the motion. I say it is quite open to anyone to make a motion if he wishes to put his views on record. I have not intimated for a moment that I would support such a motion.

Mr. CROSBY. The Minister of Public Works stated distinctly that it would be quite in order for the hon. member or any other hon. member on this side of the House to move that this item should be struck out of the estimates. I have not any doubt but if that motion were made the minister would support it, from what he said.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I would oppose it.

Mr. CROSBY. Then it would not be struck out, so that he could not really mean what he said. I wanted to see if we really had the minister on some footing where we could hold him for about a night.

Dresden public building, $17,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract, amounting to $13,000, has been let for this building. Thirteen thousand is a revote. Dresden is a very good town, indeed. Its population in 1901 was 1,613. It is about the same size as Chesley, I think. A lot has been purchased at a cost of $2,000, 60 feet on one street, and 103 on the other.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost is $21,103.80. Hon. gentlemen will see that upon striking an average we are making quite a little reduction in the cost of public buildings.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Could the minister say when the first appropriation was made for the Dresden building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot at this moment. It was voted last year, but whether it was voted previously, I do not remember. If my hon. friend will turn to the estimates he can see for himself.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I have not the estimates here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Neither have I.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I think the minister's duty would be to have them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that would not be part of my duty.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Would the deputy know?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy says that he does not remember.

Mr. MEIGHEN. At all events, this is not more than the third year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure this is the second year at all events.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Can the minister explain why it is that the contract is let on this building and not on the one immediately preceding?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At the close of the last session of parliament, there was a large number of buildings provided for and much more than the chief architect, with his staff could undertake within quite a number of months. He has to take them up, one after another ; they cannot all be done at once. In the case of Chesley, the plans are now in the department of the Postmaster General for approval. This contract for Dresden was just let a few days ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If the minister would recall the principle he laid down in the first session of 1909, there would be no difficulty in answering the question whether he had the record or not. The minister laid it down then, that public buildings that were appropriated for, in the previous year's estimates, that is, in the pre-election year's estimates, would be gone on with before any other buildings were commenced. So that, if the minister remembered the principle he laid down and desired to follow it and knew that he had followed it, he would be certain that this building must have been appropriated for in the pre-election year. Otherwise it would be a violation of his pledge to go ahead with it before the building immediately preceding which certainly was first appropriated for in 1908. Consequently, the minister must, besides foregetting the first year when it was appropriated for, also have forgotten the pledge which he made in 1909.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend does not state what I said correctly. What I said was that, before asking parliament for appropriations for new buildings, speaking as a general thing, we would ask parliament to appropriate moneys for buildings which had been contained in the estimates of 1907-8.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is the minister quite sure that is what he said ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I have not 'Hansard' here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At all events, that is what I ought to have said.

Mr. MEIGHEN. We will test our respective memories as soon as I can get 'Hansard.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that must be what I said. If I did not say that, it would

be a slip of the tongue. Immediately parliament votes money, all buildings stand on an equal footing.

Mr. SPROULE. I have noticed this custom which has been prevalent of late years and it is a very pernicious one. Items are voted year after year for public works and nothing is done. I do not know whether it is as bad this year as last, or the year before. That, in my judgment, is a very bad principle. The buildings are really required or they are not. If they are required, and the money is voted, the contract ought to be gone on with, and the expenditure made within the estimate. It is no justifiable excuse in the world to say that your architects are busy. If you had only a sufficient number of architects to prepare the plans for a quarter of the number of buildings, and we voted money for the other three quarters, would it be any justification for the government's conduct, in leaving over three quarters of the buildings for ten years and not starting them at all? That is practically what the Minister of Public Works says now. If they are not going on with these buildings, why should the government get the money for them? In my opinion, we should only vote sufficient money each year to prepare the plans and to provide for the work that is proceeded with in that year. Then, we would not have, as we frequently have, these items standing over until an election comes on when they are held out as a bribe to electors to return a supporter of the government. The present system is pernicious and should not be tolerated by the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract in Dresden has been let and I said that the plans were actually all prepared for Chesley post office and were in the hands of the Post Office Department for approval.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is the contract let for Dresden and not for Chesley? Is it not because the one is represented by a supporter of the government and the other is not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is wrong, not as he usually is but as he sometimes is. Either one of us is stupid and probably I am——

Mr. SPROULE. You ought to know best.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is so much older than I that I hope he won't be severe on me. We go on with the plans as the staff is able to get them ready, and as the department interested in the building approves we call for tenders.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is it that the plans are ready for one place and the contract let, and why are the plans not ready for the other place although the money was voted in the same year?

Mr. CROTHERS. The case is stronger than my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) puts it because the vote for Chesley was taken in 1908, a year before the vote for Dresden was taken, and yet the site for the Chesley post office has not been purchased yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes it is.

Mr. CROTHERS. Then if the site has been purchased it must have been paid for previous to last year because there is $15,000 asked, which is altogether a revote. But if the minister is right, the site for Chesley post office was purchased two years ago and nothing has been done since. One place is given the advantage of at least a year over the other.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans cannot be prepared until the site has been procured, and it happens in this case that the site for Dresden was ordered to be purchased on the 17th of August, 1908—so that there has been delay in the constituency, represented by Mr. Gordon, who supports the government—whereas the site for Chesley was not acquired until February, 1909.

Mr. CROTHERS. All the evidence tends to show that this appropriation has been dangled before the people of that constituency for at least four years.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister tells us that his architects are not able to get out the plans for all these buildings in good time, and perhaps I can suggest to him a remedy for the delay. A great many of these buildings are erected in towns ranging from 1,500 to 2,500 population; practically about the same sized buildings are called for; there is a great deal of uniformity about them, and would it not be well for the minister to have standard plans and specifications which might be used for say twenty different towns, and thus save time and trouble and expense, and expedite the erection of the buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That idea has often been thought of in the department, but the difficulty is that the style of architecture that is suited to the general surroundings of one town will not be suitable in another, and we find that it would not please the people to have one standard building for all sections of the country. Then, some towns are growing rapidly, especially in the west. The style of building must also have some reference to the location of the site. All these things have to be taken into consideration.

Dundas public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have purchased the lot, which has a frontage of 125 feet by a depth of one hundred and six feet, and we are at work on the plans. The building is to be used for post office, customs and inland revenue purposes, and the total cost will run up to probably $30,000. Dundas is quite an important town. It has a population of about 3,000 and several factories, and growing rapidly.

Mr. SPROULE. This is another instance in which the money was voted last year, and yet there was apparently no need of voting it. It would relieve the House of some work if we cut out all these votes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had a great deal of difficulty in getting the site. It was only recently that we got it. The wife of the owner refused until recently to sign away her dower.

Mr. CROTHERS. When was the first vote taken for this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1907-8.

Elora public building, $14,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract. The building is to cost $12,949. We paid $380 for the site. The fittings, furniture, lock boxes, sidewalk, fencing and contingencies will bring the total estimated cost up to $19,413.61. The site has a frontage of 69 feet by a depth of 132 feet. The population in 1901 was about 1,200, and I believe it is growing.

Mr. CROTHERS. That vote was first taken in 1907-8 also, I believe?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS. I find that the votes for all these smaller places—Preston, Dundas, Elora, Essex, Fergus, Harriston, Mitchell, Midland, Mount Forest, Seaforth, Goderich, Wallaceburg, Wiarton—were all taken in 1907-8, just before the general election, and nothing practically has been done since.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend surely does not forget that in 1908-9 there was a great decline in the revenue, and we made an appeal to parliament to justify us in allowing all except the most urgent public works to stand over, which parliament readily agreed to do. I remember that our friends were called together, and they all said they would not press for even urgent public buildings until the revenues got into better condition.

Mr. CROTHERS. If the hon. gentleman looks back to the year 1903-4, just before another general election, and the year following, he will find just the same state of things existing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was not here in 1903-4.

Essex post office, $14,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site has been acquired at a cost of $1,000. The contract has not been let, but the plans are now before the Post Office Department for approval. We expect the total cost to be $15,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is Elora a shire town?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is not, but the people there were complaining very bitterly of the want of accommodation, and in view of the fact that it has an excellent water-power, that its manufacturing is developing —carriage, sash and door factories, agricultural implement factories, saw and grist mills—that it has a large number of stores, and that it is the centre of a very beautiful country, we thought we might make an exception and give it a public building that would be suitable to a town of that size and with such a fine future.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that one of the qualifications for getting a post office is having water-power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is incidental to growth and development.

Mr. HENDERSON. Another is to have a certain number of stores.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. And another is to have one or two railways, and still another that the people should urge it very strongly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, think of the revenue, $3,500 last year.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is not a big revenue. I have pointed out other towns with larger revenue which have not been thus favoured. I have in mind other towns which have all these qualifications, and requisites and more.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The town of Milton, for instance.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not complaining, but if I can bring that town of mine within the scope of all these various qualifications—

Mr. PUGSLEY. The friends of my hon. friend would all fight very hard against it.

Mr. HENDERSON. In that case I would fight them. I notice that the minister does not forget the town of Milton. He brings it up every time I rise so that evidently his conscience is rather uncomfortable, and I want to keep him in that frame of mind until he does justice to the town of Milton.

Mr. SPROULE. If my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) thinks that the

sensitive conscience of the Minister of Public Works is likely to compel him to do justice, I am afraid he will be sadly disappointed. I would never have credited the hon. minister with possessing any such conscience. What amused me was the answer which he gave with regard to the building in Elora, namely, that the people pressed for it very hard. Yet the vote was put nearly four years ago, and the plans are not ready yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend must not jump to conclusions so quickly. He said the plans are not even under way. Why, the construction is well under way to-day. Let me say why I am pleased with my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). From the way in which he has developed along the line of the necessity for public buildings, I look forward to the day when he will have persuaded all our friends opposite into his own conviction, and we will find them approving every item in the estimates for public buildings.

Fergus public building, $14,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. What county?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Wellington South.

Mr. HENDERSON. How far from Elora?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me first give the population. It was 1,396 nine years ago. Fergus also has an excellent water-power. It has an iron foundry, a planing mill, two saw mills, a factory for split peas, &c.

Mr. HENDERSON. How many churches?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Seven.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought so. It is a Scotch town.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And the people have been urging very strongly to have this building built.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What is the postal revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $4,300, money orders issued $12,633, money orders paid $20,614.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract is for $13,449, cost of site $700, fittings, furniture, lock boxes, sidewalks, fencing, &c., will bring the total to $19,556, comprising everything.

Fort William public building, enlarging, $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is for the purpose of making additions to the post office owing to the rapidly increasing business.

Mr. SPROULE. What will the additions cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $7,450 is contract price.

Gananoque post office, addition, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is to build an addition to the main building, the addition will be 22 feet by 24—a one story brick building. We have got the land for the purpose from the town as a gift. The surveying and legal expenses cost us $75, the erection of the building $2,500, the alterations and fittings $1,500 making a total of $4,075. The specifications are now in the hands of the printer, and we will call for tenders as soon as they are ready.

Mr. MEIGHEN. A moment ago the minister challenged the accuracy of my recollection as to the statement made by him in the session of 1909, and which, if he meant it, would have constituted a principle for his department to follow in the construction of these public buildings. I said that the Minister of Public Works had clearly stated that such public buildings as were in the 1908 estimates and which he was not able to go on with in 1909, by reason of what he called his retrenchment policy, would be gone on with before any others were initiated. The hon. minister contradicted that statement. I have the 'Hansard' here which will show which of us was correct. At page 1300 of the 'Hansard' of 1909, I asked him the following question :

Will the minister also give us the assurance that those public buildings which were in the estimates last year and which now are unfortunately discontinued will be preferred and gone on with before other public buildings of a similar kind are initiated?

The minister replied :

I think that is a very fair question. I feel that is the course that I should pursue as Minister of Public Works, and will certainly recommend to my colleagues.

That was perhaps as pronounced a statement as the minister was ever tempted to make in Committee of Supply. He went on to say :

Of course, there may be cases arise, such as a public building being burned down or a wharf being carried away, which might create an exception, and we might have to include these new works, but as a general principle I am and would be committed to those works which parliament was asked to sanction last year.

The only exception the minister could think of was a public building burned down or a wharf carried away; that would be, I presume, a wharf built where there is water. A few moments ago a public building in Chesley was referred to. That public building was not in the estimates for 1908. Then a public building in Dresden was spoken of, which was in the estimates for 1908, and each year since. Under the min-

ister's ruling, under his solemn pledge to the House and the country, because that quotation was largely circulated through the press, the minister would be bound to go on with the public building in Chesley before he even initiated a public building in Dresden. Now, in 1910, the minister is further ahead with the public building in Dresden than with that in Chesley, indeed, his department has been inactive and has done nothing in regard to the Chesley building. It would be interesting for this committee to have the minister exercise his well known and most admirable ingenuity in explaining the consistency of his course with that principle.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me correct an error into which my hon. friend inadvertently fell. He said the Chesley building was not in the estimates of 1908. He should have said the opposite. Chesley was in the estimates of 1907-8, while Dresden was not.

Mr. MEIGHEN I understand I was misinformed on that, but I shall give him an illustration. He has let contracts for buildings that were not in the estimates prior to 1909 all over the country, over and over again. Can he deny that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be obliged to deny that, because there are very few public buildings in the estimates of this year which were not in the estimates of 1907-8.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That would not be denying it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He says very many; I say very few.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Would the minister give an estimate of the number?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All my hon. friend has to do is to send for the estimates of 1907 and compare them with those of this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister will not deny that there are a score?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should doubt that very much.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The presence of one would be inconsistent with his principle in 1909 and the minister doubts that there are a score. How will the minister explain that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the easiest thing in the world to do that. The words which my hon. friend reads are just what I thought, that before initiating any new works, as a general principle, the works which were provided for in the estimates of 1907-8 would be gone on with. I see how my hon. friend fell into error. By initiating, I understand to mean the putting of an amount in the estimates for the initiation of a public building, parliament voting the money, and there might be exceptional cases under which we would think it desirable to proceed with some work not in the previous estimates. Then the amount would be put in and that would be the initiation of a public building. As I said before, when parliament votes money I have to treat all works alike. This corroborates entirely the statement I make. I thought the criticism was going to be that all these public works for which we are now asking votes were in the estimates of 1907-8, before the election. It will be found that 95 per cent of the items which are in the estimates to-day were in the estimates of 1907-8.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is just what I found fault with. I pointed out that these were pre-election pledges, and I thought it was unfair that these buildings should have precedence over others where no pre-election promise had been given, and I promply came to the conclusion that simply because these were pre-election pledges they should not have priority over other places, which had really better claims. I am sorry to hear the minister say that 95 per cent of the works he is going on with are for buildings proposed before the last election. I do not think the minister has made much out of the statememnt that 95 per cent of these votes are simply carrying out pre-election promises.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Except to answer the hon. member for Portage la Prairie.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I would be sorry to have the minister think he had persuaded me or anybody that he had explained his own statement. He says that only 5 per cent are exceptions to the rule. That is a bad enough state of affairs as it is. There is no doubt ground for the complaint of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), but the minister is here making a solemn pledge, and unless he can show that his 5 per cent come within the exceptions he has stated he has deceived the country. He cannot show a single item of the whole 5 per cent, that he doubts amount to a score, where the need for a building was caused by flood or fire and not simply by the fact that the public building was in a constituency represented by a Liberal member.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend says I could not show one. Time is too precious to go through them all, but let me mention Campbellton, where the public building was destroyed by fire. That is one of the new ones.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is that the whole 5 per cent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend said I could not name one.

Goderich public building, addition, $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make an addition to the public building at Goderich.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is the character of the addition?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build an annex to the public building, also to make alterations to the interior fittings of the post office, as requested by the Post Office Department, and also by the Board of Trade of Goderich. The addition to the building is estimated to cost $7,023; the post office fittings, $3,000; contingencies and superintendence, $977; total estimated expenditure, $11,000. We assume that we will expend prior to 31st of March next, $2,000, and we are asking for a revote of $8,000 and that will leave $1,000 still to be provided in order to complete the work.

Harriston public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Here the site has been purchased, we bought the larger portion of it from the town of Harriston. Total cost of site and expenses, $3,076; total estimated expenditure for this building will be about $20,000, not including the land. There is to be an armoury in connection with it that may increase the cost.

Mr. EDWARDS. How much of this item for the armoury?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Possibly it may add $3,000 or $4,000 to the cost.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is part of this expenditure to be used for the armoury?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had asked the chief architect not to exceed $20,000; but he tells me that in consequence of the instructions to put an armoury in it, the cost may run $3,000 or $4,000 beyond that sum.

Mr. EDWARDS. I presume I am quite in order under this item in discussing the question of drill halls generally?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Quite so.

Mr. EDWARDS. The other day, on page 1628 of 'Hansard', I stated that the actual cost, when the buildings were completed, ran from 25 to 75 per cent higher than the contract price; and the Minister of Public Works replied that I was entirely in error as to that. It is, then, a question of accuracy between us, and I propose to give a few facts to prove that my statement is correct. Before six o'clock I referred to one case in Nova Scotia, at Baddeck. I might also call attention to Halifax, where the contract price was $204,250, and the actual cost $279,136, or 36 per cent above the contract price. I might refer to Truro, where the contract price was $10,280, the actual cost $12,892, or 25 per cent above contract price; to which should be added, in estimating the total cost of the building, the cost of the site, which was $5,000, paid to a gentleman by the name of J. N. Pugsley, who I understand is a relative of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What relationship?

Mr. EDWARDS. I said I was informed that he was a relative. If he is, I presume the hon. gentleman knows the relationship better than I do.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have never had the pleasure of seeing or knowing that gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is a matter, I dare say, for mutual regret for the Minister of Public Works and Mr. J. N. Pugsley if they are not related.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There may be a distant relationship, but I do not know what it is.

Mr. EDWARDS. In New Brunswick I will mention Sussex: contract price, $10,523, actual cost, $14,011, or 33 per cent over contract price. Woodstock: contract price, $39,680, actual cost, $54,259, or 36 per cent over contract price. To that you may add $6,000 for the site. In Quebec, I may mention St. Hyacinthe, where the actual cost is 37 per cent above the contract price, not counting $7,500 paid for the site. In Manitoba I would refer him to Brandon, where the actual cost is 26 per cent over the contract price; and to Virden, where the actual cost is 83 per cent above the contract price. In British Columbia I might refer him to Kamloops, where the actual cost was 76 per cent above contract price; to Kaslo, where it was 85 per cent above contract price; to Rossland, where it was 45 per cent above contract price; to Revelstoke where it was 63 per cent above contract price; and to Nelson, where the actual cost was 125 per cent above contract price. Yet the hon. gentleman told me the other day, and told this committee, that when I stated that the actual price averaged from 25 to 75 per cent above contract, I was entirely in error. Now I commend these figures to his consideration, and I want to show him that he was the gentleman who was in error and not the member for Frontenac.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? I have not the figures, and many of those buildings were erected a long time before I had anything to do with the department. Is, or is not this the case, that my hon. friend first takes what he calls the contract price, which may be for the building alone, and then he adds on, to make the total cost, plumbing, heating, electric lighting, possibly sidewalks and everything of that kind, which were not in the original contract, and the cost of the site also. Is that not so?

Mr. EDWARDS. No, that is not the case. The main item in the contract is the price for the erection of the building. Invariably there is added to that, contracts for lighting and heating. How the cost, over and above what one would apparently think would cover everything in the construction of the building, reaches these extraordinary figures, is more than I can understand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The details are all given.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is a difficult matter to understand. Take, for instance, the cottages erected at Kingston. Now at that time the hon. gentleman asked for $57,000 for those buildings. The year previous he had obtained $55,000, he then adds $75,000, which made $112,000, and he estimated at that very time $96,000. Yet he obtained from this House $112,000 for buildings which his own estimate said would cost $96,000. We inquired about the details, and why this extra money was required? That was the question which I put to him at the time the building was erected. The roof was on, the glass was in the windows, the heating apparatus was installed, the lighting fixtures were up, the walls were plastered, everything was done, yet he wanted something like $22,000 after all that had been done. I questioned the hon. gentleman in that case, and finally got him to agree to hand back $20,000 of that money. But to go on with drill halls and armouries, let me give a few instances in the province of Ontario. For Belleville drill hall, the contract price was $108,682, and the actual cost $138,511, or 27 per cent above; Brockville drill hall 30 per cent above the contract price; Woodstock 27 per cent above the contract price, not including the cost of the site which was $6,120; Kingston 28 per cent above, not counting the site, which cost $18,300; Hamilton 66 per cent above, not counting the site, which cost $6,000. That was in 1889. But let me give the history in connection with Hamilton from 1896 down. I find that the contract price was $254,276, over a quarter of a million, and that the cost was $317,937, or 25 per cent above the contract price not counting $29,000 paid for the site in 1908.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why should my hon. friend count the site? The site is not in the contract.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not count it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then why mention it? You give the impression that the cost of the site should be added to the contract.

Mr. EDWARDS. I will explain why I mention it. I am showing that the actual cost is very much in excess of the contract price. I merely mention the cost of the site where I give it so that any person who is interested in the total cost of the building may add the cost of the site to the final cost, not that it makes any difference in comparing the contract price with the actual cost. Dundas cost 92 per cent more; Cobourg 44 per cent and the cost of the site was $6,000; Burford 57 per cent; Brantford 92 per cent. In St. Catharines the contract was awarded for the building in October 1900, to one William Garson.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the percentage that the hon. gentleman gives for Cobourg?

Mr. EDWARDS. 44 per cent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What was the contract?

Mr. EDWARDS. $39,945.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman must be wrong there. What was the actual cost?

Mr. EDWARDS. $57,526. I think that will figure out to 44 per cent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman may be right, but that is not my information.

Mr. EDWARDS. The contract was awarded in St. Catharines in 1900, to William Garson for $56,000. This contract was cancelled and Garson was presented with $7,288. A new contract was entered into in June, 1904, with Sullivan and Langdon for $79,829, and with others for $14,940, or a total of $94,769; in other words the contract in 1904 was 69 per cent higher than the contract with Mr. Garson in 1900. The total cost of this building, including the $7,288 presented to Mr. Garson, was $110,534, or 97 per cent higher than Garson's contract which was cancelled in 1900. Now, the minister, a few minutes ago said that these buildings were erected before his time. The buildings that I have referred to have been constructed since the year 1896. For the buildings under construction I may say that the contracts total up $686,906, there has been spent on them $730,744, and it is estimated that it will take $72,905 additional. That will make $803,649 to which you will have to add the cost of the sites amounting to $22,200. If you summarize this you will find the following results: Take five drill halls or armouries in the province of Nova Scotia; the contract price was $234,830, and the actual cost $312,885, or 33 per cent. Take three in New Brunswick, and they cost 32 per cent over the contract price; seven in British Columbia show an advance of 33 per cent; two in Manitoba 33 per cent; two in Quebec an advance of 23 per cent; fourteen in Ontario an advance of 27 per cent. So that, I think that I have substantiated my statement that the actual cost of drill halls or armouries erected in this country ranges from 25 to 75 per cent higher than the contract price. There are 33 buildings, the total contracts amount to $1,800,-

866, and the actual cost is $2,315,148, or an average of 28 per cent above the contract price. Then, it is interesting in connection with this matter to note that the drill halls and armouries constructed between the first of July, 1896, and December, 1909, have cost this country for construction and sites over $2,049,510. We have in Nova Scotia 166 officers and 1,812 non-commissioned officers and men making use of these buildings. If you average this cost up to see what we are paying for the whistle it means that for every officer in Nova Scotia who is making use of these buildings for drill purposes this country has paid out over $1,900 since 1896 while for each non-commissioned officer and man it cost $174. If you apply it to British Columbia the average cost per officer is $2,557 and for each non-commissioned officer and man $233 for buildings erected in that province. So, you may go through the whole lot. If you take the country over it averages nearly $2,000 for each officer and nearly $186 for each non-commissioned officer and man.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in addition to this you might put in the salaries of the engineers and firemen employed in only fifteen of these buildings and they will total $132,720 in fourteen years. The charge for maintenance alone from 1896 to 1908 is $76,103. We speak about the cost of militia and defence for this country. It is a matter of some $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 a year. But that is not all. You have to take in addition to that the cost of these expensive buildings, the cost of the men employed in looking after them, the cost of maintenance. Then, you have to take the millions of dollars which are being spent annually for militia and defence and put that along side the meagre, paltry sum of money which is voted by this government in the interest of agriculture. It is something that should call for strong protest from every hon. gentleman in this House. I take this opportunity of entering my protest as one member against this sort of thing. We have too much fuss and feathers. As one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House said, I think, last year we pay too much for red tape and gold braid in this country—entirely too much and I think the money, to a large extent, is worse than wasted. I think I have amply proven the assertion which I made in the House the other day, and I reiterate my argument that no dependence can be placed upon the estimates of the cost of these buildings as brought down by the Minister of Public Works.

Invariably when the final cost of the building is ascertained we discover that the estimated cost is so entirely different from the real fact, that there is no reliance to be placed on the the estimates of cost presented to the committee by the minister. When the Minister of Public Works challenged the

Mr. EDWARDS.

correctness of my statement that the actual cost of buildings was from 25 per cent to 75 per cent in excess of the contract price, he did not know what he was talking about, and vast as his knowledge is there is something left for him to learn. Complaint is sometimes made that the estimates are not rushed through fast enough. That is not because the members on this side desire to prevent necessary expenditure of public money, but because they have learned from bitter experience that no reliance can be placed on the figures presented by the minister, and so we have to look at all these estimates with doubt. The Minister of Public Works tells us that a certain building will cost so much and that is all it is going to cost, and he tells us of the large business interests of the locality and we feel that the country can afford to spend that much money there, but ultimately we find that this building costs anywhere from 25 to 75 per cent, and in one case 123 per cent, more than the contract price, which he led us to believe would be some indication as to the total cost of the building. If the architects employed by the minister do not know what they are doing let him hunt around for men who can tell somewhere near what a building is going to cost and then he will not be subject to all this criticism.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret that my hon. friend with all his desire to enlighten me has not succeeded further than to lead to the belief that the hon. gentleman does not measure very carefully his words. I have always found in my experience that though you may not be able at the moment to probe all the statements made by a witness, or a member of parliament either, it is a very good rule to endeavour to pick out just a few things and show the inaccuracy in regard to these, and then leave it to the jury or to the public, as the case may be, to judge as to what reliance may be placed in every statement made by such a witness or member. The hon. gentleman stated the other evening that drill halls and armouries generally actually cost from 25 to 75 per cent in excess of the contract price. Every one who listened to my hon. friend understood that this statement had reference to the work which was actually supposed to be included in the contract, and his argument was that through some fault of the chief architect or a desire to help the contractor, or looseness in the administration of the department, the contractor was able to draw from the public treasury from 25 to 75 per cent more than he was entitled to receive under his contract.

Mr. EDWARDS. I made no such statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a fair inference to draw from the statement made by the hon. gentleman. He told us that the building at Baddeck cost about 35 per cent more.

Mr. EDWARDS. Fifty-nine.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As a matter of fact the contract price for Baddeck was $2,250, and the contractor was paid to the very cent what the department had agreed to pay him by the contract without adding one cent, but the cost of the fittings for that building was $1,500, which made the total cost of the building, including fittings, $3,750.

Mr. EDWARDS. What was the final cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $3,750.

Mr. EDWARDS. And here is your own statement from your own department saying that it was $5,975. This would show that we cannot get reliable figures from your department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That includes many other things besides the contract and the fittings.

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not say what it included.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but the hon. gentleman gave the committee to understand that through some fault of the chief architect the contractor had received from 25 to 75 per cent more than he had contracted to do the work for.

Mr. EDWARDS. My statement was just as clear as the English language could make it, namely that the actual price was from 25 to 75 per cent above the contract price, and that is all I said. I gave the contract price in each case as the department gave it to me, and I gave the actual cost as the department gave it to me, and I worked out the percentage. The hon. gentleman is at liberty to draw on his imagination, as he is apt and able to do, for all the inferences he sees fit, but there are the figures. The hon. gentleman did deny the correctness of these figures but he did not speak of my drawing any inferences at that time; he wanted the committee to get the idea that the statement I made was not a fact.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I certainly do deny not only the correctness of the figures given by the hon. gentleman, but I deny the inferences he sought to draw.

Mr. EDWARDS. They are your own figures.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman repeats to-night that these buildings cost from 25 to 75 per cent more than the contract price. Does that not mean that there was a contract price for the building, and that the contract price included the fittings and the heating and the plumbing and everything else. Surely that must be the inference from his language. Take the case of a building where the contract is simply for the building of the walls and the plastering and putting in the windows and doors, and if that contract was for $40,000, and there was a contract for the fittings and the heating, and the plumbing, and the sidewalks, and electric wiring at $10,000, would it be fair to argue that the building had actually cost $10,000 more than the contract price of $40,000. Surely the cost of the fittings, heating and plumbing, and improvements of the sidewalk must all form part of the contract price; yet my hon. friend has not included them in his statement of the cost of the Baddeck armoury. The cost of the building was $2,250, and the cost of the heating $1,500, making a total of $3,750.

Mr. EDWARDS. I got the figures from the hon. gentleman's department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend gets from my department a statement of the cost of the armoury, showing that the contract was $2,250, and sundry work, which would be the heating, $1,500, a total of $3,750. That is exactly what was agreed to be paid to the contractor. Then the hon. gentleman has added to the record of the cost all the repairs which were made to the building from year to year from 1901, when it was erected, down to the time he got this statement, that is, for a period of nine years, and he tells this committee that that shows that this building has cost a vast percentage beyond the contract price. Does my hon. friend think that is fair?

Mr. EDWARDS. Is that not the report from the hon. gentleman's own department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The statement read by the hon. gentleman showed a total expenditure to date on the Baddeck armoury, including site, of $5,975.62. This return was given to the hon. gentleman on April 7, 1910, and he included in it the cost of the site and all the expenditure incurred on the building between the time the contract was let in 1901 down to 1910. Now, let us look at another; take the Cobourg armoury. I charge the hon. gentleman in that case also with adding into the expenses of construction all the expenditures for repairs on that building from year to year from 1903 down to 1910, to make a total of $57,526. Let us take another—Woodstock, Ont.; he said that had cost a very large percentage above the contract price. I charge the hon. gentleman with having done the same thing there—with having taken all the ex-

penditures in the way of repairs upon the building during a number of years after the work of construction was ended and added them to the contract price. The figures which the hon. gentleman had before him ought to have satisfied him, if he had given any care whatever to an examination of them, that the effect of his statement would be to mislead the House as to the actual cost of the building. Take Woodstock, N. B., the contract price there was $31,980, and the total amount paid $37,306—a difference of about $5,000. The hon. gentleman there also added the expenses during two years at least after the building was completed, and when work was being done which had nothing whatever to do with its construction. Later on, when the hon. gentleman's figures are printed in 'Hansard,' it may be worth while still further to expose the fallacious statement he has made and show that he is entirely mistaken with regard to the cost of these buildings.

The reason I took the liberty of differing with him the other day was that since I have been Minister of Public Works, I have traced with a good deal of care the cost of the different buildings erected under the supervision of the chief architect of this department, and I knew there was no such additional amount of expenditure on construction as that which was stated by the hon. gentleman. And notwithstanding the assertions which are sometimes cast by hon. gentlemen opposite and by some others on the chief architect, I desire to say—and I say it with the greatest possible pleasure—that from the experience I have had of that gentleman, I can testify to the great industry and care he always displays in the most important work of his department. He has a great deal of responsibility in connection with the erection of public buildings; and from the observation I have had of his work, I am able to say that he does it faithfully and well. In Mr. Ewart, appointed long before this government came into power, as chief architect, the public has a most valuable servant, one who gives honest, faithful and diligent service to the country.

Mr. EDWARDS. If I had not the opportunity of being in this committee before and of listening on many other occasions to the Minister of Public Works, I might be surprised, but I must confess that I am not one whit surprised at the argument he has just made. Last year I asked for a return with regard to public buildings, drill halls and armouries. What I asked for, was this:—

At what places in the several provinces, armouries and drill halls have been erected; the total cost of the site in each case, and when and from whom purchased; the contract price of each building, and to whom and when the contract was awarded; the total cost of each building; in what places armouries and drill halls are being constructed at present, and the cost of the site, from whom, when, at what price the contract was awarded, and the names of places where other armouries and drill halls are to be built by the government in the near future.

That question bears on its face its object, namely, to obtain information as to the amount of money expended on drill halls and armouries. I do not think there can be any doubt as to its meaning. When I stated the other night that the actual cost was from 25 per cent to 75 per cent in excess of the contract price, the hon. gentleman—speaking of Baddeck—said that I included in that cost all that had been expended from 1901 down to the present on the Baddeck armoury. Well, I stated precisely what the hon. gentleman himself gave me. It was from the return furnished by his own department that I took my figures. In that return which I hold in my hand, there is no detail of the expenditure at Baddeck. All it states is that the contract was awarded to Joseph Queen for $2,250, and sundry work awarded to P. H. McFarlane at $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It states a little more. It gives the total expenditure to date.

Mr. EDWARDS. And it gives the total expenditure to date at $5,975, and that is precisely what I took into account.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rise to ask a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The minister rises to ask a question, but the hon. gentleman who has the floor can refuse, if he desires.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am going to accord to the hon. minister exactly the same courtesy which he did to me, and will ask him to wait until I get through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will suit me perfectly.

Mr. EDWARDS. And suit me better. In referring to Baddeck the minister said that I included everything in this expenditure, even the site. Will he allow me to inform this committee that, according to the return furnished by his own department, the site did not cost anything, but was a free gift. I might also draw an inference from that statement of the minister. I might say that it was his intention to try and make this committee believe that I was endeavouring to include some amount for the site of the building when I had a return showing that the site cost nothing.

Take the Woodstock armoury which happens to be the next one on the list. I

included in the contract price all that was given in the return sent down by the Public Works Department. Under the heading of contractors, it says that the building was let to Williams & Fisher for $31,980; for heating apparatus, the contract was given another firm for $2,700; then there was a contract for electric wiring and fixtures $1,500. Then there was furniture and fittings $3,500. I included all these in the contract price and they brought the price up to $39,680. One would naturally think that when the contract was awarded for this building for $31,980, and when the contract was let, as shown in this return for heating apparatus, and when the contract was let for electric wiring and fixtures and fittings and furniture, you had pretty nearly all that the building could cost when completed; and I concluded that these covered the whole contract price. I made up the amount, from the statement given in the return sent by the hon. gentleman's own department, as $39,680. And I pointed out that notwithstanding everything appeared to be covered by the contracts I have mentioned, the building cost $54,257 or 36 per cent more than the total amount of all those various contracts I have enumerated. Could I have been fairer? Had the minister furnished me with the details of expenditures throughout these various years, I would have given them to the House; but the hon. gentleman's department furnished me with the expenditures for the different years and they amounted to $54,257, which I gave to the House and on which I based the excess of cost over the contract price.

We all know that these large buildings are not constructed in one year. The hon. gentleman makes quite a hullabaloo about the fact that this expenditure was spread over several years. Why does the hon. gentleman do that if it is not meant by him as a herring drawn across the track to distract attention from the facts of the case? The point I endeavoured to make, and it nettled the hon. gentleman, as he showed quite clearly, was that the actual cost of these buildings was from 25 per cent to 75 per cent in excess of the contract price. It is up to the hon. gentleman, if he is not satisfied with that, if he wants to draw inferences, and if he thinks the House draws inferences from that, to make it clear where the rest of the money went. It is not up to me. I take the return as provided by him. It is up to him to draw inferences, and to explain them to the House and to the country. There is a feeling in the country that these buildings are costing much more than they should, that men are given a contract on a building and that extras are thrown in before the building is completed to the extent of thousands of dollars. In the neighbourhood of Kingston we have a clear instance of this in connection with the construction of cottages for soldiers. After everything was completed the hon. gentleman asked this committee for $20,000 more than was required to complete the building, when even the glass and fixtures were in and it was only after drumming that point at him that he consented to give the $20,000 back, to reduce the vote, and now he tries to distract attention from the real point I am making by implying that I am throwing out insinuations. I am not dealing in insinuations to-night, but in figures furnished by the hon. gentleman's department, and it is up to the hon. gentleman to explain what inference is to be drawn from this sort of thing. The same thing applies to Woodstock, N.B., and Cobourg. He found fault with my statement in regard to Cobourg. That expenditure I gave, also, from the statement furnished me by the hon. gentleman's department. I included in the contract, which was for $35,550, also the contract for fittings, $4,395, making the total contract, which I had a right to suppose, from the documents furnished me by the hon. gentleman's department, amounted to $35,945. I take the hon. gentleman's own statement in regard to the expenditure of 1902 to 1909, for various amounts paid as the building progressed, and it appears to be $57,526.25. I repeat that it is not up to me to explain the details; I have not the information to explain them. If the hon. gentleman sees fit to draw on his imagination for inferences and to conclude that the people of this country think that these buildings are costing from 25 per cent to 75 per cent more than the contract price, and that the money might be spent more carefully, it is up to him to explain it. The inference does exist in the public mind, and the public are not satisfied with the way he handles their money. It is all very well for the minister to undertake to twist a man's statement, but in this case he is occupying the unique position of endeavouring to twist and distort a statement furnished by his own department in answer to an order of this House. We all know how able and capable the hon. gentleman is in turning around a corner, but it has kept him busy this evening to twist around and get on both sides of this question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I charge against the hon. gentleman, and what I reaffirm against him is that, having in his possession a return furnished by the Department of Public Works, which gave on its face the total expenditure to date down to 1910, when that return was asked for, he did not inform the committee that the figures he gave included all repairs and expenses of every kind and description, which had been made on these buildings subsequent to the completion of the contract. That is the

charge I made, that is the charge I repeat, and that is the charge from which the hon. gentleman cannot escape. There is no question about that. When the hon. gentleman says that this department gave him a return, so it did, but what did it profess to give on its face? It gave the total cost incurred in connection with the building to date. The hon. gentleman has been here long enough to know that when I am asked in regard to public buildings, as, for instance, a day or two ago in regard to the post office building at Montreal, the total cost to date, I gave the cost from the construction of the building 40 or 50 years ago, not only during the time of construction, but down to the very time when my memoranda were made up in 1911. My hon. friend has been here long enough to know, he must have known, that such a return gives not only the cost of construction, the contract price, the fittings, heating, cost of site, all repairs to the building right from the very first down to the present time, whether it is 5, 10, 20 or 50 years. My hon. friend ought to have known that the figures he has given as to the total cost of the work, which he says exceeded the estimate by 25 per cent to 75 per cent, included all these items.

Mr. EDWARDS. I beg pardon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They do, whenever the site has been paid for, they do.

Mr. EDWARDS. I beg pardon, they do not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I say they do. That return gives the total expenditure upon the buildings to date.

Mr. EDWARDS. I understood the hon. gentleman to say I included the cost in my percentage.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did not the hon. gentleman give the total expenditure to date from that statement?

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not include the cost of site.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site is included in every case.

Mr. EDWARDS. I did not include the cost of site.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did the hon. gentleman deduct the cost of site?

Mr. EDWARDS. I certainly did not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me take the case of Woodstock, N.B.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is the cost of the site there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not a question of what difference it makes, because in either case it might be $6,000. What I charge against the hon. gentleman is that he had in his possession a return made by the department, showing the total expenditure to date, which the hon. gentleman either knew or ought to have known includes every item of cost of every kind or description, from the time the survey of the site was undertaken, including advertising, including legal expenses, including contract price, including fittings, heating, plumbing, electric wiring, sidewalks, any sewerage there might be, and all repairs from the day when the construction was completed right down to the time when the return was moved for ; and, the hon. gentleman sought to lead the committee to believe that that represented the cost of the building which was supposed to have been included in the original contract price. That is the charge which I make against the hon. gentleman, and that is the charge from which he cannot escape. Now, take the case of Woodstock. The hon. gentleman gave the total cost as $73,091.78, yet the hon. gentleman had before him a statement showing the expenditure beginning with the year 1902 running down to the year 1909, and I say that included, as the hon. gentleman ought to know, the survey of the site, the cost of the site, the legal expenses, the advertising, the contract price for the building, the fittings, heating, plumbing, electric wiring, sidewalks and all repairs which were made subsequent to the time the construction was finished down to the very day the return was moved for. But, the hon. gentleman sought to make this committee believe that this amount of $73,091 represented the cost which ought to have been included, and which was supposed to have been included, in the original contract price for the building.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is anything misleading in it, the parties who are responsible for it are those who furnished the return to this House. It does not appear, so far as I could learn on the face of the paper, that there were repairs included in that from time to time. We know for a fact that the erection of these buildings extends over many years. While I have been in the House I have watched the progress of the erection of buildings year after year. After the buildings are commenced it is sometimes three, or four or five, six or seven years before they are finished. The answer given to the hon. member's question including the contract price and cost of building complete, does not say down to what date.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does say to this date.

Mr. SPROULE. That return was furnished by the minister's department and by his orders ; then I say that he above all others is responsible for misleading the

House and the country, if there is anything to mislead in the statement that has been furnished here. My hon. friend only read out the return as given to him, and if the returns which we got are not reliable, then it behooves the Minister of Public Works to be more careful in what he presents to this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from Frontenac ought to be very thankful to my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) for trying to strengthen the defence he has endeavoured to make against the charge I have brought against him, and successfully, I think. The hon. gentleman says that the department is responsible. What would the hon. gentleman think if I were to assure him, as I have already assured the committee, that that return gives the figures showing the expenditure year after year, and shows the total expenditure down to the year 1910, when that return was moved for. It includes the cost of the site. The site in every case is included in these figures, and the hon. gentleman put that in and added it to the total figures, by which means he sought to make a comparison against the original contract price.

Mr. EDWARDS. Unfortunately for the argument of the Minister of Public Works in most of the cases which he saw fit to cite, the site did not cost anything. However, in comprising the total expenditure with the contract price, I took the figures furnished by the hon. gentleman's department, and proved what I stated the other day, that the actual cost was some 25 to 75 per cent in excess of the contract price. In the return thus furnished to me, in at least two-thirds of the instances which I gave this evening, the site cost nothing ; so that part of the hon. gentleman's argument falls entirely to the ground.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Taking the first item, Baddeck harbour : The contract price is apparently, $2,250, sundry work, $1,550, making $3,800. Taking that from the total expenditure, leaves $2,225. What would that be for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That could be arrived at by looking at the Public Accounts. I am not supposed to have that information with me. But that includes the total expenditure, the survey of the site, the legal expenses, advertising, salary of the clerk of works, travelling expenses, contingencies, repairs, everything right down to date.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the hon. gentleman think these small items would amount to the contract price of the armoury itself?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, running over that number of years.

Kingston post office, addition to building and alterations, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the purpose of making a two story addition to the building, 55 x 35 feet ; also to make alterations in the interior fittings, &c. The total estimated cost of $25,000. Additional accommodation is considered by the Post Office Department to be urgently required.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to ask the minister why no work was done on this building last year although an appropriation was made for the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We did not reach it in the ordinary course last year. The plans have now been approved by the Post Office Department and it is proposed to go on with the work as speedily as we can.

Mr. SPROULE. You must have reached it in some way because there was an expenditure of $2,000. What was that for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the estimated expenditure up to the 31st March next.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that there was a vote for this some years ago of $7,785, while the expenditure is only going on now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have been getting along as well as they could.

Kingston Royal Military College, covered drill hall, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The word 'covered' is a misprint and it should be struck out.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is this a new building or an addition?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A new building.

Mr. MEIGHEN. When did it first appear in the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was in last year and I am inclined to think that it was in previously.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It is a drill hall?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, a drill hall for the cadets.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I think I can advise the minister that it was not in previously. I have the proceedings for 1908. Would the minister kindly explain if the old drill hall was burned down or carried away by a flood?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. I may say that I am substituting this for a building which did appear. There was a skating rink which appeared and I decided to drop that item and put this drill hall in for the cadets.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I have the estimates for 1908 and I will read the Kingston items for the information of the minister:

Kingston Royal Military College, new quarters, additional amount.

Kingston post office, addition to building and alterations to fittings.

Kingston military buildings, repairs and renewals to blocks A, C and E, Tete du Pont barracks, &c., inclusive of electric ligthing, &c.

That is all the Kingston buildings. I do not know which of these items relates to this vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was in last year at all events.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It is being gone ahead with contrary to the pledge the minister gave in 1909, and it does not come within the exception of fire or flood. Will the minister explain why this is being gone ahead with in preference to buildings that were in the estimates for 1908?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had some items for the year 1907-8, I am quite sure. I do not profess to keep all these things in my head, but my recollection is that we dropped some two or three items for Kingston which did not seem to be quite so urgent as this drill hall and we put in an amount for the drill hall. This seems to be very urgent. Kingston Military College is doing a splendid work for the young men of the country, this is urged by the college authorities and we do not think that we ought to postpone any longer in providing for it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am afraid the minister is not very accurate. All that vote in the 1908 estimates appears since as being pursued. I see nothing dropped. Is the minister going to assert that all that is necessary to any one of those later items is simply to assure the committee that they appear to be very urgent and consequently he has decided to go on? If so, the pledge which he made in 1909 was just so much chaff and straw.

Mr. SPROULE. If they were urgent and parliament voted the money last year why did he not spend it?

Mr. EDWARDS. There is another question that I would like to put to the minister in connection with this building. I notice that the item is for $15,000. I will not be very certain that I am correct, but I think I am correct in saying that we were informed earlier in the session that any militia buildings, the cost of which was not to exceed $15,000, were supposed to come under the supervision in their construction of the Minister of Militia; that is, that the Minister of Militia was supposed to be capable of looking after the construction of a building that did not cost more than $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimated cost is $29,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN.

Mr. EDWARDS. Of course, that puts it beyond the intellectual powers, I suppose, of the Minister of Militia. We have to assume then that he is only capable of looking after the construction of a building that does not cost more than $15,000, but when the cost exceeds $15,000 it requires a person of the mental calibre of the Minister of Public Works to look after it. In that case, there are many buildings which, in my opinion, might be constructed for $14,000 or $15,000 which will cost a little more than that, so that the Minister of Public Works will get the handling of them.

Kingston Royal Military College, additional dormitory accommodation for cadets, $30,000.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is this a new building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a new building. My hon. friend no doubt, has heard of the demand for this. I visited the Royal Military College, I saw the officer in command and he called my special attention to the necessity for another dormitory for the students of the college. He said that they needed that perhaps more than anything else in connection with the college buildings.

Mr. EDWARDS. How many cadets are in attendance at that institution?

Mr. HARTY. 104.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understand the minister to say that this is also a new building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Was it in the 1908 estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is two.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this building to cost when it is completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimated cost is $75,000.

Mr. SPROULE. The contract is not let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the plans out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are not ready yet.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume it will be let by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Where have the students been sleeping previous to this time—out in the air?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a dormitory, and it was first thought that we might provide the requisite accommodation by put-

ting an additional roof on the existing dormitory, but the militia authorities, or Lt.-Col. Crowe, the commander, strongly urged the erection of a new building, stating that to put an additional story on the present one, would not afford the accommodation which it is desirable and absolutely necessary to give the students.

Mr. SPROULE. When was that building erected and how much did it cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a very old building erected by the Imperial government.

Mr. SPROULE. What has become of it, or what use is going to be made of it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is there still.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not suppose that it would move away. What use is it going to be put to ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will still be used as a dormitory because I do not imagine the new building will give all the accommodation that is needed and I presume that they will still use the old one.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the number of cadets been increasing from year to year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is so represented. There are 104 at present. If they had additional accommodation they would get more students. It is stated they are absolutely without the accommodation necessary for the comfort of the students.

Mr. SPROULE. If you accommodated 104 students last year and there is no increase this year why do you require such a large expenditure as this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are not able to accommodate many of the applicants.

Mr. SPROULE. Have they accommodation for an extra number now in the buildings other than the dormitory?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so.

Mr. SPROULE. We are to spend $78,000 to accommodate an additional number of students and there is no one to tell us where that additional number is to come from.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Militia Department, through Lieutenant Colonel Crowe, asks for accommodation for 100 cadets additional. I do not know how many additional students they would be likely to have immediately, but my information is that if the accommodation were provided the number would rapidly increase. The Kingston Military College is exceedingly popular among the people of this country and it has turned out a great many good citizens who have taken high positions in Canada and in all parts of the world.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard from time to time criticisms of the Kingston Military College. There are times when it is popular and times when it is unpopular.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think you hear much criticism now.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not say that the Royal Military College does not give a good education and turn out very good men, but there is an opinion in the country that everything connected with that military college is very expensive and that a great deal of what transpires there is nonsensical. There is a strong feeling in the country that a great deal of the money we invest there is wasted or worse than wasted.

Mr. CROTHERS. We are told that the estimated cost of this dormitory is to be $75,000, and our experience would lead us to believe that the cost will be $100,000 when we get through with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see why you should think that.

Mr. CROTHERS. The minister tells us that the building is to accommodate 100 additional students, and if that be so then we are to spend $1,000 per sleeping room per student. Some short time ago we erected sixteen little houses there at a cost of $7,000 a house, for the accommodation of labouring men who were receiving $25 a month in actual cash pay and some perquisites which brought their pay to perhaps $40 a month. The gross rental is supposed to bring about 10 per cent of the cost of a building, and here we are providing houses worth in rental $700 a year for men whose pay all told is about $500 a year. I have had acquaintance with Kingston for a great many years and I speak of what I know when I say that there were buildings there down near the water for the accommodation of these men, which we tore down and erected these new ones, and the old buildings were much better than the average man in Canada is living in to-day. It seems to me that in this case it would strike the people of Canada as very extraordinary that we should pay $1,000 each for sleeping apartments for 100 students.

Mr. CROSBY. In what way are we interested in these students of the Military College?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend can hardly expect me to reply to that, when for a great many years both parties in this country have recognized that the Kingston Military College is an institution which it was desirable in the first place to establish and afterwards to maintain in a state of efficiency. In this college our young men receive a military training and also a training in engineering which is of the very highest value to them and to the country also. In this country, which is developing rapidly, where important public works are being undertaken, it is most desirable to

have coming out from year to year a number of young men who are thoroughly trained in engineering work. However, I am not here to-night to advocate the desirability of establishing the college. It has been established and has been maintained from time to time by both political parties. All will agree that if it is desirable to have the college, it is desirable to afford the requisite accommodation for the youth being educated there.

Mr. CROSBY. That does not answer the question I asked. I understand that there are 104 students there now, and I want to know if this building is to be erected to provide accommodation for another hundred students. I quite understand that the institution is for the purpose of educating young men as civil or mechanical engineers. If it is, there are many other places where it is possible for young men to get that education. I understood the minister to say that these young men were making good in other parts of the world. I do not see why we should be training young men to go to other parts of the world unless we want to get rid of them. There is a very strong demand for post office buildings all through this country, and the $100,000 which is the estimated cost of this building, would provide many post office buildings in towns and villages throughout the country where they are much needed. You will find very few of these Kingston military college men among the officers of the standing army which we have in Canada. In most cases they send across the water for officers. I would like to ask why the Minister of Militia, who would be particularly interested in this building, is not here to explain the necessity for it if there is any. Has the hon. Minister of Public Works any idea why he is not here and where he is?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know personally, but I saw by the papers that he was at his home in Nova Scotia. If my hon. friend, or any other hon. gentleman desires the Kingston items to stand, I am quite willing to let them stand until the Minister of Militia is here.

Mr. CROSBY. I noticed that the Minister of Militia was attending a public meeting on the 18th of this month in Kings county, assisting to elect his friend, Mr. Wickwire, to the local legislature. I think the position he occupies demands his attendance here and not in Nova Scotia trying to elect a man whom the people refused to elect a short time ago. I would like to ask him how long it takes at Kingston to fit a man to be sent out equipped with spurs and feathers. As the Minister of Militia would rather be in Nova Scotia helping in the elections, I would say, let him stay there, we can do very well without him, and let us strike out this item and use the money in building post offices in a number of towns and villages throughout the Dominion which are entitled to them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As the Minister of Militia is not here, we will pass over the Kingston items.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like in the meantime to get some information. Is this to be a separate building or to be attached to some other building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be a separate building.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Of what material will it be constructed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A brick building with stone finish.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Have the plans been prepared?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What will be the size of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 130 feet in length, 96 feet in front, and two wings each 35 feet wide at the rear.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How many stories?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Three stories at least, besides the basement.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is there any limit now as to the number of students who will be taken into the college?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The accommodation is so limited that they cannot take any more at present. That is the reason given by the department for this new dormitory, which will give accommodation for 100 additional students.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has there been a rule in force restricting the number of students to one hundred?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, except that the accommodation is not sufficient for more than 100—that is, sleeping accommodation.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is there not a restriction as to the number of students taken in the college each year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course, being unable to accommodate more than 100, they would have to refuse applications.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the minister know, of his personal knowledge, that such is the reason why they refuse more students?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I do not, of my own knowledge, but that is what I am informed.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I understand there is a restriction for other reasons. I under-

stand that a student can go to that college and be educated in the profession of a civil engineer without any reference whatever to his being adapted or required for military purposes thereafter. I understand that each student is given his education in that college regardless altogether of his services being made use of afterwards from a military standpoint.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not undertake to give information as to the military side of the college. Does not my hon. friend think that when I have said I would let the item stand until the Minister of Militia could be here, it would be better to await his coming before asking these questions?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If the hon. minister will answer those questions, we might let the item pass.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I might give erroneous information. My information would only be hearsay.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I understand that a student in that college graduates as a civil engineer, and then, when he leaves the military college, he is under no obligation to serve the state as a military man? If that be the case, I do not know that we are justified spending money for that purpose, especially under the head of a military building. Personally, I do not think I would be justified in voting for this resolution. As the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers) has said, this seems to be a very exorbitant sum that we are going to pay. It amounts to $1,000 per bed for sleeping accommodation for the 100 students who go to that college, many of whom do not go there for the military training, and for the purpose of serving the state in a military capacity, but simply to receive an education which will enable them to earn a livelihood in other professions. Does the $75,000 include furniture, fittings, electric lighting, or heating—

Mr. PUGSLEY. The $75,000 is estimated to include everything. I have not a detailed estimate, but that is what the chief architect tells me.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I suppose the government own the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. From our experience in the past of the actual cost of public buildings, especially at Kingston, as compared with the estimated cost, we are justified in saying that this will probably cost $100,000, or $1,000 per student. What guarantee have we that, even if we put up this building, the 100 extra students which it will accommodate will apply to be accommodated? Has the minister any assurance to that effect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have nothing beyond the request for the building.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The request from whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From the commanding officer, Lt.-Col. Crowe.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. At the instance, probably, of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty).

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have not heard from him at all.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think we are not justified in voting that amount for that purpose. I therefore move that the item be struck out.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let the item stand.

Mr. HARTY. If I may offer a few words in explanation, I can give some information regarding the position of the college and the necessity for the building now under consideration, and the committee may then have a little better knowledge of the situation than at present. I have been slow to take any part in the discussion for the simple reason that while the college is called the Kingston Military College, as a matter of fact it is not in Kingston. It is situated in the riding of Frontenac, and I presume that the information which has been asked by various members might very properly have been furnished by the hon. member for that riding (Mr. Edwards) did he see fit to give it, rather than by myself, who represents a riding which is barely adjoining that in which this college is situated. The college, being in the county of Frontenac, in the village across the bay from Kingston, is usually known by the name of the Kingston Military College, no doubt from the fact of its being close to the city, which is much larger than the village of Barriefield, some three miles away, where it really is. The situation regarding the building is this: The wing which has been in use as a dormitory ever since the college was opened, was built by the Imperial government long years ago, and the late Alexander McKenzie was foreman of its construction. That building has been in use as a dormitory ever since the college was opened. For the past four or five years every room, which should be occupied by a single student or cadet, instead of being used only by one, has to accommodate two or three, and I believe, in some few instances, four. This made it necessary for the Commandant of the institution to ask the government to provide an additional building to be used as a dormitory, so that every cadet could be housed and cared for in a room of his own. Whether that is advisable or not is a question for the House to determine, and it is not for me to offer any opinion upon it. Regarding the ques-

tion put by the hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Middlebro) as to whether the hon. member for Kingston had asked the Department of Public Works or the Militia Department for the building under discussion, I can answer very readily. I desire to inform that hon. gentleman that from the time I have had the honour of a seat in this House until now I have never troubled the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Militia for a grant or appropriation of any kind in connection with that college. It is entirely a military institution, and as such is managed and controlled by the staff of the college, and whatever may be the necessities of the college, they are communicated to the Department of Militia directly by the college authorities, and the member for Kingston, from the day he entered this House until now, has never had occasion to interfere or ask for anything in the way of buildings or other improvements to be put into that institution.

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) devoted some little time and attention to the question as to whether or not a military institution of the kind which exists in the county of Frontenac, and not in Kingston, is desirable. That is an issue altogether foreign from the one the House has under consideration when it is asked to vote a sum necessary to provide a better dormitory for it. I have not heard the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Crosby) take any exception to the establishment of a somewhat similar institution in his own city to be used for naval purposes. I am not competent to discuss the question as to whether a naval institution somewhat after the lines of the military college in Kingston is a desirable and necessary thing for the city of Halifax or, for that matter, for the Dominion of Canada, but it struck me at the time the gentlemen were criticising the military college that it was rather a question of taste for them to throw cold water at an institution which had been in existence since 1876 while at the same time the hon. gentleman from Halifax and the people whom he represents were reaping the benefits of the establishment of a similar institution to provide for the future naval requirements of the country. I trust that the House, in dealing with the question of the amount that has been asked for this dormitory, will deal with the question on its fair merits and make it clear whether or not they approve of the use of the old stone frigate now used as a dormitory with from two to four boys in each room, or whether they think it desirable to have a new building erected, which in my humble opinion should be done, so that each cadet at the college will be able to have quarters of his own. I am sorry the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) disappeared a few moments before I rose to explain to the House why I felt it undesirable on my part to make explanations in regard to this particular institution, which I thought more properly should come from him. That is a matter of opinion for him. I think he is as well posted on the whole situation and its requirements as I am, and I was slow to offer any information to the House regarding it because I feared I should be trespassing on his preserves.

Mr. CROSBY. The hon. member misquoted me altogether. I did not speak with regard to the doing away with the military college at Kingston, I simply spoke of the effect of making additions; of going on increasing militarism in Canada when I thought that we required the money for something else. If I indicated anything else I did not intend to do so.

Mr. HARTY. Perhaps I misunderstood you.

Mr. CROSBY. So far as the naval college in my own city is concerned, I think it is something like the college in Kingston, it is a college with nothing for the people to do after they get through it. We have a naval college but no navy up to the present day, and there does not seem to be much hope of getting one either under present conditions. I do not propose to discuss that question, the people in Halifax are prepared to deal with it and we have already put ourselves on record in regard to it. I have put myself on record in regard to the naval college and the navy and I feel something the same about that, as about the extension of the college at Kingston. If there is an estimate in this book that should be struck out, it is this very estimate that we are on now and I am quite prepared to vote that it be struck out. The Minister of Public Works tells us he cannot build a post office here or there, although requisitions have been in for years and years, and members on both sides have requested public buildings, yet we find that money is being thrown into an institution which the Minister of Public Works tells us is turning out engineers. There are other colleges in Canada turning out engineers, both civil and mechanical, and why should we set ourselves up in competition with these colleges all over the Dominion, which we are so glad to have. The military college has 104 students and we are now prepared to extend it and make room for another 100. I wonder what the farmers and other electors will think of this. If we go on spending $100,000 every two or four years on this college, we will soon have more fuss and feathers in Canada than anything else. That is not what I am here for. I am here

to try and do the best I can for the people of Canada and not to go on constructing additions to the military college at Kingston. I have every desire and wish that this item should be struck out of the estimates.

Item allowed to stand.

Listowel public building, $18,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the erection of a public building in Listowel. The population was 2,693, nine years ago. It is growing well, the revenue from the post office is $6,000 odd, $30,000 were paid for money orders issued and $25,000 paid. The plans are now being prepared.

Mr. SPROULE. This is another example of what I spoke of, either loading up the estimates with items that it is not intended to go on with, or that are not needed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been no unnecessary delay. An order in council was passed in March, 1909, to purchase a site. In the ordinary course we had to prepare plans and there is a vast deal of work in the department, hon. gentlemen do not realize how much. The architects are constantly at work and are doing the best they can. There has been no unnecessary delay.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What is done by the department after the plans are prepared and entirely approved of by the other departments concerned ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The specifications are sent to the Printing Bureau and advertisements issued calling for tenders.

Mr. MEIGHEN. How long does it take the Printing Bureau to print the specifications ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It depends on how busy they are, sometimes three weeks, sometimes four, sometimes longer.

Mr. SPROULE. In 1909-10 there was $15,000 put in for 1911. It says $1,100 lapsed. That is not put in the column where revotes of an estimate voted the previous year, that is 1909, are put. Therefore, it must have been at least 1908 or 1907 that this was voted. Now, I presume that an application has been made for a building, that the government reached the conclusion that a building was needed there. They asked for a vote in 1906, or 1907, or 1908. They got a vote of $1,100 for some purpose, presumably for buying a site, but nothing is done with it. That has been carried on up to the present time, and now we are providing for 1912. This same item, therefore, must have been under consideration for three or four years. Either the building was needed or it was not needed. If it was needed, and that conclusion was reached by the House, then the building should have been erected.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we get the plans and specifications prepared, we may let the contract before the 31st of March this year. We can let it on the vote of last year.

Mr. SPROULE. Why didn't you let it before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because we did not get ready.

Midland public building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide a public building for a post office and customs purposes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister will admit that this is another building that was not provided for at all in the 1908 estimates. What explanation has the minister to offer for urgency, except that the constituency is represented by a Liberal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The explanation is that a public building is much required in Midland. Midland has been growing very rapidly of recent years, and it has outgrown altogether the present accommodation, which is in a rented building. The revenue last year was $9,000, while the customs duties were $56,734. Money orders issued were $59,556 ; money orders paid, $23,654. Value of exports, $341,000 last year ; imports, $1,065,528 ; goods entered for consumption, $1,121,561. Midland is forging ahead with wonderful rapidity. It has a great blast furnace, it is doing a very large shipping business, it has extensive coal docks, a large number of lumber mills. It would be simply a crying shame to leave Midland any longer without a public building. That is why I have made an exception to the rule, and am providing a new item for a public building at Midland.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That of course will always be the explanation. Now the minister knows as well as I do that that absolutely is not contemplated by him in his statement made on page 1300 of the 'Hansard.' If that kind of explanation is to be accepted, that the town is thriving and the accommodation is inadequate, then the minister's statement meant nothing, and he knows it. The cases he gave were these, there might be others, but they would need to be of the same character, that is to say, there may be cases such as a public building being burned down, or a wharf carried away, which might create an exception. Now that may have been all the minister thought of, but if the statement meant anything, it meant that there would be no exception except such as those given, not

because representations had been made that the town was growing, that there were blast furnaces in it, that the revenue of the post office was increasing, that the citizens asked for it. That can be said anywhere you like. Now the minister must know that his statement meant nothing at all, if he is allowed to get out of it by the explanation he offers now. But I tell the minister that the people of this country at the time placed some reliance upon it, and I hope he has not got past the point when he is at least anxious that this committee will take him at his word.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have only to say this, that absolute good faith is being kept with the various cities and towns of this country in respect to which provision was made in the estimates of 1907-8. Have we left out any of these? Not one, except where further inquiry satisfied us the building was not needed in the public interest. We are carrying everything out in good faith. What does my hon. friend complain of? Does he complain because we are going to erect a public building at Midland, having the revenue at our disposal? Does he mean that we shall not go on with a public building in Midland, when we are not interfering with the erection of a public building anywhere else? I cannot understand what he is complaining of, what he is grumbling about. How am I guilty of bad faith? Surely I have a perfect right, when I am providing for these other buildings, to have regard to the necessities of people in other sections of the country, and to submit to my colleagues an amount for other public buildings. If my hon. friend means to say that a public building is not as much required in Midland as a public building at Portage la Prairie, or some other place, let him say it. But he knows that Midland is as much entitled to a public building as the town from which he comes, if not more.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am not comparing the necessities of Midland with the necessities of Portage la Prairie, and the minister knew I was not. I wanted to know whether the minister meant what he said when he uttered the works spoken on page 1300. I do not know anything about Midland. But what I am complaining of is this : The minister says the word 'initiate' means asking parliament for a vote. Now, if it means that, he is violating his word given to this committee on page 1300. He says he should not be debarred from going ahead in other places. He told the House that his department is overworked. What is it that overworks his department? The placing of estimates before the committee, the preparing of plans and specifications to get ready to go on with the work. Now, he gave this committee his word that he would not overwork his department in order that he might go ahead with other work. We relied upon that. It has not been carried out. That is what I complain of.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister gives as a reason why he goes on with this building that there is urgent need for it because Midland is a growing place. That very same argument could and would have applied with equal force at any time during the last ten years. Midland has been an active, growing place for ten years, and the need was as great six or seven years ago as now. But there is a strange coincidence in the fact that the proposal is made now when Midland or the constituency in which it is situated, is represented in this House by a friend of the government, whereas, up to the last parliament, it was not. That seems to be the explanation of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to object to the item?

Mr. SPROULE. No, I am not objecting to the item, but I am objecting to the argument which the minister advances as justifying the item. We find this very same condition of things in other counties as well. Take the county of Wellington, if you like. There are two post offices that we have voted money for to-night within three miles of each other. Two more post offices are being built in that same county. Another is hardly finished yet, making five in the one county that happens to be represented in this House by supporters of the government. Go to the adjoining counties, and how many do you find? In many of them not one government building. Midland was needing a post office for years, but so long as it was represented by a member of the opposition, in the judgment of the minister, and his friends there was no necessity for a post office. No money could be voted for it and none was asked. But, it turned out entirely different when they managed to get a supporter in this House from that riding. That, I take it, is a more correct argument in very many of these cases.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If a public building is needed my hon. friend ought to be glad that we are at last acceding to the wishes of the people.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting to it at all, but I am objecting to the argument that the minister advances in support of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The item is all right although the argument may not be good.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Touching upon the same point brought forward by my hon. friend from Grey, that is the explanation of all this change, the minister told us a little while ago that 95 per cent of the esti-

mates for this year were in the 1907-8 estimates leaving only 5 per cent for new buildings. I have gone through the list of new buildings in Ontario, there are thirty, as I make it, and eight were not in the 1907-8 estimates. But the most remarkable fact of all is that the whole eight are in constituencies represented by supporters of the government. Surely the thing is too transparent to last any longer. Surely the minister sees that it is utterly impossible to convince any sensible person that he is not making his department a party, political tool. If the minister wishes me to give the list of the eight I am ready to do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not anxious.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not wonder that the minister is not anxious.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I don't want to waste time.

Mr. CROTHERS. It seems to me we have no sufficient information respecting this $10,000 to justify our consenting to its passage. How much information have we so far? We have been told that it is proposed to erect a public building in Midland, and that Midland is a thriving town. That is not sufficient.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You have the population, the postal revenue and the customs revenue.

Mr. CROTHERS. Did the minister give the population ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave all that.

Mr. CROTHERS. Then it is my fault that I did not hear it. But, there are several other items of information. We are asked for $10,000. None of us understands that $10,000 is asked for the building. We are not told whether it is to be a mere post office or a customs house, or whether it is a combined post office and customs house, whether it is to cost $50,000 or $100,000, whether it is to be built of wood, or brick or stone, or what the dimensions of it are. We are not told even what the minister proposes to do with this $10,000. If the minister, when he approaches one of these items, would make a full and frank statement of the conditions in the town concerned, the necessity for the building, what the government are paying now for the use of a building so as to show whether it would be advantageous to the country, instead of continuing to rent, to erect a new building, setting forth the necessities for it, the amount of money that he proposes to spend, the dimensions of the building that he proposes to erect, whether it is to be for a post office or a post office and customs house, presenting a frank statement of that kind, I fancy, instead of waiting until two or three members of the opposition shy questions at him that he would get these items through much more expeditiously. Perhaps the minister would give us some more information of the kind that I have indicated now, and if he will, as far as I am concerned, I will assist the passage of this item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should be very glad indeed, if it would do what the hon. gentleman believes it would. Hon. gentlemen opposite ask questions for the sake of getting information. They would not like me to give all the information voluntarily, because it would leave them with nothing to question me about. They might think that I was taking too much time just as in the case of Chesley. I had just begun to explain a few of these things when hon. gentlemen called out 'carried' because it happened to be in a constituency represented by a member of the opposition. They might cry out with equal impatience if I were to go into details with regard to constituencies represented by my friends. In the case of Midland, I gave all the information which any reasonable man would require. I stated that Midland was a rapidly growing place, I stated the postal revenue, I stated the customs revenue, the imports and the exports which are very large, I stated that there was a great necessity for a public building, I referred to the different industries and I was ready to answer any question that any hon. gentleman would put to me. The population nine years ago was upwards of 3,000, and I suppose it is 5,000 or 6,000 to-day. With regard to the $10,000, we propose to use that for the purpose of buying the site, and with regard to the cost, we propose to erect a good, substantial building which will be a credit to the town and the country and we hope that it will not exceed $35,000. We intend to use it for post office and customs purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you any offer for a site ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, there were some negotiations.

Mitchell public building, $18,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the erection of a public building at Mitchell. The site has been purchased, plans and specifications are prepared and we are now ready to advertise, which we expect to do in the course of a very few days. The population nine years ago was close on 2,000 the revenue last year was $4,079, customs duties. $96,689, money orders issued $25,540 and money orders paid $15,240. Mitchell is a thriving town in South Perth.

Mr. SPROULE. There was an expenditure last year of $2,000 on this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site was bought from the municipal corporation for $1,600, and we expect to spend $2,000 by the 31st of March.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the building to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From $20,000 to $25,000. It is for a post office, custom house, inland revenue and armoury for B Company of the Perth Regiment.

Mr. SPROULE. Then a portion of the cost should be charged to the Militia Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not charge anything to the Militia Department for armouries.

Mr. SPROULE. You ought to, or your bookkeeping is fallacious. When we ask for a return giving the expenditure on Militia and Defence, are we to understand that the cost of such an armoury as this would not be charged to the Militia Department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If a return showing the cost of armouries were brought down I should think that the proportionate cost of such a building as this devoted to military purposes ought to be properly included.

Mr. SPROULE. It should be charged to Militia in the public accounts, or else the public accounts are wrong.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We erect custom houses and post offices and do not charge them to these departments.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but you keep a separate account for expenditure on Militia and Defence, and unless such a cost as this were included the expenditure would not be correctly represented.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is worthy the consideration of the Minister of Finance as to whether a proportion of the cost of such an armoury as this might not be included in the account for armouries. I will mention the matter to the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Finance, and see what they think about it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is Mitchell one of these thriving, growing towns we have heard so much of to-night?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mitchell is a thriving town.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the population?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nine years ago it was 1,945.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the population now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would have to ask the Chairman as to that.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If I thought that was a subject of legitimate inquiry from the Chairman I would ask him myself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think I will have to decline to answer any questions when I am in the chair, but if it is the desire to have information which I only possess I shall leave the chair and ask another hon. member to take my place.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I realize that very fully, and that is why I did not ask you.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As the Chairman is the only one I thought able to give the information with accuracy, I thought I would refer to the matter in an undertone, which is different from addressing Mr. Chairman across the floor. I do not know the population of any of these towns from year to year, but my information is that Mitchell is quite a thriving place

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the minister give the source of his information?

Mr. McKENZIE. What difference does it make? Is not this trifling with the time of the House?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The files in my department say that Mitchell is a progressive town surrounded by a thriving agricultural country, that it is a station on the Grand Trunk railway, has four churches, thirty stores, four hotels, five mills, two banks, two newspaper offices.

Mr. McINTYRE (Deputy Speaker). I am now quite prepared to give any information that may be asked with regard to Mitchell, which is in the riding I represent. When the item was last before the committee I told the committee that Mitchell is a thriving town like I think every other town in western Ontario. It is improving in its general appearance, in the wealth of its people, in the buildings it possesses, rather than in population. Mitchell is in the centre of an excellent agricultural country as are all the towns in Ontario, west of Toronto. It supplies an unusually large district with its mail matter, as I know from having sent to my constituents letters in much larger numbers to that town than to other towns in proportion to its size. The present post office is in a small crumbling building. I have had occasion to go into it on some wet days about the time of the distribution of the mail, and I can assure you I left as rapidly as possible. The town has needed a new post office very badly for some time. At the time the town itself requested a post office, there was no available building, as the shops were all filled in the business street. The desire for a public building was manifested by the people themselves. It is usually thought that the request for a public building comes from the member

for the riding, but in this case I will be telling you the absolute truth when I say that when I was informed that the board of trade and the council of that town were moving in the matter, and had requested a public building, I regretted the fact. Not that I thought Mitchell was not entitled to a public building, when taken in comparison with very many such towns that had such buildings, but I realized that just such a situation as this would arise, when it is not very pleasant to have to explain the particular demands of your own place and have it compared with others that perhaps feel just as keenly they should have a public building, and may perhaps be able to show on the face of it better reason for having a public building. I realize that Mitchell is no larger than some other towns that have not public buildings, but when I consider that the present office is quite inadequate and even unwholesome for the officials who have to be there, and that it was not possible for the department or the postmaster to find a suitable building, and that the town was so interested as to offer a portion of its market square for the new building, I think I was justified in doing what I did, not on my own initiative or that of the town, but in reply to a letter from the department asking what my opinion was—expressing the opinion, as I did, that under the circumstances the town of Mitchell was entitled to a new building at a reasonable cost.

Mr. MEIGHEN. In order that I may not be misinterpreted, I wish to say that I was anxious that the accuracy of the minister's information as to all these towns should be put to any test that I was able to bring to bear. I have no doubt that what the hon. member who represents South Perth says is correct, in so far as it is a presentation of the facts. I make no statement as to the relative merits of Mitchell and other places; I do not know enough about it for that; but I think I do know enough about it to say, what the hon. member refrained from contradicting, that Mitchell, instead of growing and on that account deserving consideration, is on the down grade so far as population is concerned. I only wish, if the minister's inspiration has been the member for the riding, that he could in every other case rely on it as well as he could on that of the hon. member for South Perth.

Mount Forest public building, $18,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The tenders for this building have been called for, to be received on the 30th of this month. The site has been bought, having a frontage of 60 feet on Main street, by a depth of 100 feet on Wellington street. The object is to provide accommodation for post office and customs purposes, also armoury accommodation for E company of the 30th regiment, Wellington Rifles. The estimated cost of the building is $25,000. The postal revenues last year amounted to $4,924.33, the money orders issued were $20,113, and money orders paid $26,516. The population by the census of 1901 was 2,019.

Mr. EDWARDS. What was the cost of the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $3,600. It will take about $25,000 in addition to the cost of the site to complete the building.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Pugsley, House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 23, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. MONK. I would ask the government to expedite the preparation of two returns that have been very much delayed. One was ordered by the House November 22, 1909, for papers connected with Mr. Preston's mission to Japan, and the difficulties that arose there. The other was ordered on December 6, 1909, concerning expenditure in connection with the Imperial Defence Conference of 1909.

GIFTS TO MINISTERS OF THE CROWN.

Mr. BOYCE. I beg to give notice that tomorrow I will move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, to wit, the receipt by ministers of the Crown of gifts of money in the form of testimonials and of the reported contribution to such testimonials or testimonial of a sum of money by one William R. Travers, late general manager of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, now in liquidation, said Travers having been convicted and being now under sentence of six years' imprisonment for having falsified returns to the government and for theft of the moneys of the bank.

CONSTRUCTION OF PIER AT HALIFAX.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would ask the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Railways and Canals whether the government propose to proceed without delay in the erection of the promised pier on the Cunard property at Halifax, acquired by the Department of Railways and Canals for that purpose. I make this inquiry because it is represented to me by the Halifax Board of Trade that the present termi-

nal facilities of the Intercolonial railway at Halifax are very inadequate, and because that body believes that the congestion of outgoing steamers during the present season will be very great. I shall send the Prime Minister a copy of the representations I received.

QUESTIONS.

THE FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron):

1. Were any representations made to the government or to any member thereof, or to any official of the Finance Department, by the Canadian Banker's Association, or any private individual, during the past two years, in the nature of a warning as to the instability of the Farmers' Bank of Canada?

2. If so, what action was taken by the government for the protection of the shareholders and depositors of the said bank?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1 and 2. So far as the records of the Department of Finance show no such representations were made during the time referred to. The transactions in which the Farmers' Bank, through its General Manager, became implicated in December, 1909, with the First National Bank of Syracuse, New York, and the alleged obligation of the Farmers' Bank on a deposit receipt for $150,000 in such connection, were brought to the attention of the Minister of Finance, but beyond suggesting the irregularity and impropriety of these transactions there was nothing in the correspondence received to indicate that the Farmers' Bank, by these transactions, came into a position of 'instability.' The whole matter was fully discussed in the Toronto press at the time and the shareholders and depositors had ample notice of the character of these transactions. Ultimately, the Department of Finance was credibly advised that there was no obligation of the Farmers' Bank in the above connection, and that the alleged deposit receipt was returned to the bank. The correspondence in this connection will form part of a return now ordered by the House. The only evidence, during the time in question, from which the 'instability' of the bank might be inferred and which came directly to the attention of the Finance Department, was in the form of broker's lists of market valuations. In these lists Farmers' Bank stock was quoted as equal to half its paid up value and lesser sums. These indications of value were circulated by brokers for the information of the public including shareholders and depositors in the bank. Upon information of this character no action which the government could reasonably and legally take would improve the position of the shareholders.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

THE FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. THORNTON:

1. What is being done by the government to prevent the assets of the defunct Farmers' Bank from being sacrificed or eaten up in useless and unnecessary legal expenses?

2. What steps are being taken by the government to ascertain the value of the Keeley mine property, an asset of the defunct Farmers' Bank, and whatever value there is in it being preserved for the benefit of the depositors and shareholders?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. When the bank suspended payment last month a curator, appointed under the provisions of the Bank Act, took possession of the assets of the bank for the protection of the rights and interests of the creditors and shareholders. Until a liquidator, appointed by a competent court, displaces the curator that officer remains in charge of these assets for the purposes aforesaid. The shareholders, the persons primarily in interest, and the creditors who may be said to have a secondary interest so far as measure of loss is concerned, at a meeting convened a few days ago, have taken steps, pursuant, to the law as made by the parliament of Canada, to express their wishes in regard to the liquidation of the bank. The proceedings at this meeting will be reported according to law to the court, and the court will carry out the wishes so expressed and appoint a liquidator, nominated by the persons mentioned, whose duty it will be, under the direction of the court with due regard to all interests, to realize upon and distribute the assets referred to. Under the law the courts and not the government have the power to interfere and secure proper distribution of assets.

2. The duty of ascertaining the value of the Keeley mine properly belongs to the liquidator. The shareholders and the creditors in whose interests he acts may, under the provisions of the law, make known their wishes to him in this behalf for his guidance.

EMPLOYEES ON PICTOU ROUNDHOUSE.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. What are the names of men who have been employed on the Intercolonial railway in 1910, and present year, at the work of filling in ground between station house and roundhouse at Pictou and Moncton?

2. For how many days and between what dates was each man employed?

3. What are the wages paid to each man?

4. Were any of the men discharged from the work? If so, for what reason was each man discharged?

Mr. GRAHAM:

Questions 1, 2 and 3 answered as follows:

EMPLOYEES ON PICTOU ROUNDHOUSE WORK.

Name.	1910.			1911.	Total Number of days.	Rate per day.	Amount
	No. of days in October.	No. of days in November	No. of days in December	No. of days in January.			
						$ cts.	$ cts.
Robert Smith	26	26	23	11	86	3 15	270 90
John A. McEachern	26	26	23 8/10	11	86 8/10	1 50	130 20
"			3	1	4	2 90	11 60
Dan Joudry	1				1	1 50	1 50
Howard Joudry	18	22	23 7/10	10 1/2	74 2/10	1 50	111 30
John McEwen	14 4/10	4	23 2/10	8 1/2	50 1/10	1 50	75 15
John Kerwin	17 1/2	22	22	7 1/4	68 3/4	1 50	103 15
Geo. Wood	6				6	1 50	9 00
Duncan English with horse and scraper	6 1/2				6 1/2	2 50	16 25
Morton Dewis	16	24	11 1/4		51 1/4	1 50	76 88
Edward Hemmings	6 4/10	8	11 3/4	9 1/4	35 4/10	1 50	53 10
Wm. English	4				4	1 50	6 00
Elijah Sarson	7 4/10	17 2/10	23 7/10	8 1/2	56 9/10	1 50	85 35
Warren Joudry	13 1/2	22 1/2	19 4/10	11	66 4/10	1 50	99 68
Stephen Langille	3				3	1 50	4 50
John Langille	4				4	1 50	6 00
A. W. MacMillan	4	1	1		6	1 50	9 00
Wm. Langille	5 1/2	14 1/2			20	1 50	30 00
Wm. Benson	5 1/2	13			18 1/2	1 50	27 75
Wilson McConnell	1 1/2				1 1/2	1 50	2 25
George Coombs		13	11 1/2		24 1/2	1 50	36 75
John J. Wilson		1 1/2			1 1/2	1 50	2 25
John Clark		3	12	9 1/2	24 1/2	1 50	36 75
Alonzo Henderson			13		13	1 50	19 50
John W. McEwen			3 3/4		3 3/4	1 50	5 63
Murray Shea			2 1/4		2 1/4	1 50	3 38
David Rogers			17 9/10	10 1/4	28 2/10	1 50	42 30
George Matatall			2		2	1 50	3 00
Wm. Conrad			6 1/2	9 1/2	16	1 50	24 00
Thomas Walsh			1/2		1/2	1 50	0 75
John Jollymore			6	8 1/2	14 1/2	1 50	21 75
John Conrad			4	9 1/2	13 1/2	1 50	20 25
Paul Thorne			4 1/2		4 1/2	1 50	6 75
Harry Heighton				1/2	1/2	1 50	0 75

4. Two men discharged : John J. Wilson, not capable ; George Coombs, for drinking. The following men were laid off waiting for cars with stone ballast, with the option of returning to work : Howard Joudry, Wm. Langide, Edward Hemmings, Wm. Benson, George Wood, John McEwen and John Jollymore.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY PENSION FUND.

Mr. LENNOX :

Will the Minister of Railways lay on the table of the House a copy of the rules and regulations relating to pensions framed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, pursuant to the provisions of 6 and 7 Edward VII., chapter 89, 1907, of the statutes of Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM :

Yes.

TORONTO BARRACKS.

Mr. MACDONELL :

1. Has the government yet purchased a site for the erection of barracks for the permanent corps at Toronto?

2. If so, (a) where is such site, (b) from whom was it purchased, and what was the cost thereof?

3. (a) Have plans yet been prepared for such new barracks? If so, (b) what is the cost thereof and (c) when will the work be commenced?

Mr. MURPHY :

1. Yes.

2. (a) Lots Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9, concession 3, south of Dundas street, in the township of Toronto, county of Peel.

(b)

Owner.	Price paid.
Mr. Hector Death	$ 9,400
Mrs. Minnie Jones	20,000
The Halliday Estate	* 30,000
The Cawthra Estate	Expropriated : — Price to be paid not yet determined by Exchequer Court.
The Denison Estate	
The City and District Land Company	
Township of Toronto (road allowance)	$1,421

*This does not include compensation to a number of owners of cottages which have been erected on the land acquired.

3. (a) Plans of the proposed new barracks are now being drawn up.
(b) Not yet known.
(c) It is hoped that work will be commenced in the spring.

BABY FARM.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Has the government sold the property known as the Baby Farm at Toronto, and recently held by the government for military purposes?
2. If so, (a) to whom was it sold; (b) when; (c) what was the property sold for, and; (d) was public competition invited?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Yes.
2. (a) W. L. Scott, Esq., barrister, Ottawa. (b) July 4, 1910. (c) $121,000. (d) Yes.

FRENCH CENSUS COMMISSIONER.

Mr. PAQUET:

Does the government intend to appoint a French Census Commissioner, as in 1901?

Mr. FISHER. For several of the census districts French commissioners will be appointed. The duties performed by the chief commissioner and assistant to the chief commissioner in the previous census will, in connection with the census of 1911, be performed by members of the permanent staff of the census and statistics office.

ARCHIVES HISTORICAL WORK.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. In what European countries are historical researches now being made, and are these researches directed by Mr. Biggar?
2. Are historical researches now being made in the United States, and who are the persons charged with making historical researches in our country?

Mr. FISHER:

1. A regular staff of copyists is employed permanently in England and in France under the general direction of Mr. Biggar.
2. No regular agent is employed to make researches in the United States, but papers are copied in various places from time to time. The Rev. P. M. O'Leary is engaged in research work in the province of Quebec, and arrangements are being made for another representative in the province of Quebec, and special copyists are employed from time to time in Quebec and Montreal. Mr. Laidlaw, of the archives branch, is frequently sent out on a mission of investigation in the province of Ontario, and the government of British Columbia co-operates with the archives branch in research work. Research work is also carried on by means of correspondence.

Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. Has the commission on historical manuscripts, established in 1907, completely discontinued its work?
2. What was the object of this commission, how many meetings have been held and why has it discontinued its work?

Mr. FISHER:

1. No.
2. The Historical Manuscripts Commission was established to act in an advisory capacity to the Minister of Agriculture and to co-operate with the Dominion archivist in collecting, arranging and rendering accessible those original sources from which alone an adequate knowledge of Canadian history may be gained, and in studying the best means of increasing the usefulness and opportunities of the archives branch.

Six meetings were held, but all the members were not able to attend the last three meetings for various reasons.

Mr. PAQUET:

Has the government sent to the archives building all the documents, charts and plans of the different federal departments, that are not protected against fires?

Mr. FISHER. The government has removed to the archives branch several thousand volumes of the older manuscripts and over three thousand maps and plans. There are possibly other documents that may be removed to the archives, but a large number of old plans are retained by the departments, as they are required for current business.

CANADIAN TRADE COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. PAQUET:

In what countries have we commercial representatives, what are their names, where do they live and what are their salaries?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

CANADIAN TRADE COMMISSIONERS.

	Salary per annum.
Australia—	
D. H. Ross, Melbourne	$3,600
British West Indies—	
E. H. S. Flood, Bridgetown, Barbadoes	3,000
China—	
J. B. Jackson, Shanghai	3,500
Cuba—	
E. S. Kirkpatrick, Havana	3,200
France—	
A. F. A. Poindron, Paris	3,350
Germany—	
W. G. Fischer, Berlin	3,350
Holland—	
W. T. R. Preston, Amsterdam	3,600
Japan—	
G. A. Harris, Yokohama	3,500
Mexico—	
A. W. Donly, Mexico	3,100

Newfoundland—
J. E. Ray, St. John's.. 2,500
New Zealand—
W. A. Beddoe, Auckland.. 3,000
South Africa—
J. A. Chesley, Cape Town.. 3,200
H. R. Poussette, Durban.. 3,350
United Kingdom—
P. B. MacNamara, Manchester.. .. 3,350
W. A. MacKinnon, Birmingham.. .. 3,350
E. D. Arnaud, Bristol.. 3,350
F. A. C. Bickerdike, Belfast.. 3,350
J. M. Mussen, Leeds.. 3,350
J. T. Lithgow, Glasgow.. 3,200

CANADIAN COMMERCIAL AGENTS.

	Salary per annum.
British West Indies—	
E. A. H. Haggart, Kingston, Jamaica.	$500
Edgar Tripp, Port of Spain, Trinidad.	500
R. H. Curry, Nassau, Bahamas..	500
South America—	
A. E. Beckwith, Cartagena, Colombia.	500
Norway—	
C. E. Sontum, Christiania..	500

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL SHOPS.

Mr. AMES:

1. Who, not now connected with the National Transcontinental railway, drew up, or aided in drawing up, the plans and specifications for the National Transcontinental railway shops?
2. Is Mr. W. J. Press, mechanical engineer, who was appointed as machinery expert May 23, 1910, still in the employ of the department?
3. If so, what salary is he paid, and what are his terms of engagement?
4. In whose employ had Mr. Press been during the year preceding his appointment as mechanical expert for the National Transcontinental railway shops?
5. Had he previously acted as mechanical expert on behalf of or in the employ of any persons or companies to whom contracts were subsequently awarded for machinery or tools for the National Transcontinental railway workshops?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Plans for shops were furnished by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.
2. Yes.
3. $350 per month, no particular terms of engagement.
4. Mussens Limited, Montreal, Que.
5. No.

DREDGING AT LUNENBURG.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Is any dredging being performed by the government in the harbour of Lunenburg, N.S.?
2. Were any plans of the proposed dredging prepared? If so, by whom?
3. In front of, or opposite to, whose properties is the dredging required to improve navigation of the harbour?
4. In front of, or opposite to, whose properties is the dredging being performed, and by whose recommendation?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.
2. Yes, by District Engineer Dodwell.

3 and 4. The department, on the recommendation of the district engineer, is dredging the entrance channel of harbour to 20 feet depth, and along face of wharfs, in harbour, to a depth of 17 feet. Ownership of wharfs unknown to department.

GRAND TRUNK TRAINMEN'S STRIKE.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Did the government offer to appoint Judge Barron to investigate the cases of striking Grand Trunk railway employees who had not been taken back, and did the railway company decline to accept such appointment?
2. Did the railway company subsequently appoint Judge Barron for this purpose? If so, what control or supervision has the government over the investigations now being held by Judge Barron?
3. What facilities are provided the men for having their cases investigated, and is there any limit to the time in which this investigation shall be completed?
4. Have the men who are not yet reinstated received due notice of the investigation, and is there any understanding with the government that Judge Barron's recommendations will be carried out by the railway?
5. Does the government consider that because of this investigation now being held, it has done its full duty towards the men and relieved itself of all further responsibility, under the agreement or understanding had between the railway company and the government on 2nd August last, when the strike ended?

Mr. KING:

1. It was suggested by the government that a reference to some third party of the cases of those employees who had not been reinstated, would appear to be a fair means of settling the points in dispute between the parties. Judge Barron was mentioned as a person well qualified to act in such a capacity. The employees of the Grand Trunk railway expressed their willingness to have outstanding difficulties so referred; the company did not express a like willingness.
2. To the first part the answer is 'Yes'. To the second part the answer is 'None'.
3. The government is informed by Judge Barron that he is affording the men every possible facility, and that he is proceeding with the investigation as rapidly as possible.
4. To the first part, the answer is 'Yes'. To the second part the answer is 'No'.
5. The agreement of August 2 last was between the parties to the dispute, and not between the government and either or both of the parties.

DREDGE 'SYDENHAM.'

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. What were the earnings each month during 1910 of the dredge 'Sydenham' of the Canadian Dredging Company, operating at Tiffin, Victoria Harbour, Waubaushene, or elsewhere?
2. What quantities and kind of excavation was removed by it each of said months?
3. Who was the government inspector on said dredge certifying the same?
4. Were there any differences between the amount claimed by owners or operators and the amount so certified to by the department?
5. Have any complaints been received by the department or its engineers as to the manner in which said work is being done or work previous thereto, or as to overcharge in quantity or quality of said excavation? If so, what and by whom was such complaint made?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. April 30 to July 2, Tiffin.
July 4 to October 8, Victoria Harbour.
October 10 to October 12, Victoria Harbour.
October 12 to 29, Tiffin.
October 25, Midland.
October 31 to December 3, Tiffin.

April	$ 435 00
May	17,378 24
June	25,688 01
July	9,116 28
August	10,100 00
September	21,317 38
October	13,795 90
November	31,914 03
December	4,124 25

2.

	Cubic yards.
April	1,500
May	59,364
*June	13,241
*July	68,532
*August	80,800
*September	40,200
*October	31,661
November	16,583
December	1,833

*Clay, sand, gravel, boulders and rock.
3. William H. Hecker.
4 and 5. No.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS PENSION FUND.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. Did a delegation of Intercolonial railway and Prince Edward Island railway men interview the Minister or Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals within the last two years with reference to some proposed amendments to the Intercolonial railway and Prince Edward Island railway Employees' Provident Fund Act?
2. Were those proposed amendments referred to an actuary? If so, on what date?
3. Has the actuary made his report? If so, when?
4. Is it the intention of the government to lay these proposed amendments before the House this session?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.
2. Yes. September 22, 1910.
3. December 31, 1910.

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. What is the minimum and what is the maximum salary per annum, respectively, paid to railway mail clerks?
2. What percentage of the railway mail clerks receive the maximum salary?
3. Do the railway mail clerks require to pass examinations before entering the service?
4. Is the government aware that the insurance companies are said to recognize mail clerks as dangerous risks, and class them as extra hazardous, and that as a consequence a mail clerk, if he desires insurance, must pay an extremely high premium?
5. Is it the intention of the government to give a favourable consideration to the claims of the railway mail clerks now being made for an increase in salary?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Minimum, $400; maximum, $1,200, in addition to which such employees are paid mileage allowances for every mile travelled whilst on duty.
2. 18·3 per cent.
3. Yes.
4. No, on the contrary it is understood that such employees can obtain accident insurance at rates applicable to the 'ordinary' class, and that no extra rate is charged for life insurance.
5. Question under consideration.

NOVA SCOTIA PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. MADDIN:

1. Referring to the estimates providing for the construction of the following public works: Melford, N.S., construction of wharf, $6,000; Mulgrave, N.S., construction of wharf, $5,000; Port Felix, N.S., construction of wharf, $5,000; will these works be constructed by tender and contract or by day work?
2. Have any of these contracts for these works been awarded? If so, to whom?
3. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with all these works in 1911?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. By contract.
2. Port Félix awarded to Messrs. A. W. Girroir and K. Sweet.
3. Yes.

PREVENTIVE OFFICERS.

Mr. MADDIN:

What are the duties of the preventive officers at outposts, and on whose recommendation or request are such officers appointed?

Mr. MURPHY. The duties of preventive officers of customs vary according to the locality in which they are employed. At outports, preventive officers are usually engaged in the prevention of smuggling, and in checking, manifesting and delivering bonded freight. They are appointed on the recommendation of the Minister of Customs.

CUSTOMS REVENUE IN GUYSBOROUGH COUNTY.

Mr. MADDIN:

What was the total amount of customs revenue received or collected during the last ten years at the following ports in Guysborough county, Nova Scotia: Sonora, Port Hilford, Oyster Ponds and Country Harbour?

Mr. MURPHY. No customs revenue was collected at Sonora, Port Hilford, Oyster Ponds or Country Harbour during the last ten years. The places mentioned are preventive stations and not customs ports; and the officers located at these points are not authorized to collect customs duties.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return showing the date of incorporation, a copy of the Act of incorporation, and any subsequent amendments thereto, all petitions, correspondence, applications and other papers or data asking for or relating to the grant of subsidy thereto, a copy of all contracts for construction, the subsidies granted and the several payments of the same, the dates of payment and the persons to whom cheques were issued therefor, a copy of engineer's reports and certificates on which payment was authorized in each case, the number of miles completed, the number now being operated, the number of miles still to be finished, the total cost to date and the estimated cost of completion, and the present condition of the road, in the case of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company, the Quebec and Oriental Railroad Company and the new Canadian Company. Also the shareholders, directors and officers of each of these companies, the capital subscribed and paid up by each subscriber, the amounts paid out each year to directors and officers as fees and salaries, the amount paid for promotion or other expenses, in detail, for each of the above companies. In the case of any mileage operated, the yearly revenues and working expenses.—Mr. Foster.

Copy of all correspondence with the Department of the Interior or any officer thereof in regard to half-breed scrips numbers A. 8931 and A. 9970 issued to Joseph William Malbœuf, together with a copy of all documents in any way relating to the said scrips.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence, petitions and communications referring in any manner to the establishment or maintenance of the mail route from Athol post office to South Athol, County of Cumberland, N.S.—Mr. Rhodes.

A return showing—1. A copy of the report of the engineer who made the survey and estimate of the Back river or Rivière des Prairies, between the eastern end of the island of Montreal and the Lake of Two Mountains, in the province of Quebec, in view of the dredging and deepening of said river.

2. Details of work and expenditure to date in connection with the said work.

3. Estimate of cost of work remaining to be done and especially of the part between Bord-à-Plouffe and the Lake of Two Mountains.—Mr. Monk.

1. Showing in tons the eastbound and westbound traffic on the Intercolonial railway for the five years ending June 30, 1910.

2. The miles of main Trunk line and branches of the Intercolonial railway in each province through which it passes, distinguishing the Trunk lines from the branches.

3. Showing in tons the westbound traffic originating in each of the maritime provinces during the period of five years ending June 30, 1910.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a return showing how many appointments have been made by the government from the constituency of Wentworth since 1904, together with their names, to what positions appointed, and the salary or remuneration in each case.—Mr. Blain.

For a return showing:—1. All grants, leases, licenses, and concessions given to individuals or corporations of water power rights or privileges on the Winnipeg River at present in force.

2. The names and descriptions of such power sites.

3. The terms and conditions upon which they are respectively held.

4. The dates upon which these powers or privileges were respectively given.

5. What constitutes forfeiture.

6. What grants, leases or licenses have been forfeited.

7. The general rules and regulations, if any, applying to the giving and holding of the water powers on this river.

8. The amount of development effected by the grantees or lessees respectively.

9. What title or interest the Dominion claims in the running water, the bed of the river, and the banks thereof.—Mr. Haggart (Winnipeg).

CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

For a return showing the average value for duty in 1896 and 1910, respectively, of the unit of each article or commodity enumerated in the schedules of the Customs Act, on which an ad valorem duty was payable together with the rate of duty, the amount on which duty was paid, and the amount of duty paid for each year, with the totals, respectively.

He said: A return has already been brought down this year giving the units so that two of the three columns are already provided for. I would like to have all included in one return.

Motion agreed to.

DREDGING IN RIVIERE DES PRAIRIES.

Mr. WILSON (Laval) moved:

For a summary report on the state of the dredging works executed in the Rivière des Prairies up to the present time, making

specially known the length, depth and width of the canal dredged up to date and the amount expended on this work.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to detain the House at any length on this motion. The object of the motion is explicit enough on its face. Last year there was a certain amount of money voted for this purpose. I understand that some work has been done and the object of the motion is simply to get a summary report to find out what the progress of this work has been. I move that this motion be concurred in.

Mr. MONK. Before the motion carries, I would like to call the attention of the House to a motion of which I have given notice. It is No. 26 on the Order Paper and it calls for the same particulars in regard to this work. I think it would suit the convenience of all concerned if that motion were carried at the same time as that of my hon. friend, because it merely asks for the report of the engineer upon that work, a report having been ordered by the Department of Public Works before the work was undertaken, some details as to the cost of the work executed, and an estimate of the cost of the work remaining to be done. It is very much in the same direction as that of my hon. friend. I suppose there would be no objection on the part of the right hon. the Prime Minister to allow my motion to pass at the same time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. None whatever, if my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson, Laval) is agreeable. The hon. gentleman's motion will be called during the day.

Mr. MONK. Then, I would like to say a word on my hon. friend's motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very good; I have not heard my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) for some little time.

Mr. MONK. It is a very useful work and it is absolutely necessary that it should be completed. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), has already intimated, in answer to a question put here, that there is an item in the estimates for this year, regarding the completion of this work. It is only finished part of the way to St. Vincent. It would be essential that that work should be prosecuted to completion from the point where it is at present finished. Up to Cartierville or Bord-a-Plouffe, there is very little work to be done, I am informed. The bulk of the work is from Bord-a-Plouffe up to the Lake of Two Mountains and my information is that that part of the work is neither very difficult nor very costly. It would be of immense advantage to the daily increasing population along the shores of that branch of the Ottawa if this work were completed this year, as I hope it is the intention of the minister to do. If the cleaning of the river were completed it would be at once possible at certain seasons of the year to navigate from the Lake of Two Mountains down as far Cartierville, and to convey building material which is very expensive to bring in to that neighbourhood by any other than a water route. I strongly urge upon the Minister of Public Works to see that the work already begun, is completed this year. Furthermore, on both sides of the shores of the Back river a great number of Montreal people reside during the summer months, and the completion of the work contemplated by opening up the navigation of the river for the smaller craft, would enable them to reach the lake of Two Mountains. Montreal people pay such a large proportion of the Dominion taxes that I do not think it is asking too much of the government to undertake this small expenditure, so as to make the river navigable for small craft all around the island of Montreal. I therefore, join in the purpose of my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Wilson), and earnestly ask the government to see that this work is completed without fail during the coming season. My motion is:—

For a return showing—

1. A copy of the report of the engineer who made the survey and estimate of the Back river or Rivière des Prairies, between the eastern end of the island of Montreal and the Lake of Two Mountains, in the province of Quebec, in view of the dredging and deepening of said river.
2. Details of work and expenditure to date in connection with the said work.
3. Estimate of cost of work remaining to be done and especially of the part between Bord-à-Plouffe and the Lake of Two Mountains.

Hon. Wm. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). There is no objection at all to bringing down the returns in answer to these two motions. With regard to the work of dredging the Rivièr des Prairies, I may say that when the matter was first brought to my attention, it was urged that the channel would give accommodation for motor or pleasure boats. I was not greatly impressed with the argument in that respect, but later on my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Wilson), had a delegation wait upon me and presented petitions, and made very strong representations that the improvement of the Rivieré des Prairies would be of great advantage to the farmers, in enabling them to get their produce to market by water at a much cheaper rate than by rail. On the invitation of the hon. member for Laval, (Mr. Wilson), I had the pleasure of visiting the Riviére des Prairies last summer, and I would say to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), that I was greatly impressed with the advantages which would accrue from opening up and improving the waterway between

the St. Lawrence river and the Lake of Two Mountains. I concluded, however, that the work from the lower end of the Riviére des Prairies was more important, or rather that the improvement there was more urgently required than further up. That is where the work has been done during the past season. I have asked from parliament a further amount to continue this work and the intention is, as the money is provided, to continue the work up to the Lake of Two Mountains. However, for the present, I think the work on the lower part of the river is the most important, because it will afford better means of communication between that very beautiful and very rich section of the country, and the city of Montreal, than if we had begun the work further up in the first instance. But later on, as the moneys are provided I expect to continue the work right up to the Lake of Two Mountains.

Mr. MONK. Do I understand the minister to consent to the adoption of these two motions ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, to each of the two separately.

Mr. MONK. I would like to say that years before my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson), came to this House, and when he was still in the lower latitudes of provincial politics, I asked the chief of the Public Works department to carry out this work for the reasons which have been indicated now by my hon. friend from Laval. I repeatedly invited the Minister of Public Works to visit the locality, but I have never found him disposed to accept my hospitality. However, the advantages of, and need for, this work were pointed out by me more than 12 years ago.

Mr. C. A. WILSON (Laval). I quite agree to a certain extent with the remarks of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), except on one point. When this appropriation was asked last year for the dredging of the river, it was my intention and as a matter of fact, I communicated it to the Minister of Public Works, that the work should be started at both ends of the river. But, when we came to commence the work, we found we could not find a suitable dredge for operations on the upper part of the river, and it was thought better to start from the main channel of the St. Lawrence, so that the navigation which formerly existed between St. Vincent de Paul and the St. Lawrence river, might be restored. I understand from the minister, that there is no objection (if the report of the engineer which is already in the department, endorses it), that the work will be completed next year if possible.

Mr. MONK. May I ask my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Wilson), as he seems to have taken an interest in the matter, if the work on the upper part of the river is going to be carried out next year ?

Mr. WILSON (Laval). I understand that depends on the report of the engineer. My information is, that there was not a suitable dredge to start the work at the Lake of Two Mountains, and as a matter of fact, the only dredge adapted for the work, is known as an orange peel dredge—

Mr. MONK. This looks like a lemon.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). That dredge can work in five or six or eight feet of water, and the dredges which belong to the department of Public Works draw too much water to go down by the rapids.

ADMIRALTY COURT, N. S.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (N. Cape Breton), moved for:—

A copy of all correspondenec between the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Nova Scotia in respect to the proposed change in the constitution of the Admiralty Court for that province.

He said: For some time past I have been endeavouring to get better facilities than now exist for the exercise of the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Court in the province of Nova Scotia. As far back as 1905, when I first entered this House, I had some negotiations with the then Minister of Justice, now Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, and the then judge of the Admiralty Court, and my proposition at that time was to form of the island of Cape Breton, or its four counties, into a separate admiralty district. However, something happened at that time to prevent that proposition from being put into operation. The then Minister of Justice and the late judge of the Admiralty Court both agreed that it was necessary to improve the situation in the province of Nova Scotia, and to give us better facilities for the administration of the business of that court than we then had. In the year 1908 a resolution was introduced by the present Minister of Justice proposing, by a Bill to be brought into the House, to give us the kind of facilities we desired. The Bill reached only its first reading on the 12th of March, 1908, and for some reason or other was dropped, and nothing much has been said about it since. Now, in the province of Nova Scotia, as well as in the other provinces of the Dominion, there is a great deal of work for this court to do. My complaint is not that the law and the practice are not properly administered by the court now dealing with it. We have had, for many years, a very capable gentleman at the head of that court, at one time Minister of Justice of this Dominion and afterwards chief justice of our own province. He is not now, however, actively

engaged in the administration of that court, but we have in his place one of the judges of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, who is well able to discharge the duties devolving upon him. What I am complaining of is not the law, or the practice of the court, but the difficulties in the way of starting proceedings in the court. It will be observed, on looking at the Admiralty Act of this House, being chapter 141 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, that there is only one place in each province where a writ of the Admiralty Court can be issued—for the province of Ontario, in the city of Toronto; for the province of Quebec, in the city of Quebec; for the province of Nova Scotia, in the city of Halifax; for the province of New Brunswick, in the city of St. John; for the province of Prince Edward Island, in the city of Charlottetown. It is well known that in Nova Scotia the admiralty business extends to every part of the province. In the port from which I come there entered last year over 1,000 large steamers, only a few ships in number below the number that entered the great national port of Montreal. Out of this business there arise a great many complications, requiring the speedy exercise of the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Court, and it is exceedingly awkward to be obliged to go to Halifax, a distance of some 300 miles, before we can issue a writ. The proceedings against a ship are different from those against a person. A writ against a ship can only be issued while the ship is within the bounds of the province, and often claims are lost to seamen, salvers and towboats because the ship against which the claims lie gets out of the jurisdiction before it is possible to get the papers from Halifax to proceed against her. It is not necessary to argue that it is not sufficient to have good laws, but that it is equally necessary to have those laws executed and to have the court so placed that litigants can with ease and expedition take proceedings. The purpose of my moving this motion is to ascertain from the government whether it is proposed to take any steps to correct the difficulty of which I complain, so that we shall have in connection with the Admiralty Court exactly the same opportunities of getting into the court as we have in the other courts of the provinces. Although not a very old barrister, I remember when we had only two sittings of the Supreme Court in the county of Cape Breton. To-day we have seven sittings of that court, which shows how its business has enlarged. While the business of the Admiralty Court is enlarging in the same way, even more rapidly proportionately, we have in that court the same condition of things that we had 150 years ago, at the time the court was established. I think that every hon. member of this House will acknowledge that to be obliged to go 200 or 300 miles to issue a writ in any court in this Dominion is rather behind the age, and that we cannot move too quickly in bringing about better conditions which will enable litigants more speedily to get their remedies in this court, which has exclusive jurisdiction in many matters.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the motion which the hon. gentleman has placed upon the Order Paper, there is, of course, no objection to the production of any such correspondence which may exist. The subject which my hon. friend has discussed in making the motion is one of very considerable practical importance. I may say at once that, so far as I am concerned, I have not in the least degree changed the opinions which I formed after a good deal of consideration of this matter, and which I stated to this House on the 12th of March, 1908. I then introduced a resolution, which was considered in Committee of the Whole, declaring the expediency of making better provision for the exercise of admiralty jurisdiction within Canada, and upon that resolution being adopted in committee, I introduced a Bill founded upon it. That Bill was not pressed to a conclusion, but was dropped at the end of the session. The only reason, so far as I am concerned, why it was not pressed to a conclusion was the very strong objections to what was being proposed, which, on that occasion, were given utterance to by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House for whose opinions I had the most sincere respect. The general feeling, as I gathered it from the course of that debate, was against making any change, and, indeed, some hon. gentlemen expressed themselves as entirely content with the existing condition of things in the different provinces of the Dominion, and as thinking that no improvement could be made upon it.

I am sorry that I was not convinced by anything I heard on that occasion, and the three years which have passed since, with the experience they have given me of the working of the present system, have confirmed the opinion I then had formed, and which I then strongly expressed, namely, that existing conditions in the administration of justice in admiralty matters in Canada are simply intolerable. My hon. friend has instanced one circumstance which, if it were the only one, would seem to me now, as it did three years ago, to call for a remedy. Action has often to be taken and taken speedily. It is often a denial of justice to a man and the loss of his claim unless he can assert it, in admiralty matters particularly, with promptness and despatch, as the proceedings are frequently issued, not against the individual but against the ship, with the object of fastening the claim upon something tangible and secur-

ing judgment against the thing itself. A ship is here to-day and gone to-morrow. Wages to the men may be due; they may be unable to collect unless they can attach the ship and force payment in that way of what is justly due them by the owner. The ship may be a foreign vessel, it may be in port in Canada only a few hours, and unless you can serve process against the ship while she remains within Canadian jurisdiction, there may be no redress. But, under the present system proceedings cannot be instituted except through the post. You cannot attach by telegram, so that no matter where you may live, you must have your papers issued from the centre of the province to be served in the port, a process which may take 48 hours or longer. In the meantime the ship is gone, and your claim with it. That position of matters, if there were no other reason, did seem to me to call for a remedy ; and I thought that in the proposition to transfer the admiralty jurisdiction from the Exchequer Court to the various provincial courts, I had found a remedy. I was not able to understand the violent—I think I am not using any too strong a word—opposition which this proposition created among lawyers generally in the different larger centres in Canada where legal business would no doubt be more or less affected by the change I was proposing. That change, I must remind hon. gentlemen who were here at the time, was what I have just intimated, namely, simply the transfer of the admiralty jurisdiction to the various provincial courts so that every judge of a Superior Court in every province would be clothed with that jurisdiction, and so that a Surrogate Court or local judge, having authority to act in Superior Court matters, could be found in the person of every county judge in every province. The effect would be that any one desiring to institute proceedings in admiralty matters could do so in his own county town with the same facility with which he could issue an ordinary writ of summons for the enforcement of an ordinary civil claim. But the proposal was infringing upon what had been supposed to be a greater or less extent, the private preserves of this, that or the other local practitioner. It was interfering with existing conditions and vested rights ; it was going to take from a judge in one province or another some exclusive jurisdiction and hand that over generally to all the Superior Court judges in that province ; and accordingly every friend of every judge who would be effected by this measure, and every friend of every local registrar or clerk of court who might see a possible diminution in his salary was in arms against the suggestion ; and with regard to the local legal practitioner who at present is compelled just because he cannot do this admiralty work in his own town or office, to send it to some provincial centre, all of the professional men in those provincial capitals were at once arrayed against this proposal which might cut into their incomes. It was too radical, it was wrong from every point of view, and the opposition offered both by friends and opponents in this House being all but unanimous, I was forced to think, in deference to the body of opinion which seemed to be against me, that I was altogether too radical and had better cease my efforts to become a law reformer. The Bill accordingly was not gone on with, and matters have remained in the same condition since 1908 that they were in since 1891. I think that is entirely anomalous, and if it appears, from the course of the present debate, that the views of hon. gentlemen in this regard have changed, and that a measure such as I introduced three years ago would now receive a different sort of welcome, I shall be only happy to introduce it over again and submit it for consideration. I should like to say further that if it be remembered how the admiralty jurisdiction which is now vested in the Exchequer Court, came to be conferred upon that court, I think it will be seen at once that in the suggestion to transfer that jurisdiction to the various provincial courts there is nothing really radical. Until 1891 the admiralty jurisdiction had been exercised in Canada by the British Vice Admiralty Court, which might be, and probably was in each case, presided over by a judge who possessed by appointment from Canadian source the ordinary jurisdiction of Superior Courts in Canada, but who received his admiralty jurisdiction from England, and the procedure differed materially, when he was sitting in admiralty from that which existed when he happened to be sitting in the ordinary discharge of his duties as judge of a Canadian court.

In 1890, the imperial parliament passed its Act by which jurisdiction was conferred upon colonial legislatures, if they saw fit, to alter that state of things; and the language of the Imperial Act passed in 1890, contemplated, as it seems to me, that the admiralty jurisdiction which was then being taken away from the British vice-admiralty courts in the various colonies should be conferred upon the ordinary courts of each colony by colonial legislation. Let me read the section of the British Act, which, as it seems to me, has that plain intendment:

> Every court of law which may be declared to be a Court of Admiralty shall possess this jurisdiction, or, failing any such declaration, every court of law which has in a British possession original unlimited civil jurisdiction shall be a Court of Admiralty.

Now, if we had made in Canada no declaration on the subject—as we did make by the statute of 1891—then, under the Imperial Act, this admiralty jurisdiction would have gone just where by the Bill of three years ago I proposed to send it—namely to those courts which had original unlimited civil jurisdiction. But in 1891 this parliament passed its Act by which admiralty jurisdiction was conferred upon the Exchequer Court, the only federal court available, not a court which possessed original unlimited civil jurisdiction, but a special statutory court which had then recently been established. If any one will take the trouble to examine the debate upon that occasion, he will see how much Sir John Thompson, who was then Minister of Justice, hesitated. He states his hesitation with perfect candour to the House and with how slight an overbalancing of the hesitation it was he came to the conclusion to try the experiment of conferring this jurisdiction upon the new Exchequer Court which, at that time, I suppose—indeed, I know—had not very much of Exchequer Court business to do as compared with what it has to-day.

Well, now, the practical working out of the course which was then taken is that there must be a deputy of the judge of the Exchequer Court in certain localities in the Dominion. These deputies of the exchequer judge are local judges in admiralty of the Exchequer Court. There is one in Nova Scotia, one in Prince Edward Island, one in New Brunswick, one in Quebec, one in Ontario, one in British Columbia and one in the Yukon. The other provinces, having no maritime business to do, have never had a local judge in admiralty appointed. Now, in each of the provinces where there is a local judge in admiralty, the individual holding the position is either one of the judges of the Superior Court of the province or a retired judge of the Superior Court of the province. The proposition that I made was, not that there should be only one such judge in each province and that one a deputy of the judge in exchequer at Ottawa, but that there should be as many judges in admiralty in each province as there were judges in the Superior Court of that province, and that these judges should not be any retired judges of the court who had been superannuated, but the active working judges for the time being of the provincial Superior Court, the work to be divided among them and taken by them exactly as their ordinary work is divided, and as they would distribute among themselves the ordinary work of the courts which they were assigned to take, and that there should be in each instance a surrogate or local judge of the provincial court in the person of the county judge of each county in each province possessing the jurisdiction to do the ordinary practice work which such judges now possess in the Superior Courts of the various provinces.

I was not able to understand the strong opposition which that proposition elicited; and I can only say that, in my humble judgment, the three years which have passed since then have made matters just three years worse. In some provinces, I think, there is to-day no practical difficulty. It would be invidious to particularize, but while it is the case that in some of the provinces everything is satisfactory, although all of the admiralty work is being done in each case by one judge instead of being distributed among all the members of the court, in other provinces, I am satisfied, things are certainly in a very unfortunate position at the present time.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I would like to join with my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) who moved the resolution in expressing the opinion that the time has come when there should be an amendment of the law in regard to the admiralty jurisdiction and the carrying out of litigation before that court, if not all over Canada at least in the maritime provinces. It is not necessary to supplement the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) who has gone into the matter so fully, and who, if I understand him, expressed the opinion that there is ample cause for the amendment sought by my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). Certainly, so far as jurisdiction is concerned, there could be no anomaly in assigning to each one of the members of the Supreme Court of any one of our provinces, the right to deal with all questions which may arise in regard to shipping. There is no magic, there is no mystery, surrounding the law relating to shipping. I remember that the discussion on the Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice three years ago, some hon. members ventured to assert that there was some particular quality in the law relating to shipping, making it so different from any other branch of the law that the only way in which it could be satisfactorily administered was to assign to it a judge whose sole duty it would be to deal with this subject. Those who deal with the practice of the law must know that there are many branches of the law of which this could be said with at least equal truth. For instance, in regard to companies; the complications that have developed in the law relating to companies have been so great that it might be said with greater reason than in the case of the law relating to shipping that we should have a special judge to administer that law. To those engaged in shipping and those living in the seaport towns, the grievance arising out of this matter is a very real one, the present system giving rise to great difficulty and serious expense. Even after giv-

ing due weight to the arguments in the debate referred to against the change in the courts, I trust that the motion of my hon. friend from Cape Breton will be implemented and that this much desired reform will be brought into effect.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as the operations of the matter referred to by the Minister of Justice are concerned, I should imagine that an easier remedy, or at all events, a more effective remedy might be found than the one suggested. As I understood his argument in the first instance it related to the necessity of expedition in admiralty proceedings. He pointed out that a ship may be in a Canadian port for only a few days or hours, and he spoke of the delay which resulted from the necessity of obtaining a warrant from the central office. All that could be avoided, it seems to me, by a change in the rules of the Exchequer Court, by the establishment of local offices in different parts of the province. So far as to the magnitude of the business is concerned, I do not remember the time in Nova Scotia and I am more familiar with conditions in that province than elsewhere, when the business could not be attended to by one judge in addition to the other work devolving upon him. I have had a good deal of experience in the work of the Exchequer Court and the Admiralty Court and I am bound to say I never had the slightest difficulty in effecting an arrest and I never had any special difficulty in getting any case heard in the Admiralty Court. In fact I have had just as much difficulty and just as much delay in respect of the ordinary every day business of the Exchequer Court of Canada as I have had in connection with the local Admiralty Court of the province of Nova Scotia.

I do not desire to again go over the arguments upon the Bill with which my hon. friend has dealt, at very great length. I know there was a great deal of opposition to the Bill which he introduced. Opposition developed in different quarters for different reasons. I fully appreciate the position taken by the Minister of Justice and the hon. member who introduced this motion that there ought to be no unusual or unnecessary delay in the Admiralty Court. I am prepared to go further and say that the Admiralty Court ought to be one in which cases could be proceeded with more expeditiously perhaps than in any other court in the country. It is so for the most part; in the Admiralty Court there are no pleadings. Within a few days after a vessel has been seized and without any formal pleadings the case is set down for trial unless the court in its wisdom orders that pleadings shall be filed. For the most part the case goes on without pleadings and without much delay. I venture to suggest that a great deal of what my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has put forward as a grievance can be met by the establishment of local offices of the Admiralty Court in the different provinces and by the appointing of deputy registrars. The conditions were not very much changed by the Act of 1891. Up to that time, in a great many provinces at least, the chief justice for the time being had been appointed by the imperial authorities to be the judge in admiralty. After the introduction of the Act of 1891 by Sir John Thompson the judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada became the judge in admiralty, and he appointed the same men to be the local judges who had been acting before, at least in Nova Scotia, so that after all things went on very much as they had been going on in the past. The practice of the court was rendered simpler, but otherwise matters went on in very much the same way. I repeat that the appointing of a number of registrars would do a great deal to remove the inconvenience which has been alluded to this afternoon by the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie).

Mr. CONMEE. I do not rise to discuss the question from a legal point of view, but it appears to me that the Bill to which the Minister of Justice referred is the best remedy to apply. There is no reason, so far as I can judge, why there should not be every facility for dealing with such matters. I happen to represent the cities of Port Arthur and Fort William where there is a large amount of shipping, I believe larger than in any other port in Canada, taking the two cities together. There is a great deal of difficulty there. Time and again it has occurred that vessels could not be arrested and the remedy which ought to have been applied under the Admiralty Court could not be applied because of the distance from any jurisdiction in that regard. I think that matter has been referred to by the legal profession in those two cities and called to the attention of the Minister of Justice. I am sure the Minister of Justice is right and I hope he will have the courage of his convictions and go on and put the Bill through.

Mr. McKENZIE. The remedy proposed by the leader of the opposition will to some extent meet the particular grievance that we complain of in Nova Scotia, particularly in the eastern part of that province, but unless the Act will provide that the judge will go on circuit and try cases when ready for trial we would still be in very much the same difficulty as before. Very often we have as our witnesses in a case every member of the crew of a ship. It costs $30 a head of conduct money to take

witnesses from the town where I live, a seaboard town, to Halifax. If you have to take ten or twelve seamen it amounts to a large sum in trying a case in Halifax.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It has been the practice sometimes to take the evidence of such witnesses before a commission and thus obviate their being brought to Halifax. I know that is done in many cases and possibly it might be done still. But apart from that I would like to supplement my remarks by saying that I think there is no reason in the world why the judge should not go on circuit and try these cases.

Mr. McKENZIE. The practice of taking evidence before a commission does not apply much more to trials in the Admiralty Court than in any other court. There is, of course, a provision under the judicature Act which differs very little from the practice of the Admiralty Court that the judge may order that the evidence may be taken before a commission and submitted to the judge. That applies, of course, perhaps with greater facility to admiralty cases but if it is objected to on the other side and a desire is expressed before the judge for the cross-examination of these witnesses before the judge himself I do not know that the order would be granted or that it would be permitted to examine witnesses in that way. Therefore, having the judge go on circuit, having the cases tried on the spot and as speedily as possible, because you cannot hold these witnesses for any great length of time, would be the best remedy. It is desirable to have facilities for issuing papers in the Exchequer Court as in any other and the trial in the ordinary way by a circuit judge.

I do not quite understand how my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), hesitates in agreeing to throw this jurisdiction into the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. I think myself, that the tendency will be, to have a more competent better equipped court, than we have now. We would then have seven judges in admiralty with the ordinary life in the court which does not exist in any court when there is only one judge, and that one judge only dealing with admiralty as something subsidiary to his other business. I think, judging by the court we have to-day in Nova Scotia, it would be an exceptionally strong Admiralty Court, the practice being the same, the law not changed in any way whatever and a great part of the law being common to both courts. The law of evidence, the law of practice and procedure, and the law of damage is common to both courts and each of the judges being quite capable of trying a suit in admiralty, I can hardly understand why any lawyer from Nova Scotia should object at all to having the jurisdiction exercised by one of these judges exercised by each and every one of them. I would be in favour of the Bill if the Minister of Justice will introduce it again and in that way I hope that such remedies as will give us improved conditions in the province, will be brought about. I beg to move the motion.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND TUNNEL.

Mr. J. W. RICHARDS (Prince Edward Island), moved:

For a copy of all memorials, reports, correspondence and documents in the possession of the government, not already brought down, relating to a survey of a route for a tunnel under the Straits of Northumberland between the province of Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada, and also relating to the construction of such tunnel.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words upon this question before the motion is passed. It has been discussed upon several occasions very fully, especially during the last session of this parliament, when my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Warburton), gave us a great deal of information with regard to the necessity of such a work. In the province of Prince Edward Island, we are very often at a great disadvantage in consequence of not having regular means of communication. In a fertile island of that kind, productive as it is, especially in its agricultural lands, the question of transportation is one of very great importance to us. It is true, that the winter steamers which we have in the service there, have been a considerable amount of help to us during the winter season in taking our products from the province to the mainland and other parts of the continent, but during severe winters communication in that way is very irregular and uncertain, and it has, to a certain extent, a bad effect on the progress of the island from a commercial point of view. I am ready to give credit to the government for their good work in giving to the province that magnificent steamer, the 'Earl Grey'. That boat was designed and built as an ice-breaker. She has done very good work and no doubt will do as well as any boat of that kind can possibly do, but there are times when it is impossible for any ice-breaker, no matter how strongly she may be built, to keep up regular communication and during these times, I feel that we are at a great disadvantage in consequence of not having regular communication.

With reference to the tunnel, there are some who, perhaps are disposed to treat this matter very lightly. But, it is a well known fact that tunnelling has made great advances in the world. There are many tunnels in the United States, in England and in other parts of Europe and the cost

of tunnelling to-day is not nearly as great as it was some years ago. A great deal more information has been obtained with reference to the work of tunnelling and consequently, the cost has been greatly reduced. Considering this matter in that light, I think that we are entitled in the province of Prince Edward Island to have some steps taken with the view of making an investigation or survey of the proposed route for the tunnel. This is a question of so much importance that it will not down until some investigation or survey has been made, in order that the question of the practicability or otherwise of the work may be settled.

I do not intend this afternoon to go fully into all the particulars with regard to tunnelling ; that is to say, the size of the tunnel, the material of which it should be constructed or such things as that because those are matters that have already been brought before this House, and it would be a subject which would be taken up by those who would undertake to make the survey. My object on the present occasion is again to bring this matter to the attention of this parliament, and I hope that in my efforts in this regard I shall have the support of members from the other provinces. I feel that the construction of this work would not only be of advantage to the province from which I come, but it would also be of great advantage to the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and, in fact, Ontario. It is not from the sectional point of view that I approach the discussion of this question. I look upon it as a question of national interest and importance. What benefits one province, especially with regard to the matter of allaying irritation and promoting harmony and good-will, is an advantage to all the provinces and, looking at the matter in this light, I think that we would expect that the people of the other provinces would give us their sympathy and support. I have understood that on some other occasions in this House, when this matter has been brought up for discussion, hon. members from the great province of Ontario who know practically something about tunnels have given expressions of opinion favourable to the construction of this work between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

My object, as I have said, in bringing this matter before the House, is to again direct the attention of parliament to the great desirability of having some steps taken with a view to making a proper survey. It is true that a survey was made some few years ago, but I am told by engineers who are capable of passing an opinion upon such a subject that the servey, though good as far as it goes, is not sufficient to enable anybody to make an estimate as to the cost of the work. The position, as far as I can gather, that the people of Prince Edward Island take with reference to this matter is this : They say that if we have a survey made, and it is a proper survey, and it is found that the construction of this tunnel could be undertaken at something like a reasonable cost, at such an expenditure as we would have a right to expect the government would be justified in making, then, let us have it. If, on the other hand, it is shown by an investigation that this work is of such a magnitude, that its cost would be so great that this parliament would not be justified in making such a big expenditure for a province like Prince Edward Island, then the question will be settled, and there will be no more about it. But, until something of this kind is done there will be this agitation for the construction of this work, and I do sincerely hope that serious consideration will be given to this matter, that it will be taken up vigorously, and that such measures will be adopted that the question can be settled as to whether the construction of a tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland is a practicable work or whether it is not.

From the information that I have been able to obtain from engineers who have had experience in work I am led to believe that such a project may be practicable, but that it will be difficult to make an estimate of its cost until a survey has been made. If that work can be constructed for $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 I think the parliament of Canada would be amply justified in making such an appropriation to afford to the smallest province of this great Dominion regular and continuous communication both winter and summer with the mainland. I could say a very great deal more on this important question, but I think I have said sufficient to call the attention of the government to the desirability of taking steps towards having a proper and thorough survey made in connection with the tunnel project.

Mr. A. L. FRASER (Kings, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, I also wish to say a few words on this subject, which is not new to the House, and which in the past has been often and ably advocated. I shall not go at length into the subject, but I may say to those people who have expressed an opinion that the country would not be justified in building this tunnel at all on account of the cost, that they do not exactly know what they are talking about. However that may be, what the people of Prince Edward Island want now, and what they have been asking for years is that a survey be made to determine the estimated cost. If the cost is so large as to be unreasonable and unjustifiable, then the people of Prince

Edward Island would not press their claim. But, Sir, the people of my province make a fair and reasonable request when they ask the government to provide money for a survey. I spoke on this point last year, and I was answered by the Minister of Finance in the following words, which I shall quote from page 290 'Hansard,' vol. I, 1909-10. These words of the Finance Minister, when circulated in our province, raised the hopes of many people that the survey would be proceeded with at once, but, unfortunately for us, nothing has been done. I quote from Mr. Fielding:—

I am glad to hear my hon. friends from the island say that all they ask is that this matter shall be thoroughly and impartially inquired into, and if the tunnel can be built at a moderate cost they think the work should be done. To that sentiment I most heartily subscribe, and I am quite sure that the government will have that feeling towards it. There have been some surveys in the past. I suppose that each of them in its day served the purpose, it was the best that could be had; but I quite agree with my hon. friends that the matter should be taken up more vigorously and more seriously, and that we should endeavour to get a reliable and thorough survey by the best engineers, and if, as a result of that survey, it is found that this important work can be constructed at a moderate cost, I for one, would promise my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island my most hearty and cordial support.

The Minister of Finance made this statement on the 22nd of November, 1909, in the early days of last session, and his announcement that the matter would be taken up vigorously and seriously led the people to think that last summer steps would be taken to begin this survey. I regret to say that the government are not entitled to claim any very great praise for the way in which they have since dealt with this question. The Minister of Finance told us it should be taken up seriously, and yet we are well on into the present session and the main estimates for next year are down and there is not one cent included in them for this tunnel survey. I would not like to accuse the government of holding this matter back until the next election, but I am afraid some people will be suspicious that the government is waiting until the approaching elections to take the matter up seriously and vigorously. I urge now that a sum of money be placed in the supplementary estimates of this year for the beginning of the survey, and that the government should proceed with the work without further delay.

Mr. A. B. WARBURTON (Queens, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, last session I had the honour of bringing this question myself before this House, and as I went into the question at considerable length and in great detail, I shall not speak at any great length to-day.

The question has been a sort of hardy annual before the House for many years, and unfortunately a great many people had come to look upon it, not in the serious light which it deserves. That, I think, is due to the manner in which this important question has been placed before the country in the past, by some well intentioned, but indiscreet, advocates in the press, on the platform, and in parliament. Owing to these ill-directed efforts this great scheme became, to some extent, I am sorry to say, a matter of more or less ridicule. At the first session of the present parliament, when I entered this House, I noticed this state of affairs, and in consultation with my colleagues we decided not to bring the matter before the House at that first session, but that the wiser course was to drop it for the time being, so that the absurd impression which had been created should be allowed to die out. I am glad to think that my anticipation in this regard has to some extent come to pass, and that now the people of Canada and the members of this parliament look upon the Prince Edward Island tunnel scheme in a more serious light than they formerly did. I shall not refer to the survey made 20 years ago by Sir Douglas Fox, further than to point out that in speaking of the method of the survey which he thought ought to be carried on before the government undertook the work, he was careful to state, in giving his estimate of the cost upon such data as he had before him, that this estimate would be likely to change as a result of more complete information than was then in his possession. He pointed out that the proper course would be to take the line across the straits, where it was proposed to build the tunnel, and then, taking two lines parallel with the centre line at a distance of 300 yards on either side, to bore holes along these lines through the underlying strata at intervals of 500 yards, so as to discover what the material was through which the tunnelling would have to be done. All that we ask at the present moment is that this recommendation of Sir Douglas Fox, or something similar to it, should be carried out. I wish it to be distinctly understood that at the present time we are not asking the government or the country to build a tunnel. Whenever we mention this matter in this House it is published in the newspapers that we are asking the government to build a tunnel. But, again, I wish it to be understood that what we are now asking is that a survey should be made to determine whether a tunnel is practicable or not. That, I think, is a very reasonable request. Owing to the supposed geological formation of red clay shale on a carboniferous or gray sandstone basis, said to contain small masses of fine standstone, it is said that there are likely to be fissures, and, therefore, a prime consideration in the question

of cost would be as to how much water would percolate through these fissures if there are such. It is said that if there are no fissures there will be no difficulty in building the tunnel, and hence the absolute necessity for a careful and complete survey.

A very large proportion of the cost of this great undertaking will depend upon the nature of the ground through which the tunnel has to pass—not with regard to the difficulty of boring, but with regard to the difficulty of keeping out the water; and the great object of a survey is to ascertain whether there are any such fissures. This shale overlies a sandstone base, which it is believed continues for about one-fourth of the distance; so that if fissures were found to exist in the sandstone, the amount of water they would admit into the tunnel would be a most important factor in the whole distance, according to Sir Douglas Fox. My hon. friend from Kings county, has put this matter very briefly, but very well, and I am not going to take up the time of this House in going into it in detail, as I thought I was justified in doing last session. I wish simply to try to impress upon you, Mr. Speaker, and this House the very great importance of this subject of transportation to Prince Edward Island. There is no province of the Dominion, not even excepting the western provinces, to which that subject is of so much importance; and if the question of a tunnel can be taken up and settled one way or the other, it will be of great advantage. If it is found to be practicable, it will be of great advantage to have the tunnel. If it is found to be impracticable, it will be of great advantage to have the question removed from the public arena.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it would be possible to give to our hon. friends from Prince Edward Island any stronger assurance of the sympathy which the government has for this most important project than was conveyed in the language of my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), at the last session of parliament, when he used these words:—

> I am glad to hear my hon. friend from the island say that all they ask is that this matter shall be thoroughly and impartially inquired into and if the tunnel can be built at a moderate cost they think the work should be done. To that sentiment I most heartily subscribe, and I am quite sure that the government will have that feeling towards it. There have been some surveys in the past. I suppose that each of them in its day served the purpose, it was the best that could be had; but I quite agree with my hon. friends that the matter should be taken up more vigorously and more seriously, and that we should endeavour to get a reliable and thorough survey by the best engineers, and if, as a result of that survey, it is found that this important work can be constructed at a moderate cost, I for one, would promise my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island my most hearty and cordial support.

I have no reason, Sir, to suppose that the views which were presented by the Minister of Finance on that occasion, are any different from those which are entertained by the government as a whole. The question, however, of making a survey is a very important one. There is no use of making further surveys unless they are more thorough and complete than the surveys which have been made in the past. Speaking for myself personally, I would say that if a company were formed, which would undertake to build a tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland for the sum which has been mentioned, $10,000,000, I would favour the granting of that aid for the purpose. The difficulty, however, as presented to me by the engineers of my department, is that a tunnel may cost $10,000,000 or it may cost $40,000,000, depending upon whether fissures should be encountered in the progress of the work, and let in water from the ocean, which would enormously increase the cost. Anybody who has made a study of tunnels, even through mountains, on dry land, realizes how difficult it is accurately to estimate the cost and the difficulty is, of course, enormously increased, in the case of a tunnel under water. Therefore, when a survey is undertaken, it is necessary that it should be undertaken under the guidance of the most competent and experienced engineers, and that it should be thorough and complete covering almost every foot of the distance between the mainland and the island. I can assure my hon. friends that the matter which has already been engaging the attention of my department, will be seriously considered, and I am not without hope, that provision will, before long, be made for a thorough and complete survey, which will be entirely satisfactory to our friends from Prince Edward Island.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the government ascertained anything as to the probable cost of a complete survey?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only in a general way. A complete survey would be pretty costly; but still, upon the information I have, I think the cost would not be regarded by parliament as larger than would be warranted by the great importance of the work, in case it should be possible to undertake it.

Mr. FRASER. Can the hon. minister give us any idea of the time at which he intends to take up this work of the survey?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I intend to submit the matter for the consideration of the government during the present session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may say, that at least three years ago, I am not sure that it was not four years ago, I strongly urged upon the government to do this very thing. I stated then that the people of Prince Edward Island and the people of the whole of the Dominion of Canada were entitled to know whether this was a practicable project or not, that ample time had already elapsed during which that information might have been obtained, and that, in my opinion, not a single day ought to be lost in taking effective steps for the purpose of enabling the government to place on the table of this House definite and specific information on this question. I entertain the same opinion to-day. I only regret that three or four years have been lost between that time and the present in which this work has not been taken up.

Motion agreed to.

NEW WESTMINSTER PENITENTIARY.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster), moved:

For a copy of all correspondence since the 1st of January, 1910, with the Department of Justice or any officers of that department, making or supporting request for increase of pay to employees of the penitentiary at New Westminster; and of all reports or recommendations in that connection made by any officer of the department. Also a copy of all reports made during the period indicated by the grand jury at New Westminster with reference to the conditions at said penitentiary.

He said: My object is to bring to the attention of the government and the House the very unsatisfactory situation of the officials of the penitentiary at New Westminster. The subject of the pay of these officials is not new to the government because for two or three years they have been making most persistent efforts to get an increase which will to some extent put them on a level with their much better situated neighbours in the city of New Westminster. They have been encouraged by government officials to believe that their petitions were receiving serious consideration, and that in a short time they might expect good results, but the years have gone on the conditions of their labour have continued the same and their responsibilities and expenses have increased, and still, though the necessity for their being paid higher wages has increased, nothing has transpired to warrant the belief that they are any nearer success now than when they began to petition. In the meantime public attention has been directed to the conditions in that institution. We had a few years ago a report, a most unfair report, from an official at Ottawa referring to irregularities in that penitentiary, and claiming that these showed inattention, neglect or perhaps incapacity on the part of the officers, notwithstanding the fact that the officers had petitioned in vain for efficient help, and also to have the conditions of those who were employed made tolerable. We have had the matter brought before the public in a new and in a very formal manner in a report made by the grand jury at the city of New Westminster, in which report the attention of the government was invited to the conditions at the penitentiary, and which declared that these conditions were such as to invite and facilitate the escape of every prisoner confined in it. No doubt the Department of Justice has taken cognizance of that report and has resolved on some line of policy; but so far as the officials at the penitentiary are concerned, they have heard nothing whatever of anything being done for the purpose of providing a remedy and removing the reproach which the grand jury has fastened upon that institution. In bringing this matter before the House, I am anxious to impress upon hon. members as forcibly as I can, the fact that there is not in the minds of the public at New Westminster, any reproach upon the penitentiary officials. The view taken locally of that institution is that there is indeed a lack of that efficiency which we have the right to expect, but that this is due to the fact that the rate of pay offered by the department makes it impossible for those in charge to secure the class of help which they desire in order to carry out its work effectively. They find their old hands constantly leaving to accept more lucrative employment outside; they find the material available to fill the vacancies consists only of persons temporarily out of employment who take that service merely as a means to obtaining better positions outside it later. I am well aware that the conditions at New Westminster are not confined to that city but are common to all the penitentiaries in the west, and to a lesser degree, to those in the east; but the conditions at Westminster are accentuated by the excessive cost of living as compared with the east, and by the failure of the department to make a proportionate allowance to equalize these conditions.

I have had prepared a statement from the figures presented in the 'Labour Gazette' of the cost of living in different places in Canada. I find that, as compared with eastern cities having penitentiaries, the cost of living in New Westminster is 51 per cent higher than at St. John, N.B., the point of comparison for Dorchester penitentiary, and 56 per cent higher than at Kingston. There is allowed to the lower officials west of Ontario $100 per year in consideration of their location, but this is absorbed absolutely by the difference in rent between New Westminster and the eastern cities. The table of rents,

as shown by the statistics in the 'Labour Gazette' shows that at St. John, the nearest town to Dorchester quoted in these statistics, the average working man pays $9 per month, at Kingston he pays $10 per month, while at New Westminster the lowest at which any of the staff of the penitentiary can secure a house is $18 per month. So you will see that the difference in rental between the east and the west absorbs the whole of the extra allowance and leaves nothing to compensate for the extra cost of living in other respects.

This matter of salary is regulated, I believe, by statute, and therefore, cannot be so readily adjusted as if the conditions were otherwise. But I see in the estimates a move on the part of the Minister of Inland Revenue to deal with the officials of that department west of Ontario by providing a special allowance of $150 a year for every employee below a certain amount. I would suggest that a similar course should be followed with regard to the New Westminster penitentiary and other institutions, pending a more thorough statutory adjustment which might well be made in the shape of a general increase in the salaries of the officials of those institutions. There is no purpose to be served by dwelling at any length on this matter, but I would ask the minister whether he cannot give some indication to these men to encourage them and their families to hope that there is a ray of light ahead of them.

Mr. BRADBURY. In this connection I would like to say a word or two regarding the institution at Stony Mountain. The employees there occupy very much the same position as those at Westminster. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) has put the case so well before the House that I need not say more than that I heartily concur in the opinions and sentiments expressed by him. The hon. Minister of Justice, has, I believe, received a petition from the employees of the Stony Mountain penitentiary drawing his attention to some of the facts in Manitoba similar to those described by my hon. friend from Westminster as existing there.

As everybody is aware who knows anything about western life, the cost of living is very much higher in the west than in the east. We also know that men occupying the position, for instance, of instructors in these institutions command, as a rule, very much larger wages outside than are received from the government. Men occupying positions similar to those of instructors in the Stony Mountain institution receive in Manitoba any where from $5 to $6 or $7 a day; and I understand that these men are working for the government for something like $2.50 a day. This, surely, should not be continued, and I enter a plea with the Minister of Justice to consider the position of these men, taking into consideration at the same time the fact that they must be men of ability to instruct those who are placed under their charge, and of a good deal of force of character to command the respect of those whom it is their duty to instruct. And that they have been successful is evidenced by many of the men who have been turned out of that institution in Manitoba. The class of instructors the government has secured for that institution, I am glad to say, is perhaps as high as that in any other institution in Canada. They are worthy of every consideration the government can show them. I urge upon the government the desirability of treating the instructors and others in these institutions fairly liberally to encourage them to take an interest in their duty by showing them that the country appreciates what they are doing for the unfortunates who are placed under their care.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I think I may at once state that I sympathize very sincerely with the views which have been expressed by both the hon. gentlemen who have discussed this motion. It is no longer ago than this morning that, at the breakfast table, I heard a discourse which was very eloquent and moving upon this very subject of the increased cost of living. And I scarcely know what the solution of the difficulty is to be. I think, however, that I can assure my hon. friends of the west that it is not alone in their part of the country that these difficulties are felt. Possibly, we shall continue to have them until the views of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) prevail, and we get rid of the increased price of commodities by getting rid of our tariff. Then, I suppose, we shall have nothing to pay except our taxes. And if we can manage to meet the taxes, the increased cost of living, possibly, will not be one of the things troubling every one who has to depend upon a fixed salary.

Now, with regard to the particular motion that is made here, there is certainly no objection to bringing down all the papers which exist and which are referred to in the motion. There is not, so far as I am aware, any presentment from a grand jury such as is referred to in the motion. I certainly have no recollection of seeing any such document within the last twelve months. But, upon the other branch of what is asked for, the application for increase of salaries of officials in the penitentiary at New Westminster, there have been urgent representations made during the last few months, and I have been for a longer period than that aware from the practical administration of affairs in the penitentiary that conditions are not satisfactory. Exactly what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor,

New Westminster) mentions is taking place. We need good men, reliable men, men of good physical as well as mental qualifications, for the responsible position of guards in our penitentiaries. But such men can get better wages outside than they can get in the service, and the result is very generally that we no sooner get a good, capable man acquainted with his duties than some one else comes along and offers him more, and, of course, he takes it and we lose the man who has just learned to be valuable. But, while that is so, the practical question of what is to be done is far from being free from difficulty. The increased cost of living, as I said, seems not to be at all confined to the west. We have just as strong representations, just as numerous and emphatic representations, from our penitentiaries in the maritime provinces and in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and these representations have been so unanimous from each one of our six penitentiaries and there has been so much practical difficulty in securing anything like permanency of service, of our guards particularly, that the question has become one which, I am afraid, cannot be any longer put off from practical consideration. I had been sanguine, when I took up the duties of the Department of Justice four years ago that this question, so far as the penitentiaries were concerned, would probably not need to be considered again during my tenure of office. It was the first piece of work, I think, to which I fell heir when I took charge of the Department of Justice, to have in hand before the Committee of the Whole in this House the newly revised Penitentiaries Act which was passed in 1906. By that statute, a very considerable general increase in salaries was given. There was an effort to make that uniform. I think that effort was in the right direction. I should like to see the salaries uniform. It is difficult to satisfy the man from Nova Scotia or New Brunswick that his services in the penitentiary are not worth just as much as those of the man in identically the same position at Stony Mountain or New Westminster. And it is a very invidious sort of thing to make a distinction upon any such ground as that the cost of living is higher in one section of the country than in another. If it is to be recognized as right in the penitentiary service, it must follow in all branches of the service, and with the service to the country worth just as much in one part of the Dominion as in another, it is difficult to justify upon principle the making of any distinction.

In respect to what is to be done about it, I cannot give any other answer than to say, and I do say in all sincerity, that the subject is receiving, and will continue to receive, the most careful consideration of which I am capable. It is one which does not rest altogether with me, perhaps not at all with me; it is something in respect to which I must procure the assent of my colleagues to any recommendation I may make and, of course, the assent of this House. These salaries are fixed by statute. If the time has come, notwithstanding that it is only four years since there was an increase, it is for this House to say so, and if I can see my way to a recommendation which will to some extent alleviate the condition of things which has been spoken of by hon. gentlemen this afternoon and which in the practical everyday administration of the department, I certainly have very acutely felt for months, if not for years, I shall personally be only too glad.

Motion agreed to.

DISPUTED PATENT TO LAND.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster), moved:—

For a copy of all correspondence between the Department of the Interior or any of its officers and any other persons, respecting the timber on the Fanny Louise Irwin homestead in the district of Chilliwack, British Columbia, including any instructions to solicitors to issue a writ in Exchequer Court for cancellation of timber rights not reserved in Crown grant of the homestead.

He said: I wish in a very few words to call attention to what I regard as a bluff on the part of the Department of Justice, but which while it does not appear serious to me is giving a great deal of uneasiness to the farmers in the district of Chilliwack against whom it is directed. The story at the foundation of this motion, is told in a couple of official letters summarized in this communication from the legal firm of Davis, Marshall & Macneil, of Vancouver, addressed to William R. Barge, of Rosedale. That letter reads:—

In January, 1910, you purchased from Mrs. Jane E. Hermon 10 acres of land, being part of the northeast quarter-section 34, township 2. Mrs. Hermon purchased this property from Fanny Louise Irwin, who in turn obtained it from the Crown in August, 1903. The Department of Justice have instructed their solicitors at Ottawa to bring an action against you and the other holders of this property to have the patent issued, cancelled on the ground that it was issued in error, and should have reserved to the government the timber upon the lands in question. We have been asked by the solicitors for the Department at Ottawa to endeavour to come to some amicable arrangement with the owners before they issue a writ in the Exchequer Court against you.

The proposal made by the department is for the owners to agree to surrender the patent in question, upon the understanding that the Crown will issue a fresh patent reserving the timber. Would you be prepared to do this? Kindly let us know at once, as failing to hear from you, or should you re-

fuse, proceedings will be commenced in the Exchequer Court against you.

I have another letter to the same effect from the same firm addressed to Mrs. J. E. Hermon.

If the Department of Justice were dealing with the original patentee of this land, there might be some sense in these proceedings, because so long as the original patentee held something to which he was not legally entitled, it would be proper for the department to endeavour to overtake the error it had made, and to remedy the error; but in this case you find that several years have elapsed, these properties have passed into 16 or 20 hands; the first patentee of 160 acres, as I believe, divided the property into about four sections, each of these subdivided it and they have continued to subdivide it since, and now all these persons are menaced by a threat from the Department of Justice to take proceedings in the Exchequer Court to assail the rights which they obtained by virtue of a patent from the Department of the Interior to the original holder of these lands. I do not think that these persons have anything to fear from the Department of Justice or any other department of the government if they stand upon their rights. I do not think the department will ever go to the Exchequer Court with a case of that kind; I do not think they would last long if they did, and I say that in all humility as the opinion of a layman upon a point of law. I say further that the Department of the Interior should not be a party to this, they should be ashamed to permit another department to issue this bluff against innocent persons. who had nothing whatever to do with the mistake in question, who had no possible means of knowing that any mistake had occurred, but who, on the contrary, owing to the conditions surrounding the timber in the Chilliwack district, had every reason to believe that this patentee who held the patent in her hand not reserving from the land the timber rights was indeed the owner of the timber as so many settlers in that locality are the owners of the timber. This matter having been brought out in this way, I think it would be opportune for the Minister of the Interior to give some assurance to these settlers that they will not be harassed in this matter by the government, but that the responsibility for the error will be placed where it belongs, in the Interior Department, instead of being visited on the heads of this large number of innocent persons in the Chilliwack district.

Mr. OLIVER. The case to which my hon. friend alludes is, in fact, as he has stated it. At one time, many years ago, it was the custom, to allow homestead entry upon timber lands in the province of British Columbia, excluding timber from the right of the homesteader and when the patent was issued to the homesteader, the timber was excluded from the patent. In this particular case, which my hon. friend has mentioned, and I think in one other case that has come to the attention of the Department of the Interior, the patent was issued to the homesteader without the reservation of the right to the timber.

The department, of course has no knowledge of what disposition has been made of his rights, or her rights, by the patentee but the department is perfectly aware that the original owner of the timber is still the owner of the timber and, in dealing with the matter, the effort has been made to secure to the holder of the timber the rights which he paid for, and which he possesses, that is, the right to cut the timber upon this land, a right of which the homesteader was perfectly aware at the time that the homestead entry was given, and, of course, at the time the patent was issued. Instead of the present holders of the land being willing to accept a patent for the land excluding the timber, according to the equity of the case, they have seen fit to stand upon what they are pleased to consider their legal rights. Holding a patent which does not exclude the timber, they refuse to give up the timber. It was a legal matter, and was left by the Department of Interior to that of justice. On the advice of the Department of Justice proceedings were being taken to reinstate the respective parties to their rights according to the conditions upon which they had been parted with. In so far as the Department of Interior is concerned, we are anxious not to do anything that will oppress or injure any individual settler, or the purchaser from an individual settler, but, on the other hand, the department is anxious to protect rights which it has passed to other individuals, and which by error have not otherwise been protected. If my hon. friend asks for an apology from the Department of Interior for the action taken, I can only say that I do not see that any apology can be offered, except that an apology might be offered by the officials of the government who made the error, which government I may say, was our predecessor in office ; but, for the action of this government in doing what can be done to protect the rights of the owners of the timber, who have unquestionably the right in equity to the timber, I do not think that there is any apology to be offered.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Was there a license on the timber when the patent was issued?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and when the homestead was given also.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like to ask the minister if the letter written by the Vancouver solicitors was written with the authority or by the instruction of the Department of Interior.

Mr. OLIVER. I could not answer that unless I saw the letter.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It is the letter which my hon. friend from New Westminster has just read.

Mr. OLIVER. I would have to refer to the records of the department. I could not answer off-hand.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The letter, I see, states that they have authority from the government to take proceedings in the Exchequer Court. I can only say that this is the ordinary, usual case of a bona fide purchaser for value without notice, and it is recognized in all the courts in the land that a person who gets a title in that way has a perfect title. I think it is idle for the Minister of the Interior to say that the department are justified in instructing a firm of solicitors to endeavour to recover from those parties, who have innocently purchased in good faith and paid full consideration, any compensation whatever because of the two they are the innocent parties. But here, notwithstanding that this letter states that if these innocent, bona fide purchasers for value, do not do as the department suggest—that is release the right to the timber, I suppose—action will be taken in the Exchequer Court of Canada. In the first place, I submit that no action can be taken as a matter of law and that as a matter of equity it should not be taken, and therefore, the department has no right to put up a bluff of this kind against innocent purchasers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The department seems to be very much more zealous in this case than it was in the case of the Blairmore townsite. There a grant had been procured from the Crown by the grossest fraud and imposition, proved by evidence, and found by the judgment of the Exchequer Court of Canada. Notwithstanding that fact, the department recalled the judgment of the court after it had been pronounced, took no further proceedings, and left those in possession of the property on whose behalf the fraud and imposition had been practised.

Mr. OLIVER. If I may have the privilege, I would like to point out a very wide difference between the two cases. In the case under discussion of the patent of Fanny Louise Irwin, if it were merely a question between the government and Mrs. or Miss Irwin, there would be no attempt on the part of the department to cancel the patent which had been issued. It is not an attempt to assert the right of the Crown to this property ; it is an attempt to protect the right of the proper owner of the timber upon that property, which right he has not disposed of, which we have no right to take from him and cannot take from him, and which the owner of this property knows perfectly well that he or she has no equitable right to. Because of an error in the issue of the patent, which, I repeat, was not the fault of the present administration, they hope to secure a value in the timber that does not belong to the Crown but belongs to another private person.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think there is a very great difference between the two cases, but for the reason that I pointed out, and not for the reason that the minister has assigned. In the Blairmore townsite case action was taken by the Attorney General of Canada upon the relation of a man who was entitled to the property as against the Crown. That man proved his case in court. He was the relator in the suit at whose instance the Attorney General of Canada took that proceeding. His case proved up to the hilt that fraud and imposition had resulted in the title passing from the Crown to some other person. That was absolutely proved by evidence, and that was found by the judgment of the judge of the Exchequer Court. Notwithstanding all that the Crown put to one side the man who had proved his case in court and directed that no further proceedings should be taken against the men who had received the benefit of the fraud and imposition that had been practised upon the Crown and which had been described in very emphatic and distinct terms not only by the judge in the west, Mr. Justice Wetmore, to whom the matter had been referred for the purpose of taking the evidence, but also by the then judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada, Mr. Justice Burbidge. I think there is a difference between the two cases, but I do not think it is a difference that would impel the government to take action in the present case when they had refrained from action in the case to which I have alluded.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct a couple of errors into which the Minister of the Interior appears to have fallen. In the first place he said that the mistake, if any, was not of this administration but of their predecessors. I wish to call attention to the fact that the mistake was made in 1903 when this administration was in office as it is now. Next, the minister stated on two occasions, that these persons perfectly well knew they had not the rights to which they so tenaciously held. I am in a position to say to the minister

that he has no warrant for that belief, that as a matter of fact the present owners, or some of them whom I know, had no reason whatever to suppose that they were not the absolute proprietors of this timber when they bought the lands under the deed giving that right to the persons from whom they purchased. I am in a position to say further, that one of the persons to whom this threat was addressed had actually resold his right before he was ordered by the department to surrender his patent. He would have been in the position of having to compensate the person to whom he had sold, but without any recourse himself. I have another letter here which I will read to round off the correspondence, and this letter covers one or two of the points unintentially mis-stated by the minister. It is dated April 13, 1910, and addressed to Mrs. Jane E. Hermon, Rosedale P.O., B.C., I would like to lay emphasis upon the chivalry of a department that will attack a helpless woman in this manner. The letter goes on:

Dear Madam,—In August, 1903, the Crown granted to Fanny L. Irwin certain lands in the railway belt in the province of British Columbia. On the 20th of November, 1909, the lands were conveyed to you by Fanny L. Irwin;——

So that, as you will see, the department very well knew that she was not the original homesteader:

—subsequently you sold a portion to Joseph W. Oakes and a portion to William Robert Barge. Apparently from the documents in the land registry office you still have an interest in a portion of this property. The Dominion government have instructed proceedings to be taken in the Exchequer Court of Canada against you and the other owners to cancel this patent on the ground that it was issued in error as the timber should have been reserved from the lands in question. Messrs. Chrysler, Bethune & Larmonth, of Ottawa, are acting for the Crown in this matter and have asked us to see if some amicable arrangement cannot be arrived at with the owners before commencing legal proceedings. The proposition made is that the parties now entitled to the property should surrender their patent to the Crown.

Mark the words: 'now entitled to the property;' that is what these lawyers said:

The proposition made is that the parties now entitled to the property should surrender their patent to the Crown, on the understanding that a new patent shall issue reserving the timber. Kindly let us hear whether you would be prepared to consent to such an arrangement.

Yours faithfully,
DAVIS, MARSHALL, MACNEIL & PUGH.

So, here we find an answer to the minister's statement that this was done by his Tory predecessors when as a fact it was done in 1903, and also to his statement that the department were dealing with parties who very well knew they had no rights. His own solicitor's letter actually refers to this long series of transfers. I think it is a most astounding thing that the government of a great country like Canada should presume upon the ignorance of settlers in a remote part of the Dominion to think that these settlers would accept a bluff of this kind, and at a cost of hundreds of dollars to each of them, enable the department to find an easy way out of an error which it had committed.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION OF LETTER CARRIERS.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster), moved:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Post Office Department and any of its officials or other persons, relative to making an allowance for the transportation of letter carriers on the tramway system in New Westminster.

He said: I am happy to say that since I put this notice on the paper its object has been accomplished by the issue of an order for the payment of the transportation of the letter carriers. However, if the minister has no objection I think it is well that the motion should carry because there was very extraordinary delay in securing this little concession, and I should like to know why this delay occurred.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I have no objection to the papers being brought down. I may tell my hon. friend that there was no ill-will on the part of the department towards paying for the transportation of the letter carriers, but we thought at the time there was a combine between the street railway companies of the various cities to claim an exorbitant amount for this service. We did not object to pay the transportation of the letter carriers in these cities, but at the same time we did not wish to pay the street railway companies an exorbitant amount. We were always willing to pay a moderate price. The reason of the delay was that we were conducting negotiations with the various street railway companies of the cities from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Motion agreed to.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier), moved for:—

A return showing in detail:—
1. All sums paid by the concessionnaires of grantees of the Beauharnois canal as rental or royalties upon the rights conveyed to them by the Crown on the Beauharnois canal, or paid by their assigns in the enjoyment of the said rights, since the concession.

2. Of all sums paid or expended by the government upon the said canal since the date of the said concession.

3. Of all sums actually due the Crown by the grantees or assigns for the use of said canal or in connection therewith.

He said: The object of this motion is to put the House in possession of all the facts and circumstances connected with the alienation of the Beauharnois canal. Some of these papers were brought down some time ago, but I have not been able to find them, and it is important at this juncture that we should become familiar with the facts, as there is now before the House a Bill to regulate the method of the alienation of our water-powers. I presume there is no objection to our obtaining this information. I may add that we have just had held in the city of Quebec a forestry and conservation meeting, at which the resources of this country have been discussed and enumerated and enlarged upon as never before. We were told there of the vast extent of our forest wealth, and it was asserted by those who are competent to speak upon the subject, that there was to be found in Canada probably 40 per cent of all the water-powers in the world. The importance of husbanding these resources and of alienating them only after the observance of most careful formalities, were subjects fully treated of at that meeting in Quebec. It is very important that we should know the extent of our resources, but it seems to me it is equally essential that we should do something practical towards their conservation, or otherwise the circumstances which have attended their alienation in the past would soon leave us without these resources. There were some guiding principles laid down at the Quebec meeting, which do not seem to have been observed when the government parted with the Beauharnois canal. The principle was admitted on all hands that none of our water-powers or other resources ought to be rented or alienated without, in the first place, the preparation of a careful estimate of what the particular object to be alienated consists of and upon what terms such alienation should take place. I have been unable to discover that this rule was observed when we parted with the Beauharnois canal. There was not a carefully prepared estimate of what that canal represented in the way of capital expenditure, what we should claim as a return upon that capital expenditure, what the future worth of the water-power to the surrounding country might be, and what we received as a return for that alienation. No such careful estimate was made before the property was alienated. There was no provision made in the deed of alienation for an increase of rental in case the water-power of the Beauharnois canal should be increased by subsequent work on the part of the concessionnaires in order to derive a larger revenue than was anticipated. There was no publicity before the alienation took place. There was no general invitation for tenders in order to ascertain whether others were ready to give more for that valuable property than was given finally by those who acquired it. That was another condition which is insisted upon not only in the laws and regulations of all the other countries that have dealt with the alienation of water-powers, but by all those on this continent who have studied the question. Here was a valuable water-power situated within reach of several important centres, and within easy reach of the city of Montreal. Indeed, I believe that it is at present intended to use that water-power to supply the city of Montreal with electricity. A vast field was thus opened to those who had the handling of the power, and no tenders were asked for. The alienation, I understand, was a perpetual one. On this matter there has not been much legislation in Europe, but there has been some in Switzerland and in France, and I believe attempts have been made to get legislation in the United States. There was no provision, as I understand, for a revision of the rentals from time to time. I speak without having seen the deed. The original grantee of the powers has, I understand, transferred his privileges.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). In what year was the grant made?

Mr. MONK. I do not know exactly in what year, but I think four or five years ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. About five years ago.

Mr. MONK. So that, as far as we know, none of the principles which it is claimed everywhere should apply to such alienations from the state were observed in the alienation of the Beauharnois canal. I remember that my hon. friend paid a visit to Beauharnois at the time there was a rumour abroad that the alienation was about to take place, but I am not aware that rival parties were given a chance to make an offer, which I believe would have been superior to the one which was accepted by the government. At all events, it is conceded by those who know about the transaction that it has been immensely profitable to the grantees. I hope we shall have no more of such alienations. I hope that even at the present session the government will adopt some legislation which will, for the future, prevent any indiscriminate alienation of a most valuable asset. I cannot but believe that there is exaggeration in the statement, made by competent persons, however, that we have in Canada 40 per cent of the water-powers of the world, but even if we have a far less proportion of the world's wealth, it is evident that we

must be careful of it, and that we must not merely announce the policy of conservation, but put it into practical shape, so that governments can never in the future be tempted to make such alienations as the one referred to in this motion. We can, of course, only speak fully as to the facts when the return is brought down. I desire, with the permission of the House, to add to this motion these words:—

4. The names of the shareholders of the present tenant or proprietor company, with the number of shares held by each and the par value of such shares.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister of Public Works answers my hon. friend with reference to the production of the documents for which he has moved, let me say that the granting of the lease to Mr. Robert of the water-power on the site of the old Beauharnois canal was the result of a long-standing fight between the citizens of Montreal and the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Co. For many years, as my hon. friend is aware, the taxpayers of the city of Montreal were endeavouring to get rid of that monopoly. Five or six years ago I took a personal interest in this matter, along with some citizens of Montreal, and I am glad to say that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was one of those citizens. We were taxpayers of Montreal, and we intended, as soon as possible, to get rid of that monopoly.

Mr. MONK. I am afraid my hon. friend is giving me a merit to which I am not entitled. I have no recollection of this.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will refresh my hon. friend's memory. Deputations were organized, not to go before the city council, because it was recognized that the citizens of Montreal could not get justice from the city council, but it was realized that there was a magnificent water-power to be had at the Beauharnois canal, which was not being used, and delegations were organized to ask the government at Ottawa to protect the taxpayers of Montreal as against the monopoly known as the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Co. I remember the last delegation which came to Ottawa, composed of some members of the city council of Montreal, including the mayor and my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Mr. Martin), and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman is mistaken there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am sorry to say that my hon. friend has in this instance a bad memory.

Mr. MONK. I cannot lay claim to such patriotism.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course his presence there was all to his credit. He was present at the office of the Prime Minister with the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Mr. Martin), some of the aldermen of Montreal, as well as delegations from the surrounding districts of Jacques Cartier, Laprairie, Beauharnois and the various electoral divisions of Montreal. They all urged, irrespective of politics, that the water-power of the Beauharnois canal should be leased to a strong firm which would not be bought or would not be induced to give up its rights to the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company. And this is the reason why it was stipulated there and then and published throughout the press that the government would not call for tenders, but would be given to a body of men, respectable and responsible, the management of the Beauharnois canal water-power. If tenders had been called for, of course the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company would have repeated the very unsavoury operation which took place with regard to the Soulanges, Heron Island and Richelieu river water-powers. Therefore, when a company came before the Prime Minister, with a subscribed capital of $4,000,000, representing the best elements in the city, the government wisely decided to lease to it the Beauharnois canal power. What was the consequence? I happen to know the facts, because I took some part in the fight which took place a year or two ago in Montreal in order to obtain a pure civic administration there. The result was that after that water-power was given the Canadian Light and Heat Company, the prices for electric energy in Montreal for lighting and heating purposes fell some 30 per cent.

Mr. MONK. Not quite so much.

Mr. LEMIEUX. To what extent did it fall?

Mr. MONK. I cannot say, but not so much as that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course I cannot give the exact percentage, but there was a very large reduction, and the people of Montreal to-day are free from the thraldom under which they formerly suffered as regards electrical energy.

We are told that we have given away a very valuable concession for years and years to come. Well, the papers have all been laid before the House. The lease is renewable every twenty-one years during a period of some 70 or 80 years. I happen to know a little about this matter because some year and a half or two years ago, the Prime Minister being ill, I was asked to replace him when the first sod was turned at Beauharnois and the new building was being put up. Let me tell you that the new company have spent some $2,000,000 on this

project. I do not know if my hon. friend has seen the building being erected at St. Timothée, but certainly it will be one of the finest power buildings ever put up on this continent. Is it reasonable then that a company which has broken the worst monopoly the citizens of Montreal had ever contended against and which is spending so much money should be called on to renew its lease every year. Every one will understand that what was done has been done in the interests of the taxpayers of the city of Montreal.

Mr. MONK. Is there any clause providing that the company may not amalgamate with the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think my hon. friend will find that such a clause is in the contract, and it was inserted at the request of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and myself. The Minister of Justice himself (Sir Allen Aylesworth) inserted that clause in order to prevent the possibility of that company joining the monopoly which had crushed the citizens of Montreal for fifteen years before. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk)—and I say it to his credit—joined his efforts with ours. There was no political bias, it was purely a municipal question, and both Conservatives and Liberals joined hands to get rid of the monopoly then existing.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The hon. minister says that the lease is for 70 years renewable every 21 years. When renewable in 21 years, does that mean revising the rates?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The contract was brought down three or four days ago and is on the table now.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Huntingdon). Just one word in answer to the statement of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that the government had no report before them by engineers on the value of the canal. Before the Soulanges canal was constructed the Beauharnois canal was used for the purposes of navigation. At the time the Conservative government had under consideration the construction of the Soulanges canal, the people along the Beauharnois were very anxious that instead of constructing the Soulanges, the Beauharnois canal should be deepened. But the report of the engineer—no doubt a very distinguished man in his profession—then was that it would be impossible to deepen the Beauharnois canal because along by Valleyfield there was but a continuation of rock. Now we all know that the Soulanges canal has not been the success which the engineer expected; and the lessees of the Beauharnois canal discovered that the report of the engineer at that time was altogether wrong because they have succeeded in deepening that canal to the extent of about twelve feet. The people along the Beauharnois take an altogether different view from that taken by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). At the time there was an agitation for the leasing of this canal and I was upon the delegation of which the Hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has just spoken, which went to Ottawa, not for the purpose of urging the government to refuse to lease this canal but for the purpose of urging it to grant a lease to the present lessees and thus prevent it getting into the hands of the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company and in this way deprive the people of Valleyfield, Montreal and the surrounding districts of the cheap electrical power which they so much desired. The Canadian Power Company have expended a sum almost equal to the cost of the canal and are not yet in operation, but the result of their operations has been that the people of Valleyfield are now offered their light and heat at a reduction of 40 per cent. That is one reason why they take an altogether different view from that taken by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier? I have not the lease before me, but my recollection is that it contains a clause which compels that company to give light and power to the city of Valleyfield, to the city of Montreal, to Beauharnois and the surrounding section at prices to be fixed by the Railway Commission. There could be nothing fairer than that. And I submit to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that the conservation of natural resources does not mean locking up those resources but giving them to people with capital who will develop them. We who live on the south side of the St. Lawrence, along the Beauharnois canal, are very well satisfied with this lease. The people generally thought, in view of the report that engineer Munro had made twenty years ago, that the lessees of the Beauharnois canal had been buncoed by the government and were paying prices in advance of what their leases were worth. It remains to be proved whether that company will make the big lot of money that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) imagines they will.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN (Montreal, St. Mary's). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the House will allow me, I hope, to add a few words to what has been said on the question. As a Montreal city councillor and as a representative of St. Mary's division, I have had the honour to accompany the delegation which, a few years ago, interviewed the ministers with the object of obtaining the lease of the Beauharnois canal on behalf of the Robert Company, as stated

by the hon. Postmaster General a moment ago.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier remembers no doubt that for some time past there was a movement going on in the Montreal city council with a view to effecting a change in the lighting system. We were intent on getting rid of the Montreal Light, Heat and Power, which, as stated by the hon. Postmaster General, had full control of the lighting.

Now, the city council, last year, advertised for tenders. The Robert Company put in a tender, and I remember fully well that one evening council sat until midnight in the hope of securing the contract for lighting to that company. However, the majority in the council made all kind of objections, so much so that the company found it impossible to accept the terms set down.

I remember, among other things, that they would not give them a contract for more than five years, and finally, they had to refuse it.

I sincerely believe that the government, by giving a lease to the Robert Company acted in the best interest of the public. It had the result of relieving the people of Montreal, in view of the fact that the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company had to reduce their rates to a very great extent. As a matter of fact, the Montreal Light, till last year, made an allowance of 15 p.c. upon the consumer paying within ten days. It is quite different now. I know what I am talking about, having had a contract with the same company for the lighting of my own house for a period of five years, and I got a discount of 46 p.c.

My opinion is that, while the government may not realize any profit by its lease to Mr. Robert, the benefit will all go to the people living alongside the canal, and more particularly the people of Montreal.

I do not see why the member for Jacques Cartier should ask any explanation about this matter. I am sure that the consumers in Montreal will greatly benefit by that arrangement.

I endorse all the statements made by the hon. Postmaster General, and I think that the member for Jacques Cartier ought to be quite satisfied.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). After the remarks which have been made by the hon. gentleman who followed my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), there remains but very little for me to say, beyond giving to the House a summary of the lease which was entered into between His Majesty and Mr. McIntyre and Mr. Robert, of the right to use water of the Beauharnois canal. I think it desirable that the terms of the lease should be placed on 'Hansard' in consequence more especially of the statement of the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), that he trusted no such lease as this would ever again be entered into by the government. I understand that the reason my hon. friend made that statement is, that he is of the opinion that it does not follow out the principle of conserving the water-powers of the country. My own idea is that the proper way to conserve the water-powers of this country is not to lock them up, not to prevent them from being developed, but to encourage their development and to ensure, as far as it can possibly be done, that power shall be supplied to the people at the lowest possible price. It seems to me that in order to do that, first of all it is desirable that strong men, men of good financial standing, shall be induced to take hold of those water-powers with a view to developing them, that is, unless the government itself, on behalf of the country, is prepared to engage in the development of water-powers as a public work. That has not so far, been done in Canada. It is true that in Ontario they have organized the Hydro-Electric Commission, but that is only a commission for the distribution of water-power, it is not a commission that, so far, has had anything to do with the development of water-powers. The commission purchases its water-power from private companies which have expended large sums in the development of power. It seems to me that these are two essentials, but the most important of all is, of course, that this great public utility shall be furnished to the people desirous of using it at the lowest possible cost. In order that the people may get electricity at the lowest possible cost, there must be some permanency of tenure to the company developing the power. If the views of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), should prevail that a company should only be allowed a lease of a water-power for a short period of time, and the lease should then terminate, and if it is my hon. friend's views that the company then should receive no compensation for the money expended in the development of power, which might amount in many cases to a very large sum of money, then in order to recoup themselves, the company would be obliged during the short period of their tenure, to charge very much higher prices for the use of electricity than would otherwise be the case. I do not think that would be desirable or in the interest of the country.

Another feature which I think is essential is, that it should be provided that, if at any time in the future the government

of the country should feel it desirable in the public interest to acquire the property and operate it as a public work, the government should be enabled to take over the property of the company on giving fair compensation, which I assume would embrace not only the actual cost, but a reasonable percentage on the moneys the company had invested in its undertaking. It seems to me that in that way, the public interest would be conserved, the people would get electricity at the lowest possible cost and the government would be enabled at any time in the future to take control of the property when it might become necessary to do so in the public interest.

You will agree with me when I have read this lease, that it fulfils every condition which I have suggested to the House as being desirable in the public interest. And looking back now to the time when this lease was executed and bearing in mind that the idea of the conservation of water-powers and other natural resources had not advanced to the stage it has now reached, it is remarkable that the government should have exercised such great care in seeing that in every respect the public interest was guarded in the lease of this water-power. I can account for it by this fact that even before the great number of people who are to-day interested in the conservation of the natural resources of the country became so interested, I can well remember my hon. friend the Prime Minister, both in Ottawa and elsewhere, putting forward in the very strongest manner possible, the desirability of taking steps for the conservation of the natural resources of our country and to him is largely due the forward movement which conservation has taken during the last few years and the very forward state which it has reached to-day.

The lease was made on December 10, 1907. It is between His Majesty, the King and Mr. William Cassels McIntyre and Mr. Edmund Arthur Robert, both of the city of Montreal. It recites that the Beauharnois canal is no longer needed for purposes of navigation and that it is considered desirable to lease it for the development of electricity for heating, lighting and industrial purposes and for the reasons which are set forth in the order in council, and which are to be found set forth to a considerable degree also in the lease, it was decided to grant a lease without competition to the gentlemen whom I have named. Then it provides that the lessees may have the right to take water from the Beauharnois canal and certain rights are given in the land bordering on the canal. The lease is for a period of 21 years renewable as therein provided, returning therefore the annual rent or sum of $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For how long may it be renewed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There may be two renewals. The lease is for 21 years with two renewals of 21 years each.

It provides that the lessees shall make all urgent and necessary repairs to the canal and the works in connection therewith subject always to the supervision and approval of the minister. It also provides that the lessees shall at their own cost and expense maintain, perform, operate and keep in good and sufficient repair, all bridges, including farm bridges, ferries, weirs, roads, fences, ditches and culverts, and all other servitudes whatever, which it is now incumbent on His Majesty to maintain and to keep in repair in the premises.

Thus the government is relieved of considerable burdens which would otherwise exist in respect to bridges crossing the canal and other matters to which this clause refers.

It is also provided that the lessees shall indemnify His Majesty against all liabilities for damage, detriment or injury that may result from the construction, or operation of the works or from neglect to maintain them in an efficient condition. It provides for the rights of the Montreal Cotton Company and of all other lessees. Here is a very important clause:

> The lessees shall, whenever so required by the municipality of Valleyfield, or by the municipality of Beauharnois, or other municipality adjacent to the canal, or by the city of Montreal, furnish the municipality or the city with electrical power for municipal lighting purposes at reasonable rates and on reasonable conditions, such rates and conditions in the event of disagreement between the parties to be determined by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada; provided always that notification of such requirements be given by the municipalities respectively, or the city, as the case may be, to the lessees within two years from the grant of this lease, and that reasonable time be allowed the lessees after such notification to enable them to comply therewith.

You will see that evidently one of the objects which the government had in view was to enable the municipalities of Valleyfield, Beauharnois, and any other municipality adjacent to the canal, as well as the city of Montreal, to secure electrical power for municipal lighting purposes at reasonable rates, and it is provided that if the company and these municipalities cannot agree upon the rates, then they are to be fixed by the Board of Railway Commissioners. That, I think, Mr. Speaker, is a very important safeguard for the public interest. Then, certain other provisions are made with regard to sewer pipes, carrying cables over the canal, &c.

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier stated that there is no provision that there shall be an increase of rental in case the company should develop additional power. Well, as I said before, I do not think the matter of increasing the revenue of the country is of such great importance as the reduction of the cost of lighting and power. It is the reduction of the cost of the supply of these important utilities to the people that is the essential thing to be aimed at, but, even in the suggestion which my hon. friend made that there is no power to increase the rental, I think it will be found that he is entirely wrong because my hon. friend would agree with me that it would not be possible, at all events, not reasonably possible—indeed, I do not think possible at all—to increase the power unless the flow of water through the Beauharnois canal were increased. That would necessitate the deepening and widening of the Beauharnois canal, so as to give a larger intake and to allow more water to flow into the canal. It is expressly provided by the lease that no work of that kind shall be undertaken except with the approval of the minister, who must be satisfied that any such works will in no way interfere with the level of the St. Lawrence river, and as no such works can be undertaken except with the consent of the minister, it would be quite within his power, if he thought it in the public interest, to exact a larger rental commensurate with the additional power which would be derived by the company by reason of the enlargement of the intake and the consequent increase in the flow of water.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the minister if any such additional works have been undertaken.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not as yet, but plans for such works are now before the government, and are under the consideration of the engineers.

Mr. MONK. They have not yet been approved?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet. The parties interested have been here and they are to receive a further hearing before any action will be taken with regard to the proposed additional works. Then my hon. friend also asked if any provision had been made which would prevent amalgamation between this company and the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company. As my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) stated, that was one of the objects which the people of Montreal had in view and if it is true, as my hon. friend the Postmaster General stated that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier was present at certain interviews which took place when he urged that some steps should be taken towards enabling these people to develop that power, then I think my hon. friend would be entitled to very great credit for joining with my hon. friend the Postmaster General at that time. That is one of the points about which we were very particular and which is emphasized in this lease. It is expressly provided that these lessees shall not amalgamate with the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company and in order to effectively guard against any amalgamation it is expressly provided that whenever a company is formed and these lessees shall transfer their rights and powers to the company, there shall be placed with a trust company a controlling interest in the capital stock of the company which shall not be voted on except by the authority of the minister. It is expressly provided that this stock shall be laid away with the Montreal Trust Company giving a controlling interest, and this will effectually prevent any amalgamation with the Montreal, Heat and Power Company from taking place.

In carrying out that agreement it has been carefully seen to that on the formation of the company, called the Canadian Light and Power Company, 51 per cent of the capital stock of that company has been lodged with the Montreal Trust Company under that agreement in order effectually to carry out the provisions of the lease, and to secure the public interest by preventing any amalgamation between this company, and that great light and heat company, which very largely controls this important public utility in the city of Montreal.

I may say that in the papers which are brought down the assignment of the lease to the Canadian Light and Power Company is attached to the lease itself and there is also the agreement between the light and power company and the Montreal Trust Company, under which the Montreal Trust Company accepts the trust with respect to the holding of this 51 per cent in order to safeguard the public, and to prevent any amalgamation between the Canadian Light and Power Company and the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is there not a clause in the lease that the rates shall be under the control of the Governor General in Council?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I read that. They are under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners. In so far as the rates are concerned, my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) spoke of there being a revision of the rental. That is of some importance from the financial standpoint in so far as the country at large is concerned. It might very well be, that, as the water-powers of this kind belong to the nation, the nation should receive a certain rental—not an un-

reasonable rental, but a fair, reasonable rental for the use of these water-powers—but what is of far greater importance than the question of rental is the question of the rates which the people are to pay for the use of electricity, light and power, and this lease expressly provides that every five years the rates that the company can charge these municipalities may be revised by the Board of Railway Commissioners. This is a most important provision and I think it is evidence of the very great care which the government exercised in the preparation of this lease. Then, Sir, I come to another provision, which I think is also of vast importance, and it is this:

If the demised premises or any portion thereof shall be required for public purposes, possession of the same may at any time during the said term be resumed by the government upon twelve months' notice in writing by the minister to the lessees. Upon such resumption all privileges and rights of the lessees hereunder shall cease, and His Majesty shall pay to the lessees the value, with an addition of five per cent thereon, of all work, plant, buildings, machinery and material done, erected, built, or placed by the lessees under this lease in or upon the leased premises or upon other premises leased or required by them, for the purpose of converting the hydraulic power of the canal into electric power and of disposing of the same in Beauharnois, Valleyfield, or other municipality adjacent to the canal or in Montreal, including the transmission and distribution system, such value to be fixed by arbitration as hereinafter provided as representing the fair value of the same in the then existing conditions.

To summarize briefly the important provisions of this lease—we have the fact that a fixed rental is reserved, that no works can be undertaken for the enlargement of the intake and thus increasing the flow of water and consequently the power, without the consent of the minister who can impose such terms as he thinks best in the public interest. We have the fact also that no assignment can take place without the assent of the minister, and upon assignment being made the controlling interest in the capital stock must be placed in a trust company. Then 51 per cent of the capital stock is placed in the Montreal Trust Company, by the agreement entered into, a copy of which is attached to the lease, for the purpose of ensuring that amalgamation should not take place between the company and the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company. We have the further provision that the charges for light and power to these municipalities adjacent to the canal and to the city of Montreal, shall be subject to the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and subject to revision every five years. We have also the further and important provision, that the government, whenever it may deem it advisable in the public interest to do so, may take over all the rights of the lessees, all their power, all their plant, all their works of development, all their transmission lines, on simply paying the actual value to the company with an advance of five per cent thereon. It seems to me that if the hon. member for Jacques Cartier were to set to work to prepare a lease that would most effectually carry out the best ideas of those interested in conserving the water-powers of the country it would be impossible for him to improve upon the lease which the government gave in respect to the power in the Beauharnois canal. There is no objection, of course, to giving the information asked for in the notice as printed, but the hon. gentleman has amended the motion to ask that the government shall lay upon the table of the House a list of the shareholders in this company. There is no such list of shareholders so far as I am aware in any of the departments of the government. There is no provision in the charter by which a list of the shareholders is to be submitted to the government, and it would, therefore, be impossible for the government to comply with the motion if it were amended as asked by the hon. member.

Mr. MONK. After the description given by the Minister of Public Works of the absolute control and power which the government have over the grantees of the Beauharnois canal, I am surprised that he should find it impossible to consent to the proposed amendment by which it is sought to obtain a list of the shareholders, and the par value of the shares of this company. Surely if the government has all this influence over this company it is possible for the minister to obtain for parliament a list of the shareholders, particularly in view of a stipulation that a proportion of the shares will be placed in the hands of a trust company in the event of a transfer by the original grantees. It is very important under the circumstances that we should know who are the parties interested in this company and in the grant, and unless the House is adverse to getting that information I shall insist upon that part of the motion. It seems somewhat strange that just at this moment when the discussion of the disposition of our national wealth is so prominent, that a demand for such information as I have asked should be met with so much protest. I presume the Postmaster General is speaking as acting Minister of Railways, and if one were to believe him the whole of this transaction was dictated to the government by a zealous desire to come to the assistance of the city of Montreal which he says was some years ago suffering from the oppression of a powerful

company which distributes electricity throughout the city. Therefore, according to the Postmaster General, in order to come to the assistance of the city of Montreal, the government without observing the rules and principles which now obtain throughout the civilized world in regard to such matters, conceded this power upon most favourable and happy terms to Mr. McIntyre and the other gentlemen associated with him. I wonder if it occurred at that time to the Postmaster General, that it would have been a fit and proper thing—as the establishment of a municipal lighting plant for the city of Montreal was then being discussed, and is to-day a live question—to offer these singular advantages to the city of Montreal itself. Why was not that done? Why was not such an offer made? It will be difficult to understand why it was absolutely necessary, in order to relieve the situation in the city of Montreal, to concede such a very favourable grant to two gentlemen, who, if we are well informed, have since, upon the transfer of that grant realized very considerable profits. That is a question of some importance. Was the situation of the city of Montreal at that date so bad that it was necessary in conceding this grant to omit all the precautions which generally surround grants of that nature. Why was not a careful survey made of the Beauharnois canal, and an estimate prepared by experts, setting out upon what terms that grant should be made, what the rental, and what conditions should be attached to it. None of these formalities, judging by what we have heard from the treasury benches this afternoon, were observed at that time. The Minister of Public Works tells us that the grant is not perpetual. Well, until we have carefully examined the deed it is difficult to see how far it extends, and what length of time it gives to the grantees or their assigns, but the minister himself has told us that it was a grant for 63 or 64 years. At Quebec, during the discussion of this most important subject, very strong objection was made to a grant over 50 years, and it was stated there by competent persons that a grant for that length of time was absolutely contrary to the public interest. I myself did not share that view, and I urged at the time that it was impossible within a period of 20 or 25 years in the case of important concessions given to concessionnaries to have sufficient time to carry out the scheme of development. But, 64 years is a very long period indeed, particularly as I assume from what has been stated by the minister that the rental continues the same during the whole period of the lease. The state receives upon a capital expenditure of over two million dollars, a revenue of $12,000 per year, which does not vary. It is true, as the minister says, that improvements and changes cannot be made without the consent of the government. But nowhere in that clause did I hear my hon. friend point out that if improvements and changes were made which the government could not otherwise accept, it might avail itself of that opportunity to exact additional rental. That would not be honest or proper on the part of the government, under the clause read by my hon. friend. It was not contemplated that improvements and changes would give rise to an increase of rental. It is now well known to everybody that a clause such as that mentioned by my hon. friend will not prevent a merger of interests, an evasion of what was contemplated by the clause, a fusion between these grantees or their assigns and the company mentioned by my hon. friend. There are so many devices known to the public by which clauses of that kind may be entirely set at nought that it seems almost a childish argument in the mouth of my hon. friend to suggest that such an obstacle could not be overcome. For instance, suppose this company made a contract to furnish electricity, not to the city of Montreal, but to the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company—my hon. friend is a lawyer—would we have a right to intervene? No. Our right to intervene, and the application of the clause cited by my hon. friend, is restricted to the case of the grantees or their assigns undertaking to furnish electricity to the city of Montreal. It is, therefore, open to this company—and this is only one way out of many—under this very deed, to furnish electricity to those who furnish electricity to the city of Montreal, without in any way coming under the control of the clause invoked by my hon. friend. My hon. friend the Postmaster General seemed to claim great merit for having brought about a diminution of rates in the city of Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not personally. I said the citizens who led the movement for better treatment on the part of the electric company. I claimed credit, not for myself, but in company with my hon. friend and the delegation which came to Ottawa at that time to ask for that power.

Mr. MONK. I would be glad to give credit to my hon. friend for the great public spirit which he manifested at that time and since, but I do not think the facts are exactly as he says. This company has not yet reached Montreal; it is not furnishing electricity there, and, although I would not utter a single word in disparagement of the great company which my hon. friend the Postmaster General thinks so poorly of, I do not think they are of a disposition to be terrified by what is going on now at the Beauharnois canal, for they long before-

hand began reducing their rates to their customers. I quite sided with those who thought we were paying excessive rates, because it seemed to me that the city of Montreal, surrounded on all sides with water-powers of great magnitude, easily developed, ought to have electricity just as cheap, even much cheaper, than the city of Toronto, for instance. But other companies have since established themselves at Montreal, and this is the real cause of the reduction of rates.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend will admit that the first break in the monopoly was the granting of that lease of the Beauharnois canal, and since that policy was adopted there has been a reversal of public opinion in Montreal. Last year the good municipal organization fought a battle which brought victory, and since that victory the Local League of Quebec has given all other electric companies the power to operate in Montreal, and a commission was granted by the Quebec government, as a result of the fight which was begun here in the Prime Minister's office, where my hon. friend was so conspicuous in his advocacy of improvements which would bring about cheaper electricity.

Mr. MONK. I do not know whether my hon. friend refers to the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Mr. Martin).

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. member for St. Mary's division was taken to task last year, and the new city council accorded an investigation of the charges against him, but no one would bring a charge against him, and the worst opponents he had with regard to his municipal career had to admit that there was nothing against him.

Mr. MONK. I will not dispute my hon. friend's statement. When my hon. friend refers to the good municipal government which we have in Montreal, I quite agree with him that we had an end put to a state of affairs which was almost intolerable, but the result of the popular vote on that occasion does not seem to have favoured my hon. friend from St. Mary's division, and I would assume, from what he said to-day, that his electors were very ungrateful to him, after all he had done to reduce the price of electricity. Now, Sir, I have spoken of the futility of the clause mentioned by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. As a matter of fact—and this is some justification, I hope, for my asking for these documents—at the present moment there is a rumour of an arrangement practically amounting to a merger, or amalgamation between the very grantees to whom this concession was made and this very company which has been so much animadverted upon to-day by my hon. friends opposite. The grant was made some time ago. Transfers have taken place since, the government has intervened, payments have been made, at the present moment communications are passing between the government and this new company, and I hope we shall have all these documents before the House, as we are entitled to see them. To the control of rates under these circumstances I would apply the same argument as I would apply to the argument made by the Minister of Public Works respecting the furnishing of electricity to the city of Montreal. The right to control the rates arises when this company furnishes electricity to the city of Montreal. Until then there is no such right. Does it arise if the grantees or their assigns furnish electricity to the Light, Heat and Power Company? It does not seem so, from the clause read here by the hon. minister. Besides, we know what this control of rates amounts to nowadays. Companies must be allowed to collect sufficient revenue to pay the interest upon their capital and debentures, and we know something of watered stock, of over-capitalized companies, to know of what worth such an argument is in the mouths of those who carry out transactions of that kind. It is better to foresee than to apply a remedy, which, under the circumstances, must necessarily be nugatory one-half the time, if not more.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN. (Translation). I ask the hon. member to let me say one word in order to answer the insinuation that he has made a moment ago against me.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). When I shall have done you will speak as you like.

Mr. MARTIN. (Translation). When you shall have done it will be impossible for me to speak because, according to the rules of the House the discussion shall be closed and nobody can speak after you.

Mr. MONK. (Translation). We have another motion immediately after this one on the order of the day and you can speak on that motion.

Mr. MARTIN. (Translation). Mr. Speaker says that I cannot speak upon the debate when you shall have done.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) You will speak a little later.

Mr. MARTIN. (Translation). Therefore you do not wish I should answer the insinuation you have made.

Mr. MONK. I said that there were other companies in the city of Montreal. We have the Saraguay Company, we have the Central Light and Heating Company, there are other companies projected, there is the possibility of the city of Montreal establishing a lighting and heating plant itself, and there is, as my hon. friend the

Postmaster General stated, the new administration of the city of Montreal. These facts, and these alone, have influenced the movement to which my hon. friend the Postmaster General pointed a moment ago. I find that there is no change in the rental. I find that the alienation is for more than half a century; possible it may be more than that; but, according to my hon. friend, it provides for sixty-three or sixty-four years of enjoyment, and I do not find that the clause invoked by my hon. friend as amply protecting the city of Montreal, is sufficient excuse for the government having violated in this instance the cardinal principles of alienation as they are recognized by all the authorities on the subject, short periods of alienation, changes of rates according to the amount of power developed, absolute control of rates under all circumstances, and, above all, the tender of an opportunity to all the citizens of Canada to make an offer before an alienation takes place.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN (Translation). If the House will allow me, I would like to answer the insinuation which has been made about me a moment ago by the honourable member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. SPEAKER (Translation). I cannot allow the hon. member to go on with his speech, the debate being closed, and he having already addressed the House on the subject.

Mr. MARTIN (Translation). I wish to speak on a question of privilege, with a view to giving some personal explanations.

While it is true that last year an investigation was carried on under a Royal Commission into the affairs of the Montreal city council, that investigation was held at my own request.

Without going into the particulars, I may say at the outset that having taken an aggressive stand in regard to the city council, having branded my collegues as 'boodlers' and thiefs, it was natural that they should do all in their power to crush me by whatever means available. Things even went to the point that false affidavits were forged, but the commissioner conducting the inquiry would not allow me to defend myself. Nevertheless, I was one of the eight who were singled out in the commissioner's report. I called on the Montreal city council at the time to institute proceedings against me, in order to give me a chance to vindicate myself, but without avail. I requested the present council to institute proceedings against me, in order to give me an opportunity of defending myself, but the new council did not move any more than their predecessors. I even went a step further, Mr. Speaker, and asked the attorney general for the province of Quebec to take proceedings against me so that I might be in a position to show the falsity of the charges laid against my character. Here again, I was unsuccessful.

If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who has thought fit to refer here to these slanderous insinuations, is serious, knowing as he does that a man guilty of fraud and corruption in the way that he gave the House to understand that I had been, that such a man, I say, is unworthy of occupying a seat in this House, it is incumbent on him— and I challenge him to do so—to move for an investigation into my dealings, in order to find out whetner or not I was guilty of such offences, whether or not there is any foundation to these charges against me. Let him move for an inquiry whereby my right to occupy a seat in this House will be settled one way or another. If I am unworthy of occupying a seat in this House, that inquiry will show it. It is the only means of finding out the truth in this connection and of vindicating my good name. I would welcome such a move on the part of the member of Jacques Cartier, as it would put me in a position of defending myself and setting matters right.

Notwithstanding what Judge Cannon or anybody else may have stated, I challenge whomsoever it may be to show that I failed in doing my duty while sitting in the Montreal city council, and I fear none of the insinuations which may be aimed at me, and especially by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I object to any important amendment being added to the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Objection being taken, I find that, according to Bourinot, the motion must be according to the notice given and its terms cannot be altered without the consent of the House. I therefore cannot allow any amendment.

Motion agreed to.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. MONK moved:

For a copy of all correspondence concerning the lease or alienation of the Beauharnois canal, of all reports called for by the government and made concerning the said alienation by experts, officers of the departments or others, of all orders in council respecting said alienation, and of the deed or deeds between the Crown and the concessionnaries embodying the said lease or alienation and respecting also any transfers of their rights and privileges by the original grantees.

He said: (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I need not repeat what I said on the preceding motion, in connection with the Beauharnois canal; it is substantially the same thing. But I consider it my duty to say a word in answer to my hon. friend from

St. Mary's (Mr. Martin). I made no charges against my hon. friend. The hon. Postmaster General stated that he, together with the hon. member for St. Mary's had gone to much trouble to protect the citizens of Montreal against the monopoly set up by the Montreal Light, Heat and Power. I took occasion to state that the constituents of my hon. friend from St. Mary's had been very ungrateful, since in the municipal election which followed, they had forgotten the zeal he had shown for their interests. It is neither a charge nor an insinuation that I made.

I did not follow the inquiry carried on by Judge Cannon, but I understand that it was utterly unbiased, and the citizens of Montreal were satisfied with the findings.

If this statement which I make is satisfactory to my hon. friend, I make it with the greatest pleasure, as Judge Cannon has been submitted to vicious attacks before the public and in the press and he was without the means of vindicating himself.

Mr. MARTIN (Montreal, St. Mary's). (Translation.) Specific charges were made. I myself made specific charges against my fellow councillors, but he refused to look into them.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT OF THE IMPERIAL DEFENCE CONFERENCE, 1909.

Mr. MONK moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable for the convenience of members of the House and of the public, to provide additional copies of the printed report of the Imperial defence conference of July and August, 1909.

He said: I hope there will be no objection to the expression of this wish. I think the members of the House will admit that the Imperial Defence Conference of 1909 was a very important event indeed in the history of this country; that arrangements were arrived at there the result of which was to change in very large measure the understanding between the British government and the government of this country regarding the defence of this country and the share of Canada in the general defence of the empire. These arrangements and agreements are contained in a blue-book the supply which failed very long ago when we should have had an ample supply of a document of such importance. The consequence is that to-day—and even long before to-day—when any body wishes to refer to the discussions and proceedings of the Imperial Defence Conference of 1909, it is impossible to secure copies. Members of the House know the exceedingly large quantity of blue-books printed, to my mind unnecessarily, when you consider the matters treated in many of them. We are embarrassed from one year's end to the other with printed matter of which a very limited supply would, I think, suffice concerning analysis of honey or fertilizers or other such matters. But this imperial defence conference report is a document to which reference requires to be made continually, which the public desire to consult, which we wish to have at hand, and which will be required for a long time to come. Last year, before the session was half over, it was very difficult to obtain any copies of this blue-book. I myself suffered much inconvenience in this regard. One applied for the blue-book and could not get it; the French version particularly was wanting in an extraordinary degree. And during the public discussion and public meetings which followed the session during the by-election we could not possibly obtain a copy of this important document which the whole discussion bore upon. I have laid upon the table the letters of the three officers of the House from whom we most naturally would expect readily to obtain copies of the English and French versions of this report, but by these letters it will appear that I could get neither, because, as was stated, the supply was exhausted. We will require these documents again, and it is convenient that we should have them handy. This is not a very voluminous document; and I hope the House will adopt the expression of this desire that we should have easy access to this document, and that a certain number be printed in both languages.

While on my feet, I would like to say that I have been informed on very creditable authority that the whole verbatim report of that conference had been transmitted to Canada, and that certain members of the House had that word for word report what was said at the conference as well as of what was decided and done. That is what happened with regard to previous conferences. What I wish to call particular attention to is that some members of the House have access to that verbatim report though it was refused to others, and these others had no opportunity of seeing it. If this motion is carried, I hope the government will carry out the suggestion I make that the whole report be printed and placed at the disposal of members of the House.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). There is certainly no objection to the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) being carried. I understand that he refers to the blue-book brought down to the House last session. If there were no more copies printed, it is certainly not the fault of the government. I understand that questions relating to the printing of blue-books are decided by the joint committee on printing, a committee composed of members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons. This com-

mittee has standing rules stating how many copies of each blue-book have been printed and distributed, and, unless they pass some orders to the contrary, this standing rule would apply. I understand that the rule has been covered in this case. But I see that the number of copies of the French edition especially—I do not know anything about the English—are exhausted. Under these circumstances, there is no objection—quite the contrary—on the part of the government that some more copies should be printed. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) however, does not state in his motion what would be the number of copies required. Perhaps it would be better to have this defined in the resolution, in order that the clerk of the House may immediately give the necessary instructions for printing, or, what will be still more regular, refer the matter to the joint committee on printing to determine the additional number of copies required. But, as to the principle of the motion, there is absolutely no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to second the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that the full report of the proceedings should be printed. I suppose that the government has that report. I presume the government could obtain the consent of the home government to have the report printed for parliament. I see no reason why we should not have not only the conclusions which were arrived at, but what is far more important, the grounds which were urged for or against those conclusions, and the attitude on these various questions of the representatives of the other Dominions of the empire. In the case of the conference of 1902, I think the Prime Minister himself suggested that there was no reason why the report should not be published in full and if I remember correctly he said he would communicate with the home government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Last session the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that so far as Canada was concerned, there was no objection whatever to bringing down everything.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I remember that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Unfortunately Canada was not the only party to the conference and objections were raised to bringing down the report. We have no objection, we had none then and we have none now, but I doubt if it will be possible to obtain the consent of those objecting until perhaps the next Imperial Conference. For my part no objection will be raised on the part of Canada to the publication of everything that took place. Not only that but we will urge it.

Mr. MONK. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries finds that the motion might well pass the House and I am satisfied with this. As to the number of copies, I do not like to make an excessive demand, but it is an important document and judging from the number of demands that have come for it, I should say that a large number should be printed in both languages, as in every province there must be many electors who would like to see the very terms of the agreement arrived at.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let it pass and we will confer with the clerk as to the number to be printed.

Mr. MONK. I had expected that the minister would say something about the verbatim report. Of course the Prime Minister has alluded to that. If we are all agreed that we should see that verbatim report, how is it that we are not given that opportunity? I could understand if the objections came from the imperial government that my right hon. friend would have to defer to that government but does he think that there is no distinction between an objection coming from that quarter and an objection coming from one of the other dependencies where perhaps for purely local reasons the publication of the verbatim report would not be desired. Such an objection would be no valid reason for not publishing the report here.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS OFFICER AT INGRAM DOCKS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax) moved :

For a copy of all orders in council, regulations and rules of the several departments of the government respecting the participation by employees of the government in civic or municipal affairs, and especially with regard to their disability from serving in civic or municipal councils; and all correspondence, documents and papers since the first day of January, 1900, touching the operation of the said orders in council, rules and regulations. Also a list of all employees of the government who have been elected to or have served in city or municipal councils during the said period from the first day of January, 1900, up to the present time, including all those now so serving and those who have been prevented by the government from serving.

He said: I mentioned this to the Prime Minister the other day. The facts are that a preventive officer in the county of Halifax holding a position which commands a salary of $150 a year happened to be elected in November or December as member of the municipal council of the county of Halifax. After his election it was brought to his attention that his position as a preventive officer might be lost by holding the position of municipal councillor. He wrote to me to ascertain whether this intimation

was correct. I made application to the Department of Customs and in reply received from them the following regulation:

File No. 58140. No. 1345 B.

MEMORANDUM.

Department of Customs, Canada,
Ottawa, 2nd January, 1906.

To Collectors of Customs:

Customs Officers not to hold any Corporate Office.

The attention of customs officers is directed to the following regulation, under order of the Governor General in Council:—

'No officer of customs is allowed to hold any corporate office, nor to interfere in political questions, either local or general.'

That portion seems to be the language of the order in council. Then the memorandum continues:—

The corporate offices above referred to are such offices as warden, mayor, alderman, school trustee, councillor, &c.

The rule applies to officers in the inside and outside service of the Customs.

JOHN McDOUGALD,
Commissioner of Customs.

As I understand it, no copy of this memorandum was ever sent to the officer to whom I allude. It is perfectly clear that the salary of $150 a year which he enjoys is absolutely insufficient for the support of himself and his family. It is, therefore, abundantly evident that a very considerable portion of his time must be devoted, and is devoted, to seeking other means of support. As a matter of fact, his appointment is simply made for the convenience of a small number of vessels visiting this outport, and he does not pretend, nor is it expected by the Department of Customs, that he should devote the whole of his time to the performance of his duties. The office to which he has been elected as a member of the municipal council of the county of Halifax takes, I suppose, ten, or twelve, or possibly fifteen days in each year; that is to say, he would be absent from his home at Ingram docks, in the county of Halifax, about that number of days in each year. The unfortunate position of matters at the present time is that his district will remain unrepresented for a portion of the year, because he cannot resign until he is sworn in after the council meets, and there will not be time to elect another representative of the district.

Well, what I desire to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister is, in the first place, that this seems to be a rather paltry and unnecessary rule in so far as officers of that status are concerned. I entirely agree that employees of the government of Canada, even holding a very small position, such as this man, ought not to interfere offensively in political affairs—I mean in federal or provincial elections—but I am bound to say that I see no particular reason why they should not be elected as members of the municipal councils, which, in this particular instance, and, I think, generally throughout the country, are not run on federal or provincial political lines. That rule seems to be rather unnecessary in so far as officers of this character are concerned.

There is no such rule generally prevailing in all of the departments of government, or else the rule is absolutely violated every day. I am not speaking from personal knowledge, but I am informed on good authority that there are at the present time, in the council of the city of Ottawa, no less than three civil servants who are receiving remuneration of a very considerable character and the whole of whose time is supposed to be devoted to the public service. Now, why is it that a civil servant at Ottawa, receiving a salary of $1,500 or $2,000, is at liberty to become a member of the city council and participate in the municipal government of this city and an officer holding the petty position to which I have alluded, a position commanding a salary of $150, and taking only a few days of his time in each year, should be debarred from doing exactly the same thing? It is perfectly obvious that the rules of the different departments are not the same, or that these rules are not being carried out. Therefore, I have asked for a return, which will set forth a copy of the orders in council, regulations, rules, &c., touching upon this subject. I think it is desirable that we should have some statement of the principle or policy upon which the government is acting in such matters, and that we should also know exactly what any employee of the government throughout the country serving in any department is to expect. So far as the unfortunate individual whose case I have brought to the attention of the House is concerned, he entered into this election contest in absolute ignorance of any rule or regulation which would debar him from doing so, and as a result he, and the district which he represents, have been placed in the unfortunate position which I have pointed out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I confess that I was somewhat taken by surprise when my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Borden, Halifax) informed the House that this customs officer in Halifax, who receives a salary, if salary it can be called, of $150 a year, should be called upon at the same time to resign a position to which he had been elected in the municipal service of his district. It is evident that this officer cannot live on the salary that he receives, that he must have another mode of living, that this is only an adjunct to his ordinary avocation, that, therefore, he is more of a private citizen than an official of the government, and I must say that under such

circumstances I could not see the reason of the rule which has been exercised against him. But, I have not been able yet to take the matter up, as my colleague the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is away, but I intend, on his return, to confer with him and have the reason for such a rule, if such a rule exists.

At the same time, I must express my satisfaction with my hon. friend that he has brought the matter to the attention of the House, because evidently there is an anomaly which must be rectified in what is going on. It is perfectly true that at this moment there are three members of the civil service who are now in the service of the city of Ottawa. One or two of them are aldermen, and one is on the board of control. No exception has been taken to their election, and though some of them were elected after a somewhat severe contest, I am not aware—it has not reached me—that any exception has been taken by anybody to these particular candidates because they were in the service. On the other hand, I have at this moment correspondence showing that in another city where men similarly situated, that is, being in the service of the government, attempted to be candidates, objection was immediately taken to them. It is very often found here and elsewhere, that there are men in the service who enjoy the confidence of the community in which they live to the extent that no one has found fault with them when they sought to take part in the municipal politics of their locality. In other localities men quite respectable, but still having their enemies, as most of us have, were confronted with notice of objection the moment they attempted to enter municipal politics. Under such circumstances, I believe that we shall have to adopt a uniform rule. I have not talked over the matter, and I would be obliged for any opinion that would come from the other side of the House, but, expressing my own opinion, I would say that, perhaps, the safest course would be to make the rule absolutely uniform that any man in the service of the government obtaining a salary which provides for his living—I do not mean a customs officer who is receiving only $150 a year—should be debarred from entering the municipal service. I would not call on any man who is now in possession of a municipal office to resign, and, perhaps, the best course would be to give notice that in future no man who is a servant of the government should be allowed to enter the municipal council of the locality in which he lives. Either the rule must be that all servants of the government shall be allowed to enter municipal politics or else that all shall be debarred from so doing. I do not think the present practice of allowing some employees of the government to enter municipal politics and others not, should be allowed to continue.

Mr. PERLEY. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that if he is going to make a rule of that kind he should only apply it to civil servants who are in receipt of large salaries and who are supposed to devote all their time to the service of the government. All good citizens owe a duty to the municipality in which they live, and the civil servants owe that duty as well as the rest of the community. I think the government of this great country should be willing to put themselves to some little inconvenience, if some valued citizen who happens to be in the employ of the government, should be selected by his fellow citizens to represent them in the civic administration. If any salary limit is made, I would suggest that only those who receive large salaries should be debarred from accepting municipal honours.

Mr. EMMERSON. When I was Minister of Railways we had a great deal of difficulty in the department with reference to this very matter. We must recognize that the municipalities pay practically nothing for the services of their representatives. For example, in the city of Moncton, the remuneration is so paltry, if it is anything at all, that it could not strike any one to engage in civic politics, but there were cases in which men who sought the suffrage of the people, were foremen in different departments of the railway, and it was represented that as they had, in consequence of their position, control over the voters, it was unfair to those who were running against them. One hon. member has stated that these municipal contests are not run on party lines, but I think it is the experience of every hon. gentleman here that it is an unfortunate fact that too often party politics do enter into municipal contests. There should be discrimination as to what officers should be allowed to seek municipal honours, in any general rule that may be established, and when I was Minister of Railways that principle was given effect to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the principle; I do not understand.

Mr. EMMERSON. The principle is that where a man in the government service has control of a large number of men under him, and can grant them favours, he should not be allowed to enter into these contests. It is not that the government loses very much of the time of the employees by attending to their municipal office, but there were constant complaint that the government official had an advantage over the other man who was opposing him.

Mr. McGIVERIN. (Ottawa). It is very probable that this question concerns more

particularly the city of Ottawa than any other municipality in the Dominion. The citizens of Ottawa have had the good fortune to have had many members of the Civil Service represent them on the board of aldermen, on the school board, and in some cases on the board of control. It would seem to me, Sir, that where we have a large body of civil servants, as in this capital city, gentlemen who are paying their taxes and who are deeply interested in the good government of the city, they should be allowed to have the ordinary rights of citizenship and permitted to aspire to any municipal office which is in the gift of their fellow citizens. If there should be any question as to their civic duties interfering with the discharge of the duties of their official position, that can be easily set right, because the deputy minister of any department can see that the official attends to the work of his office. Of course, the first duty of such officials would be to earn the salary they are paid by the government of the country, but surely in their spare hours, after they have rendered full service to the State, they should be entitled to take part in the municipal government of this city. It would appear to me that one of the great difficulties in this country, is to get men of position and intelligence to interest themselves in municipal affairs, and if we are to make a rule that no civil servant shall enter municipal politics, then the city of Ottawa would be deprived of some of its most honoured municipal representatives. We have been fortunate in Ottawa that we have had some very good men, particularly members of the Civil Service, to represent us in the city council, and on the board of control and on the school board. In this city the government officials, do not, as a rule, come under that class referred to by the member for Westmorland who is in a position to wield an influence over other employees, and consequently, the condition of affairs spoken of by that hon. gentleman, would not be applicable here. For my part, I would be extremely sorry to see any rule adopted by the government which would preclude members of the Civil Service, at all events in the city of Ottawa, representing their fellow citizens in municipal matters.

Mr. CONMEE. I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) that those who enter the public service should not be permitted to enter municipal politics. I should think that a civil servant running for municipal office might be able to wield a very unfair influence as against his neighbour who is not in the service. If the matter is dealt with by the government, and there is to be an exception made of the city of Ottawa I do not think that I would enter very much objection, but, as a general rule the civil servant cannot do justice to the public interest for which he is paid and at the same time do justice to the municipality. I know of cases where gentlemen of the Civil Service have entered municipal politics very much to the injury of the Civil Service, and I do not know that they were very much use to the municipality. When gentlemen enter the Civil Service, with the advantages it affords, it seems to me that they should devote their time and energy and ability to that service, and if they do that, I do not believe they will do more than justice to the reward they receive.

Mr. EMMERSON. May I be permitted to explain that if my hon. friend referred to me as having objected to government officials taking part in municipal or civic affairs, I failed to make myself understood. The point I wished to make was this. The right hon. leader of the government intimated that some general rule, perhaps a sweeping rule, would be desirable, and I asked him to discriminate by taking into consideration the relative positions of the officials. I thought it was not a question of the payment which they might receive from the municipality or the city, but a broader principle—that possibly men in the government service should be permitted to give their services to the advantage of the community in which they reside.

Mr. CONMEE. If I may be permitted, I did understand the remarks of the hon. gentleman in the light in which I spoke. Now I understand that he wants to draw a line, and I would like him to tell us where he would draw that line. If I understood him aright, he would draw it at the employees of a government railway. There are a great many others in the government service, however, whom it would be even more objectionable to have engaged in municipal affairs. Even men in the employ of a great company can wield and do wield an unfair influence in a small community as compared with other men.

Mr. LENNOX. I think in the course of ten years I have not had the pleasure of agreeing with my right hon. friend the Prime Minister until now. Listening to the debate, I find that the ideas enunciated by the right hon. gentleman are more in harmony with what I think would be a safe rule than any that have been expressed subsequently. I think the only safe way would be that those who earn their livelihood in the Civil Service of the country should be debarred from entering anything in the nature of political life. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that municipal politics are to some extent diverted into political channels. It

is a happy circumstance when it is not so ; but it is the rule, almost if not wholly universal, that the municipal elections have a bearing upon the subsequent parliamentary elections ; and I think it would be a very dangerous thing—and here I agree with another gentleman whom I do not often agree with, the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee)—if the large army of civil servants that we have in Ottawa—and if this government is permitted to remain in power long, the army will increase in number—were allowed to engage in the municipal warfare of the city of Ottawa. An exception might be made in the somewhat limited number of cases of persons who are so locally situated that it is found convenient to employ them to perform some minor office for the government ; but the exception should be confined pretty strictly to that class of cases. The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) said he would like to have discrimination, and that the position of the person aspiring to municipal honours should be the determining factor ; that if he were a person likely to exercise influence over those who voted for him, it would be improper for him to have the position. On the other hand, if it be a position in which he would not likely exercise influence, he might well be allowed to exercise the rights of citizenship. But who is to draw the line? Is the candidate to ask permission of his minister to be allowed to take this position or not? And, if he is, where is the guarantee that all will be treated alike? I confess that I would not have perfect faith that all the employees of the various departments would have equal justice ; and we can well imagine that if a head of a department has to draw the line, there might be a feeling, and might perhaps be justified, that there was unjust discrimination, and that a Conservative, for instance, would be prevented serving a Liberal given that privilege. Or there might be a Conservative and a Liberal opposing each other, so that the minister would have practically the power to determine which one should be in the municipal council and which should not. I trust, therefore, the government will take this matter into early consideration, and make a rule on the lines the Prime Minister has indicated, that those who are drawing comfortable incomes from the Civil Service shall feel obliged to give all their energies to that service and shall not consider it a hardship to be deprived from engaging in municipal affairs.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me we can hardly apply the same rule to both classes of civil servants, namely, those in Ottawa and those on the Intercolonial railway, because the cases are not at all parallel. In a city like this the rule that I would be disposed to apply would be that when civil servants who own property and are therefore on a par with other citizens, they should have the right to go into municipal life because municipal officers have the power to tax or prevent taxation of property. If civil servants are property owners to an extent sufficient to qualify them for municipal office, I would be inclined to the opinion that they should have the right to be elected to those offices. But I would go a step further. I would make the civil servants here the same as any other citizens. I would enable their creditors to collect debts from them and deal with them in the business relations of life just as they would with other individuals. If that be done, I can see no reason why it would not be perfectly proper for civil servants to accept municipal office and take their share of municipal government the same as other property owners. It is unfortunate that in some parts of the country, of late years there has been a tendency to run these municipal campaigns on political lines. That is very wrong and it sometimes gives a civil servant an advantage in a contest which he should not enjoy. We ought to discredit as much as possible the tendency to run municipal contests on political lines. With that understanding, I can see no objection to civil servants who are property owners being elected to municipal office.

But when we come to the employees of the Intercolonial railway, who have a great deal of business patronage to dispense, the case is different. Take an important employee on the Intercolonial railway in some town where he can control many things, that railway has much to do with the municipality, and in such a case I think that these civil servants should not be eligible for municipal election. I think that there you might probably draw the line and say that where the employee is receiving a reasonable salary, he should give his whole time to the service and not take part in municipal matters. But if he be only in receipt of a trifling salary, such as $100 or $150, it ought to be beneath us to make any rule prohibiting such a man from taking part in municipal life, if he be qualified in other respects.

Mr. McKENZIE. In a former debate I had occasion to express the same opinion as has been given to-night by the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the right hon. the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with regard to the recipient of such a paltry salary as $150. These parties should not be disqualified from participating in any of the duties of citizenship. However, I find the expression of opinion prevalent in the House that the government does not

begrudge the time which civil servants may bestow on their duties as councillors or municipal officers. If there be no objection on the part of the government to let civil servants give their time to the discharge of such duties, this subject might well be dropped in this House altogether. The qualification of our aldermen or municipal councillors is a purely local matter to be dealt with by the local legislatures. If any one will look over the statutes of the different provinces, he will find many which disqualify certain persons from running for municipal councils, such as sheriffs, clergymen and municipal employees; so that if we do not begrudge the time given to these municipal duties, it is perfectly safe for us to leave to the legislatures of the different provinces the duty of saying who shall be eligible. If any one who is running should abuse the office he holds from the government, that will very soon become known, and it will be in the hands of the local legislature to disqualify any such person. But there is no power in this House to enforce any such regulation except by the drastic method of dismissal. But if a regulation is to be enforced, let it be enforced by the local legislatures. Not so very long ago we had a drastic regulation in force in the province of Nova Scotia which prevented Dominion officials from voting in a Dominion election. I had the honour of introducing a Bill into the legislature of Nova Scotia to remove such disqualifications. So, I think, in the province from which I come, we are advancing along the line of being willing that Dominion officials should take part in municipal government. And, as I said, if this House is willing that the time should be devoted to the service of the municipality, I think we can well leave it to the provincial authorities to decide who are eligible for such positions.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have listened with great interest to the opinions expressed on this question, and perhaps I may not agree with any of them. I think that as to the inside service here in Ottawa, when a man accepts a public position with a fixed salary, he agrees to give all his time and all his services to the country. It may be said that his hours only extend from 9 a.m. or 9.30 a.m. to 5 p.m., and that outside of that time he is free to do what he pleases. I do not so regard it. I think the civil servant is paid for all his time and for his whole service, and that, besides the time, he spends in his office he should give time to rest and recreation in order to better fit him for his duties. But, if he takes advantage of that, and devotes five or six hours of the evening to a municipal council meeting, he is certainly not going to be as well prepared for service next day, and I do not think it fair to the country that he should accept the salary paid to a civil servant, and waste energy, if not his time, in doing work other than that which the country requires of him.

I think it would be a hardship to impose this condition upon the outside service, upon the man who does not agree to give all his time or, possibly, even more than a small part of his time, to the service of the country, as in the case instanced by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). It seems to me it would be rather a hardship to deprive such a man of the right to run for municipal office. But he is in a vastly different position from that of a civil servant at Ottawa, who accepts payment for his entire time. I have had occasion, before now, to appeal to the Minister of Customs in a matter somewhat similar, the case of a collector of customs in my own county who was running a hotel. I thought it not a reasonable thing that a man should hold these two positions. However, I think I was overruled. Nevertheless, I contend I was right. I do not think a man engaged in commercial business should be permitted to be an officer of the customs and pass his own goods through the customs. But that is very different from a civil servant engaging in municipal affairs. I think a civil servant whose whole time is paid for by the country should abstain from having anything to do with municipal affairs, but should give his entire time to the service of the country, including the time of rest and recreation which he should use in better preparing himself for his duties.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) consider it fair that a civil servant who owned a lot of property in the city should have no say in the way in which that property was taxed for municipal purposes? And, if you do not allow him to be elected to municipal office, he can have no say in the matter. The taxes he has to pay are low or high according as there are or are not qualified municipal officers. For the owner of property to have no say in the question of taxation would, I think, be unfair.

Mr. HENDERSON. He would be in no worse position than thousands and tens of thousands of other citizens who are not elected to the municipal council. I understand that the civil servant is allowed to vote for municipal affairs. He can express an opinion in that way. I think he would be under no hardship. Besides, the civil servant knows, when he accepts a position in the service, one condition of which is that he is to be paid out of the public treasury for his whole time, that certain privileges do not belong to him as they do to citizens who make no such engagement.

He should give his time to the service of the public, either in the shape of work or rest or recreation the better to fit him for the duties of his position.

Mr. DANIEL. It is easily seen that there is something to be said on both sides of this question. At the same time, so far as my experience goes—and I have had some experience in municipal affairs—I should agree with the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With regard to gentlemen holding positions in the outside service, most of them are in the same position as those in the inside service so far as being paid for all their time is concerned. Speaking for my own city, I know that the duties of an alderman or councillor require a great deal of the time of the person upon whom they devolve. A man who is not a master of his own time is not in a position to carry out the duties of alderman or councillor in that municipality at all events, so far as that municipality is concerned. I do not think the man elected for office, municipal office there, can fulfil his duty towards the government and perform his municipal duties also. Mention has been made also of the issues which arise, of the character of the issues involved in these municipal elections. While, in many cases, elections are not run on Dominion issues, yet, in almost every municipal election in this country, the influence of Dominion politics does enter to some extent; and there is no doubt that for his own welfare as well as for the general welfare of the community, I think, it is much better that the civil servant should not take any part whatever in political elections or anything of that kind. I think that is better for himself and also better for the service of the country. We recognize in our province and I presume it is so in other provinces, that an officeholder under this government is not eligible, for instance, for election to a local legislature. A civil servant who has once accepted such an office is under no greater disadvantage with regard to matters of that kind than those who wish to run for the local legislature. A civil servant would understand that he was debarred from seeking municipal preferment and I see no hardship in that. I believe it would be much better if this government made a hard and fast rule that persons accepting positions in the civil service of Canada were thereby debarred from entering into contests for municipal offices. A municipal council might have to do business with these civil servants on behalf of the government and if they were members of the city council the government might have an influence over them that would not be in the interest of the municipality. I endorse the opinion expressed by the Prime Minister that it would be better to make a rule debarring officials of the Dominion government from taking part in municipal politics, although I can understand that a municipality might thus be deprived of the services of very useful men.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It may be rather difficult to define where the line, if there is to be one, should be drawn. I would be inclined to accept the line laid down by the Prime Minister, that is a line between those offices which command the entire time and service of the officers and those of a paltry or petty nature, which are merely adjuncts to the chief means of livelihood of the person holding them. Take the office to which I have called attention. That man has been in the service of the government for 30 years. For 26 years he enjoyed a salary of 17c a day or $60 a year. About four years ago, some change was made in the Department of Customs, under which his salary has been advanced, I think to $150. It does not seem reasonable that a man holding a position like that, purely for the convenience of the country just as many postmasters throughout Canada, hold their offices, should be debarred from becoming a member of a municipal council. After all the main consideration is to make some clear and definite rule, to make all the employees of the government understand what that rule is, and then to carry it out uniformly all over the country. That does not now seem to be done and it is for that reason that I brought this matter to the attention of the House.

Motion agreed to.

THE FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

For a copy of all correspondence between the government or any member thereof, or any official of the Department of Finance, and any person or association, with reference to the conduct and affairs of the Farmers' Bank since the date of its organization.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution and the two that follow it, my desire is to get all the information possible in the hands of the government, which will enable the House and the country to form a correct opinion as to what, if any, responsibilities lie at the door of an imperfect Act on the one hand, or of an imperfect administration of the Act on the other and to define as sharply as possible, the line between the two.

The story of the history and failure of the Farmers' Bank, is, to say the least of it, not pleasant reading for the citizens of our country and no pleasant comment upon the Banking Act of which we have been so proud, and which probably we have been prone to eulogize a little too highly. Just as I would deprecate the too great eulogy of

the Bank Act and the system that is founded upon it, so I would deprecate going to the other side of the scale and in a moment certainly of a good deal of stress and anxiety, where criticism is easily and largely evoked, undertaking over drastic legislation, because of any one failure or because of the circumstances which bring some of these matters more distinctly into the public mind. I do not imagine that this House proposes to lose its calmness or good temper or good sense, but at the same time the circumstances surrounding the failure of the Farmers' Bank and the public opinion which has been aroused because of that lay a duty upon this House of examining very carefully as to where the weaknesses have been and after examination of remedying them fully, completely and, I believe, just as soon as legislation can be passed.

Now what are the circumstances of the case? We have already had within the last few years, too few years, several rather bad bank failures. They came, some of them, suddenly; they struck very heavily, but there were certain circumstances in connection with them, which enabled the public to more quickly forget them. The principal circumstance was that, by the interposition of the other banks, no one lost anything. The note holders, of course, were paid and the depositors were paid, and if any loss occurred it was the loss of the capital by those who subscribed to a business venture with all the risks which surround a business venture. This is a different case. In the first place, this is a farmers' bank. The very name of it, and the canvass which was put on for stock appealed to the farming community, and it had the effect of introducing, amongst the shareholders of the bank, a large amount of the capital of farmers, which at the best, is earned slowly, and which when it is to be parted with in the way of loss, is a more serious matter possibly than it is to the average business man and to the business community. On that bank, being a farmers' bank, farmers were placed as directors and, without at this present time canvassing that subject at all, it certainly, in the results which have taken place, cannot be said to have eventuated in the very best conduct of banking affairs. Fortunately, under the banking system that we have, the note holder has been in this, as in all the other cases, absolutely protected. Unless there was an avalanche of failure, a cataclysm, that would hold good under our legislation, and to my mind is a very excellent point in our banking system. When they came to invest their money in it and expected to make a profit by it, you find that they lost, not only the money they put in, but all their prospective profit as well, and have to double up by adding to the amount they lost, an equal amount because under the liability clause they have to pay the losses that have occurred. Depositors who thought that when they were depositing in the bank, it was as safe as a bank, as the rule runs, and that they would have there not only their savings, but the interest thereon, find that they are liable not perhaps to lose everything, but yet a large part of the money which they had deposited and the interest which they had hoped to gain. But what makes it more particularly hard and bitter is, that, being a farmers' bank, the farmers putting their money into the stock of the bank, and followed up their confidence and optimism, by putting in their earnings and savings also, as deposits hoping to strengthen the bank while at the same time, they made their own profits.

You have the institution running four years, and in that time making a banking loss of $780,000, more or less. You find it at the end of that time on the rocks, and, from the curator's reports and the examinations which have been made in the court, you find that during that four years a strange series of banking operations was taking place—directors who did not direct, inspectors who did not inspect, a Banking Act framed for the purpose of preventing abuses which did not prevent a single abuse, and a government charged with the supervision and the working of the Banking Act during the whole time not supervising, at least, not to the extent of changing by a single inch the course which was being pursued, or saving by a single dollar the money which was at stake. Now, that is the presentation of the case, that is the way it stands.

But you find more than that. The Act was supposed to set out clearly and definitely the conditions to be fulfilled before an engine of that kind could get running rights on the broad track of finance and trade in this country. You find that every provision and particular of the preliminary conditions laid down in the Bank Act have been absolutely broken, flatly defied, and yet there seemed to be no trouble at all in the bank getting in a position to do business.

Mr. MILLER. Will the hon. gentleman go a little more into detail and say what provisions were not complied with?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will have all the detail before I get through if he will curb his impatience for a moment.

Mr. MILLER. That is all I want.

Mr. FOSTER. This is about the condition of things as it appeared. I do not want to enter into this matter too much in detail, as I am simply asking for papers, but one point that I want to bring before

the House is this: On that condition of things there is a broad feeling of unrest, and, I might say, indignation, particularly in those parts of the country where the matter comes home to the depositor on the one hand, or to the shareholder on the other, and the demand is made, if I understand, not only for an investigation, but for a remedy as well. It is on that line that I want to call the attention of the House for a few moments to the conditions laid down by the Act, and to discuss the question as to whether or not the Act is all to blame, or the government, which called the engine into operation, is all to blame, or whether the Act is partly to blame, and the supervising authority partly to blame and to apportion, as I think we must before we can come to any definite and proper conclusion, just the amount of defect that there may be in each of these and where it chiefly lies. If the Act is defective, then the supervising authority is without fault, because it had not the powers under which it could act. If the Act is not defective and still that condition of things happens that I have spoken of, then it must be that the supervising authority has been careless, or lax, or inefficient in its work. Now, then, what is the power that the Act gives? Who is responsible for the formation of a bank? There is, first, the legislative authority granting the incorporation of the bank. This parliament is responsible for the instrument calling into existence a banking company in this country. The government lays down the conditions which govern the formation and running of a bank. It then puts into the hands of certain officials and certain departments the duty of seeing that the conditions are carried out. If the conditions are ineffective the supervising authority, as I said, has not the machinery with which to do the work, and you cannot hold it responsible, but, if the Act, in its provisions, gives a plentitude of power, then we must inquire if the supervising authority has done its duty under the powers that the Act has given. It is the company's incorporation that this House is responsible for. But the Act of incorporation cannot call the bank into existence, cannot authorize one single bit of the work to be done, cannot put a single operation into running order.

It makes the frame work, but something else has to be done to put the machine into active working order. The motive power is not the act of incorporation, it is gathered up by the provisional directors. The provisional directors, after parliament has done its duty, under the authority of that legislation open the stock books and take subscriptions. That takes a certain amount of time and has to be done under certain regulations, and when it is all done you yet have absolutely no bank because not a stroke of business can be done up to that point. After the provisional directors have done their duty and have assembled the motive power, to wit, the money which is to be put into the operation, and have called the subscribers together, the duties of the provisional directors cease and the subscribers take up the work and they elect their directors, and those directors make an application for what? For running orders; for leave to go ahead. And until these running orders are given you cannot have any harm done. Then we come right to the point: Who gives the running orders? It is the government of the country through the Department of Finance. The conditions laid down are in brief these: That there shall be at least $500,000 bona fide subscribed. That word 'bona fide' is in. It must be an actual subscription not a fake subscription. That must be subscribed in order that there shall be a backing to the bank in its operations. Is that a casual provision? No. It is elementary, it is fundamental, it is the essence of the contract arrived at by the wisdom of parliament. It was not always so, but after years of experience and much deliberation it is a fundamental condition now that if a bank shall go into operation it shall have at least $500,000 bona fide subscribed. But that is not all. It must have $250,000 of that $500,000 which is bona fide subscribed, collected in cash and put into the hands of the Minister of Finance. Both those things are fundamental and no running orders can be given until both those things are done. Now, if it is fundamental that $500,000 should be subscribed bona fide and that of that $500,000 $250,000 shall be paid up and paid into the Finance Minister, the next question comes: Who is to judge as to whether that $500,000 is a bona fide subscription or not; who is to be the judge as to whether that $250,000 has been paid up and is paid in? The judge is the government in and through the operation of the treasury board. Then, Sir, if anybody is made a judge as to whether these two provisions have been carried out, it is no perfunctory office that that person has to fill; it is vital. The interests not only of the shareholders but of all possible depositors, and to a large extent the business of the country are in the hands of that organization which decides whether these two actions are bona fide and whether they have been complied with. There is no prima facie complying with them, no 'possibly' complying with them, no complying with them by this or that man saying they have been complied with; no. Too big interests hang on that, too much is at stake; that must be an actual satisfactory decision come to on facts and the facts must be considered sufficient to make it beyond cavil. Is the act lame in tying the hands of the Treasury Board at that particular

point? I do not think so; I do not think the act is to blame, for what does it say:—

No certificate shall be given by the Treasury board until it has been shown to the satisfaction of the board, &c.

If these words 'to the satisfaction of the board' were not in, there might be some reasons why it might be urged that the Act was defective:—But it matters not if one man makes a solemn affidavit or ten men make a solemn affidavit, or 5,000 men make a solemn affidavit the Treasury Board is not bound to take that as evidence. It has to be satisfied ; it can call for, and it has the right, and I think the duty to call for evidence which absolutely satisfies it. I think the language of the Act is clear enough and wide enough and inclusive enough to put the responsibility upon the deciding power. Now, Sir, what happened? It turns out that in the first place $500,000 was not bona fide subscribed. In the second place it turns out that $250,000 was not bona fide paid in ; was not paid in at all. What does the curator say? He says that $170,000 was all that remained of the collections from the subscribers. More than that was collected from the subscribers, but $41,000 was paid out by and to the provisional directors for the purposes for which it was paid which are not given in detail—we will say the expenses of promotion, and the like of that. And when that $41,000 was taken out there was but $170,000 left of the money that actually was paid in, the whole amount paid in being $211,000. But there were notes given where cash was not paid and these notes were used, possibly as collaterals, I do not know. But to make a long story short, there being a deficit some man borrowed $80,000, and out of his borrowings made up the sum of $250,000, and that $250,000 was deposited to the credit of the Receiver-General in the Bank of Montreal in the city of Toronto. There is actually the state of the case: The Treasury Board had the application before it. The fundamental conditions are, the subscription of $500,000, and the paying up and paying in of $250,000 of actual cash. Neither the one nor the other was done, and the only way that the $250,000 came to be paid in at last was that some men, the bank not being in existence, not having running power, borrowed a sum of money and added to it. If you contend that a man can borrow $80,000 to make up the deposit, you could just as well contend that not one dollar of the $250,000 need be paid up, but that the whole of it might be borrowed, and that would satisfy the meaning of the Act. Will any man say that it would satisfy the meaning of the Act? No, nor can he say that the borrowing of $80,000 satisfies the meaning of the Act? Yet, that being the condition of things, the Treasury Board issued the certificate on the 30th of November, 1906.

Now, I am not going to say that the case is complete, or that this House of the country should judge it until the other side is heard. I am simply putting the thing as it is, and asking the government for all the papers and all the knowledge in their possession, in order to get all the facts together with the version of the government. That it seems to me is eminently fair. But, I am putting this case as strongly as I can from the point of view of the sufficiency of the power which was put into the hands of the Treasury Board, and we will see what the information is and hear what the government has to say.

Now, what did the government do? The government—that is, the treasury board—evidently felt that there was some trouble in the matter. It went to the Minister of Justice for an opinion upon the evidence that came before it as to the sufficiency of the preliminary conditions being fulfilled. What was that evidence? An affidavit by Mr. Travers; that is all, so far as the Prime Minister's answer would lead me to conclude. An affidavit was handed in by Mr. Travers, stating that the money had been subscribed bona fide, and that $250,000 had been paid in, and that it lay there in the Bank of Montreal. According to the Prime Minister's answer, no other evidence was asked. Now, suppose that there had been no discussion of the matter, no cautions, no warnings, was the Treasury Board justified in taking the affidavit of the man interested—that and nothing more, and asking for nothing more? I say, not in a case of that kind. I say that was not the proper attitude of the Treasury Board. Even if not a breath of suspicion had reached the Treasury Board, it ought to have asked something more; it ought to have made further examination; for all the interests of depositors and shareholders in the future lay upon the shoulders of those who made that decision, a decision made under great responsibility, and the grounds of it should have been as broad and as well substantiated as possible. What did the Minister of Justice say? He said that the affidavit submitted, if accepted by the Treasury Board, was sufficient for them to base the certificate upon. The Minister of Justice did not estop the Treasury Board from going behind the affidavit of Mr. Travers. He said: If you accept that—as being sufficient, I suppose—you can issue the certificate; but that did not authorize the Treasury Board to issue it, or preclude it from saying, we think under the circumstances this is not enough, and we must make a further exemination. I say that even if there was no suspicion or

hint of things not being as they ought to be, more information should have been insisted upon by the Treasury Board before setting that engine going. But were there no cautions, no warnings? We ask that question. I will not say positively that there were, but this I will say, that if there were warnings, if there were cautions, written to or whispered in the ear of any member or official of the Treasury Board that matters were not as they should be—and it was known on the streets of Toronto that they were not—and that an investigation should be made, a decision given by the Treasury Board in the face of these cautions and warnings would be a very serious matter. Were any such cautions given? Were they warned? Were they expostulated with, not once, not twice, but many times? I ask the government; we will get the answer. If they were not, that part of my argument will fall. If they were, their responsibility is undeniably greater and much more heavy. Then the order to go ahead is given, and the engine starts with its full train, and it runs for four years. But there is still the Bank Act; there is still the Finance Department; there is still the government; and just as that engine stood still on the track until the Treasury Board gave it the running orders, just so it could be pulled up at any time by the same Finance Department and ordered to report its conditions. Every month certain returns had to be made; but that is not all, and that is not the most. Those returns are scheduled, and the official mind might say, we have read over the returns and they seem to be all right; we need not go further. But there is another provision which gives additional power to the Finance Department—section 113 of the Act. I will just read that. Parliament in its legislation decided upon the questions that would be asked; arranged the schedule, tried to make it take in every important particular, so that when it came each month to the Department of Finance, that department might have grounds for criticism, for judgment. It is not supposed that the returns come to the Finance Department simply to be pigeon-holed. They are there for a purpose—to be carefully scanned, to see if possible what is the condition of the bank as revealed by those returns.

What if there be anything that does not seem to be just right to the minister? If he feels he has not what he ought to have and there is something still wrong, under section 113. 'The Minister may also call for special returns from any Bank, whenever in his judgment they are necessary to afford a full complete knowledge of its condition.' That is a power virtually untrammeled. Whenever the minister likes he may call for a return, the object being to bring about information which will guide him in ascertaining the exact condition of the bank. Those are the words of the Act 'to afford a full and complete knowledge of its condition.' This is a broad and strong power, and one which brings its own responsibility. After going orders had been issued and the bank was in operation, what happened? Among a number of others, one thing happened, the record of which we have in a non-official way. On the 11th January, 1910, the Superintendent of State Insurance in the state of New York wrote a letter to Mr. Fielding, Finance Minister. What induced the superintendent to write that letter? It was this: A man by the name of Tevis from Kentucky, with some associates, conceived the idea of buying out a mutual beneficiary insurance society or the control of it in the state of New York. It was a society which had about $3,000,000 of assets, and was in rather a comatose condition. Tevis and his associates came to Travers and borrowed $150,000 from him to buy control of that insurance company. They bought control and then immediately turned round and sold $180,000 of securities, with $150,000 of which they were to satisfy the loan. But the state of New York said, that is a mutual insurance company and the assets belong to it, and the state superintendent of insurance got busy to get back the $150,000, a part of the proceeds of the sale of securities of that society, from its lodgement in Toronto in the Farmers' Bank. He could not get it back from manager Travers, but it was necessary that it should be got quickly before liens could be put against it. He invoked the aid of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on the 11th of January. He detailed the whole of the circumstances to that minister and he said to him: Can you help me in the matter to the extent of getting information as to just how this thing stands in the bank? What was the answer? It was: There is no government inspection and consequently we cannot act; but if you will just apply to Travers, I think you can get all the information you require. But Mr. Hotchkiss had been applying to Travers and did not get the information he wanted, so that the Finance Minister, on the 11th or 12th of January was made cognizant of that kind of transaction—a transaction which, if it had been explained to a proper kind of banker—and no banker would make $150,000 advance upon it until it had been explained to him—would have been dismissed in shorter time and in stronger words than I would take in telling you. But that was the kind of transaction of which the Finance Department was aware on the 11th of January, 1910, and that was the answer which the department gave. But after the department thought it over, it came to the conclusion that it was somewhat grave and

made up its mind to communicate with Travers, and it so informed Mr. Hotchkiss and asked him if his letter could be used. Permission was given, and a letter was written to Travers, and in due time an answer came which was transmitted to Mr. Hotchkiss, and Mr. Hotchkiss again wrote in further explanation of the transaction and still asking the Minister of Finance for his aid as far as it could be given. In the reply of Travers to Mr. Fielding, there is this phrase: I regret that you think this an unusual banking transaction. Therefore, the letter of Mr. Fielding to Travers, which we have not got, but which we will get, must have contained that statement. There then is the confession by the Department of Finance that this was a peculiar banking transaction, that the department knew all about it, so far as its salient features were concerned, and that it had felt impelled to communicate with Travers and ask for an explanation. So far so good, but from the 11th of January up to the time of the closing of the bank, though often importuned, the Finance Department does not seem to have made any progress at all in aiding the insurance commissioner on the other side of the line to get at the rights of the transaction.

Now we want an explanation. Possibly a full and complete explanation may be given. We have no right to form a judgment until an explanation is given, and for my part I do not.

What else took place? We have what is called a bakers' association. What is that banking association for, and had it any particular duties or could it have exercised any rightful influence on a transaction of this kind and on the bank which was carrying it on? We had the idea in this House that whether by the direct giving of powers to the banking association or by that still stronger power which the association of all the banks must inevitably have upon any one of them, irregularities like this could be checked and managers committing them could be called down. Did the Bankers' Association know of this transaction? I should judge that they were fully appraised of it by Mr. Hotchkiss. Did they make any representations to the Finance Minister that something should be done? That information we want to get; but there is the fact that during the whole year, the Bankers' Association did not move to obtain an efficacious adjustment of that matter. Whether that association tried its influence or not we do not know. Whether its powers allowed it to exercise an influence in a case of that kind, I am not lawyer enough to be a judge.

But, I do have faith enough in the power of the associated banks to know that, if they had got a hustle on, they could have had an explanation and a restitution from the Farmers' Bank in a very short time. So that in this case, we evidently found no particular advantage from the Bankers' Association. The question comes up: If the Bankers' Association did not act, was it because they had not the power? If they have not the power, is it the proper thing for this parliament to enlarge their powers, so that, if the Finance Department does not do what some of us think its duty, the associated bankers will be able to remind the recalcitrant bank that it is outstepping the bounds? Not making any assertions as to whether they should have acted—I do not know whether they have the full power to act; one thing is certain, that, by some means or other, a remedy must be found. If the Banking Act is not strong enough in the powers it gives the Finance Department and the Treasury Board, give them stronger; if the Finance Department and the Treasury Board have not done their duty, let that be known to the country. If the Bankers Association is useful for balancing such things and has not the necessary powers, and we think it would be a good body to trust with such powers, let us give them the powers that are needed. The whole matter can be brought under review. For my part, there stand out clear before me two things: one is that a bank should not be able to get into operation in this Dominion under the conditions under which this bank got into operation; and the other thing is that, in this case as in the cases that have preceded it, the weak spot is the head office and the almost complete lack of effective inspection in the head office. Does any one mean to say that a level headed inspector, one who was at nobody's beck and call, absolutely independent of the bank he was inspecting, could have gone into the Farmers' Bank at any time in 1910 or any other year during which it has been running and not, almost in a trice, have put his finger upon the weak spot in that management? But, the inspector did not inspect, from the fact that it is almost impossible, under present conditions, for the inspector to inspect the head office. When the inspector of a bank goes out to the branch offices, he is boss there, and they know it; but when he is in the head office, he is not the boss there—the manager is the boss and the inspector knows pretty well his limits.

How that should be remedied is not for me to discuss to-night; but it is for me, and for other members of this House, to think about, and it is for us to discuss without fear and without favour, with the one supreme object in view of preventing such abuses in future, thereby conserving the people's confidence in the banking institutions of this country, which is the first great thing; secondly, the people's savings in these banks, and thirdly the capital which is put in good faith into these banks by men who hope to make a

success of their venture in the banking business.

That is all I have to say on the point. The information I have asked for is designed to bring before the House what is absolutely necessary to my mind. And let me say just one word there: I have asked for returns over and over again; I have asked for bread and have got a little bit of a stone. That is too common in the returns brought down by the government. But this is a return that will not stand for anything like that; this is a request that calls for all the information and wants it frankly, freely, fully, no matter whom it hurts. We must have it before we can remedy the evils. And it is with that view, and with these reasons to support it, that I ask the House to pass this order.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has, in this case, asked for information. He works himself up into a great state of indignation, making out a case before the information is handed out. I think that in this, as in so many cases, it would have been more in keeping had he first obtained the information and then made his speech. He has told us that he reserves judgment until he has the information. I am glad that in one part of his remarks he made that statement. In the beginning of his remarks he said there had been loss, and there was indignation. Notwithstanding the statement that he would suspend judgment until the information was before him, and knowing that where there is a loss of money there is indignation and an effort to fix blame, it would seem that he was endeavouring to take advantage of that state of affairs to make a case against the government which he feared he could not make when the information came down.

I do not think that any hon. member of this House will say that in the Banking and Commerce Committee party politics ever plays any great or serious part. I think that committee is composed in large part of business men from both sides of the House who always endeavour to do business on business principles without regard to partisanship. I was not a member of the House when the Farmers Bank obtained its charter, which was in the year 1904. But that bank did not within the year prescribed, make the required deposit of $250,000, and applied, as many other banks have done, for a renewal of its charter. This application came up when I was a member of this House and of the Banking and Commerce Committee, in 1905. The hon. member who has spoken (Mr. Foster) has endeavoured, I think I may fairly say, to charge grave negligence to the Finance Department. The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) is absent from the House, but he is primarily responsible for the acts of that department. I remember very well that when the Farmers' Bank Bill asking for a renewal of their charter was before the Banking and Commerce Committee, the Minister of Finance very strongly objected to the renewal being granted; and I remember that in that case, as in a number of other cases since, the Banking and Commerce Committee ruled against the advice of the Minister of Finance, and the Bill was carried through the committee against his hard opposition. That is not the only time it has occurred.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLER. Did I understand the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) to speak?

Mr. HENDERSON. I have been asked how that is, because I am a member of that committee, I think the Finance Minister, when he comes, will bear me out that on every occasion in the refusal to extend the time for bank charters, at any rate beyond one year, I have stood with the Finance Minister. And, on more than one occasion, the Minister of Finance has remarked: That is one question on which we agree.

Mr. MILLER. Then the hon. member for Halton affords the corroborative evidence that in many cases the Finance Minister has opposed the renewal for enlarging the time of bank charters, as he did in this case. The hon. member spoke of the shareholders of the bank. I think it is the duty of this government and of this parliament to protect, as far as possible, the rights of note holders, who are well protected, and the rights of depositors. I do not know by what process of reasoning it can be argued that the government or this parliament ought to safeguard the interests of the shareholders of a bank more than the rights of the shareholders in any other financial or other institution. The shareholders enter into the banking business, they elect their own officers, their own general manager, their own board of directors, and they have the same rights, the same privileges, the same opportunities of guarding the money that they have put into the stock of the bank that any other shareholder has. In this case the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that there had been a neglect and an overlooking of the preliminary provisions on that point. I asked him to speak more in detail and he said he would later on. I suppose he did and that he thought he was giving me the information for which I had asked when he said that the Bank Act points out that there must be $500,000 in stock, in bona fide subscriptions. The Act does say so. He argued further, and correctly, that the Banking Act, section 15, says:

No certificate shall be given by the treasury board until it has been shown to the satisfaction of the board, by affidavit or otherwise, that all the requirements of this Act and of the special Act of incorporation of the bank, as to the payment required to be made to the minister, the election of directors,——

and so forth—

—have been complied with.

The hon. member and others will note that section 15 says:—

Until it has been shown to the satisfaction of the board, by affidavit or otherwise.

The board may, if they choose, accept the bald statement of the incorporators, or they may require an affidavit. The Act seems to imply that if an affidavit is obtained that is all the evidence they may naturally be expected to ask for or require. But the hon. gentleman says they accepted the affidavit of Travers, who is a man interested. Let me say they accepted the affidavit of Travers, who was the man of all men who knew the facts. Affidavits in support of many actions in court are taken from the men interested because they are the men who have the knowledge, perhaps the only men who have, or ought to have, the knowledge. It turns out that part of that $250,000 was borrowed money. The Finance Department and the Treasury Board have given the right to many, many banks to do business; had they any greater ground in this case to suspect that part of the deposit had been borrowed than in any other case, or than they will have in any case in the future? If the hon. gentleman knows any reason now why the treasury board should have had suspicions, when that part of the $250,000 was borrowed and not paid in the usual way, he might state what information he has in that regard. It was not suspected, the Treasury Board had no such suspicion. It is all right for us now that the steed has been stolen to look back, but there was no reason then to suspect any wrongdoing. Mr. Travers is known now to have been a dishonest man, or a very weak man, but nobody knew that at the time. Many of the provisional directors of the bank were known to be men of good character and repute, and still they have that reputation as honest business men, so I repeat there is no reason why the Treasury Board should have had any such suspicions. The hon. gentleman has said: If there were hints and warnings. That is a style and argument characteristic of him: If there were rumours, if there were hints, if there were warnings—then he immediately goes on to build up his case as if he had proven there were hints and warnings, although he has not afforded one tittle of proof that there was anything of the kind. If I say that actually there were no hints or warnings the hon. gentleman cannot contradict me, because he does not know and he has no information that there were any hints or warnings, or that the Treasury Board or the Finance Department, or the minister had any reason to suspect that these people were not honestly doing an honest business.

Mr. SPROULE. Would not the hon. gentleman regard it as the duty of the Treasury Board to go beyond the mere statement of an interested party and ascertain from the stock books in what position they stood, if $500,000 was bona fide subscribed, if $250,000 in cash was bona fide paid in on the spot, because I assume the books would show it unless they are falsified? Would he not regard it as the duty of the Treasury Board to make at least that inquiry?

Mr. MILLER. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether any person in the whole history of the government of Canada has ever made any such hint or whether any person on either side of the House when the Bank Act was being framed, or at its last or any former revision, has ever hinted that an affidavit as required by the Act, was not sufficient evidence?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member has not answered the question.

Mr. MILLER. I quite agree with the hon. member for North Toronto that if at that stage there had been any warnings or hints, or any reason for the Treasury Board to believe that these people were not honest and the statement in the affidavit untrue, they would have had reason to go further afield for information.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend state from actual knowledge, that there were no cautions, no hints, no warnings at that time?

Mr. MILLER. We have often heard it said that it is not possible to prove a negative. I am not building up a case against the government.

Mr. FOSTER. You do not need to say that.

Mr. MILLER. If I could, I would not be unfair enough to endeavour to build up a case against the hon. member for North Toronto, upon any accusation whatever, upon fancied facts or mere rumours, nor has the hon. member the right to endeavour to build up a case against the Finance Minister, the department or the Treasury Board, upon rumours or street gossip, and I say, it is too often his habit, and it would be to his credit, if he did not do it as often as he does in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has stated positively that I had no such information. On what ground does he make that statement?

Mr. MILLER. I made no such statement. I said: If I say that there was no hint, that there was no warning, the hon. member for North Toronto cannot contradict me, because he does not know.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you know?

Mr. MILLER. I know that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), does not know. I know it very well, because I know if he had the evidence, he would have produced it, and he did not produce it. I am not pretending to give evidence for any one. The hon. gentleman is endeavouring to build up a case on evidence that he assumed to have and did not have.

The hon. member has spoken of the the Bankers' Association. The Bankers' Association are in a much better position to hear any rumours that may be heard.

Mr. HENDERSON. I assume the hon. gentleman is making a defence, possibly for the government, possibly for somebody else. But if the treasury board or any of its members were informed that this $250,000 was not raised in such a manner as is described by the banking Act, would he then consider that the affidavit of Mr. Travers should be accepted without any further inquiry?

Mr. MILLER. That would depend very much upon the source from which that information came, and the shape in which it came. I can easily understand, and I do not know whether it was the case in this instance or not, that financial companies already existing, other banks, jealous of the incorporation of a new bank, might cause a rumour to be circulated that no one might reasonably rely upon, but if any person had absolutely that information he ought to have given it to the Treasury Board, before the certificate was issued, not as a mere rumour, but in some such shape that the Treasury Board could have accepted it, and would have had a reasonable right to believe that the information was true. I do not believe that the Treasury Board could act on mere rumour at all.

The hon. member for North Toronto spoke of the Bankers' Association. I was saying when the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) rose, that the Bankers' Association are in a much better position to know what is going on in banking circles than anybody else. The Bankers' Association are always jealous of the reputation of the banks because if one bank fails and causes loss to depositors and shareholders it always reflects upon and injures the credit of other banks as was done in this case. Therefore, the members of the association are always careful to give warning to the Finance Department in cases where the circumstances seem to justify it, and I do not believe that any such warning ever came to the Finance Department of the Minister of Finance from the Bankers' Association. The hon. member for North Toronto has pointed out section 113 of the Bank Act which does give the Finance Department or the Minister of Finance the right to call for special returns.

> The minister may also call for special returns from any bank, whenever, in his judgment, they are necessary to afford a full and complete knowledge of its conditions.

Section 147 of the Bank Act provides for regular monthly returns showing the financial condition of the bank:

> Every bank which neglects to make up and send to the minister, within the first fifteen days of any month, any monthly return by this Act required to be made up and sent in within the said fifteen days, exhibiting the condition of the bank on the last juridical day of the month last preceding, and signed in the manner and by the persons by this Act required, shall incur a penalty of fifty dollars for each and every day, after the expiration of such time, during which the bank neglects to make and send in such return.

So that the Minister of Finance must have had a return less than a month from the time he received a warning, in so far as it was a warning from the notice alleged to have been received from some one in the United States That return which showed, over the signature of the officials of the bank, the standing of the bank had been received not more than a month prior to that notice so that it was not necessary for a special return, nor could anything be gained by seeking such a special return. While this section pointed out by the hon. member for North Toronto gives the Minister the right to call for special returns there was no section of the Banking Act that gave the Minister of Finance the right to send any official into any bank to make an inspection of its books. The Bank Act expressly says that no person shall have that right except the directors and officials of the bank. There was some gentleman in the State of New York who it is said did advise the Minister of Finance that a loan of $150,000 had been made that was irregular. What would any person expect the Minister of Finance to do in such a case? He writes to Mr. Travers, the general manager of the bank, and points out that the loan was not a regular loan, that it was not properly made. This is not the only instance, I imagine, in which the Minister of Finance has had to point out to many men, managers of banks, insurance, loan and trust companies that the business that they were doing was irregular business not being honestly—I will not say honestly—but not being regularly carried on. In most cases it would be sufficient to call

the attention of the manager, or the managing director, to the irregularity in the business that was being carried on. There was no neglect of duty. As to whether, in view of what has taken place in regard to the failure of two or three banks in the last few years, there ought to be an amendment to the Bank Act and whether the Department of Finance ought to have greater power, is another question. The Minister of Finance evidently thought, before the failure of the Farmers' Bank, not influenced in any way by that failure because the failure had not taken place at the time, that the depositors and shareholders of a bank ought to have greater protection than the Bank Act at present gives them because in section 56 of the new Bank Act submitted to this House there is provision for the election of shareholders' inspectors. This principle has been excepted by the Bank of Nova Scotia because for some time the shareholders have had the right to appoint shareholders' inspectors and inspections have been made by the shareholders' inspectors of that bank. The Minister of Finance is carrying that into the proposed new Bank Act. I do not know that I have really anything more to say as to that. I do not think it is fair at this time, simply because the Farmers' Bank has failed, to endeavour to make any capital out of any accusation against the Minister of Finance. I think that in the newspapers some very unfair accusations and charges have been made. We cannot help what is done in the newspapers, but I think that the hon. member for North Toronto is too old a parliamentarian to properly and fairly take advantage of any feeling which exists at the present time to make charges against the Minister of Finance or the Finance Department that are dependent entirely on rumour which has probably not the slightest foundation in fact.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, all the information in the hands of the government in respect to this matter will be brought down, in the language of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) fully, frankly and freely. There is no reason at all why all the particulars with regard to the formation of this bank and every other transaction should not be brought down absolutely as it is in the records of the government. I cannot but believe that my hon. friend from North Toronto on reflection. will agree with my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) that it would have been more advisable if he had waited until the whole of the information was before the House to make the comments which he has made, because I have reason to think that some of his surmises will not be borne out by the facts. If there has been laxness on the part of anybody, I think everybody in this House must bear the blame. This Farmers' Bank was incorporated—I forget in what year now. But it did not organize during the time allowed it in which to complete its organization. It had to come back to parliament, and it got an extension of time. It had to come back again to get a further extension of delay. I know, and, in fact, it has been stated by my hon. friend from South Grey, that there was some hesitancy on the part of the Committee on Banking and Commerce to allow this renewal of the charter which had been given to the Farmers' Bank. Perhaps it may be after all that this hesitation was overborne by the very title of the bank itself. It was to be a farmers' bank. It was to be outside of the general curriculum of the other banks, and if the committee had refused it incorporation it is quite probable that there would have been a great deal of murmuring and it is quite possible that it might have been said that when the farming community came to have a bank of their own the Bankers' Association were powerful enough to prevent incorporation being given. If the incorporation had been refused it is quite possible that instead of having the government blamed in the year 1910, it would have been blamed in the year 1905 because this incorporation was not granted. At all events, whatever may have been the motive, the committee thought it advisable to give the charter, and they renewed it not once, but twice. When it came before parliament, so far as my memory serves, not a word of dissent was heard from anybody. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) passes rather lightly over these facts, but he insisted on two points as to which he thought the government was to blame, basing his opinion on the information which he has before him at the present moment. The first of these was as to the action of the Treasury Board in giving a certificate to the bank, and the second with reference to a certain transaction which was mentioned in the press only a few days ago. With regard to the certificate granted by the Treasury Board, in considering the information we have before us at present, can any one say that the Treasury Board was in any way blamable. It may be said that other facts will be disclosed, although I do not think so, but even if the insinuation made by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) turned out to be true, namely, that there had been outside information given to the Minister of Finance, or to some one I do not know who, would it have been advisable on the part of the board to exercise even more than the caution they did? Under our present information, I ask any man in this House, does he believe that the Treasury Board which is presided over by the Minister of

Finance was in any way blamable in granting the certificate? The evidence before the Treasury Board upon which the certificate was issued that the bank should commence operations, was the very substantial fact that the $250,000 required by law was deposited to the credit of the Receiver General. This was accompanied by an affidavit that all the formalties had been complied with and that all the necessary requirements enacted by law had been carefully observed. Could any man under these circumstances have his imagination so perverted as to suppose that there was something wrong behind this? I ask any business man in this chamber, if, under such circumstances he would not have acted just as the Minister of Finance did, namely, take the advice of the Minister of Justice as to whether the law had been complied with, and then give a certificate. I am not a member of the Treasury Board, and I do not know what took place, but on the evidence before us at present I do not think any one will attach blame to the Minister of Finance. Then we come to the second point made by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) with reference to the particular transaction revealed but a few days ago by the correspondence published in the press as having taken place between Mr. Hotchkiss, superintendent of insurance for New York state, and the Minister of Finance.

Mr. SPROULE. May I be permitted to put the same question that I put to the hon. member for South Grey? Would not the right hon. gentleman think it the duty of the Treasury Board, having this information from disinterested parties, to try in some way to verify the allegations by an examination of the books of the bank? That would be the best way to ascertain whether the stock had been subscribed bona fide and whether the amount the law required had been paid up bona fide.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think so. I should think that the proper man to give an affidavit was Mr. Travers, manager of the bank. It has been stated by the hon. member for North Toronto that the affidavit which had been put in the hands of the government was false. That may be, but my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows as well as I do that there never was a law passed by the legislature of any country which was not violated at some time or other. You can pass all the laws you want to in this parliament, or any other, but so long as human nature is what it is there will, unfortunately, be some one found to violate that law. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) states that the affidavit put in the hands of the Minister of Finance was false, but I put it to any business man if he would be likely to suppose, in a similar transaction, that such was the case. Now, the second point raised by my hon. friend was with regard to the correspondence between Mr. Hotchkiss and the Minister of Finance. It may be that the law is defective in this respect, but at all events the Minister of Finance answered very properly that we had no bank inspection provided for in our Act, and, therefore, he could not assist Mr. Hotchkiss as that gentleman wanted him to. I may observe, by way of parenthesis, that in the Bill now before the House to renew the Bank Act, the Minister of Finance has himself suggested that the law be amended, and he provides for a different audit, which, if it had been in force previously, possibly would have prevented some transactions of the Farmers' Bank. But there was no inspection provided for in our law at that time, and the Minister of Finance very properly answered that he had no authority to give Mr. Hotchkiss the information asked for, or to take the proceedings which Mr. Hotchkiss wanted him to take. But the Minister of Finance was not satisfied with that; he at once wrote to Mr. Travers, manager of the bank, informing him of the complaint which had been made against him. What followed then? If what I am informed is the fact, then the comments of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) fall to the ground. I am informed—I have not had time to verify the information—that this transaction between the Farmers' Bank and Mr. Tevis for the purchase of the assets of this Mutual Insurance Company fell through and was not carried out, and that the securities which Mr. Hotchkiss was after were returned to him. If that be so the Minister of Finance had nothing more to do when he was informed that the transaction about which complaint was made had been called off for some reason or other, and the Minister of Finance would be free from the blame which the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) tries to place upon him. The Bankers' Association is also free from the blame he tries to place upon it, because he said—if I have taken his words correctly—that from the 11th of January up to the present time, no explanation has been given of this transaction. Well, no explanation has been given of the transaction, because, if I am correctly informed, the transaction was never completed, and the moment it fell through there was nothing more to inquire about it. I think, therefore, that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was a little premature in his judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think I was premature, and if my right hon. friend will allow me to say it, I do not think his information covers all the ground.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know whether it does or not, but at all events it would be better for me and for the hon. gentleman to reserve our observations until

we know all the particulars. However, if my information be correct, I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that his opinions are a little premature.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is just one observation which I would like to make with regard to the duty of the Treasury Board in such cases. I do not propose to pass any judgment upon the transaction, nor do I understand that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has done so, in the absence of the evidence that is to be brought down, and before the inquiry that possibly may have been made. But I would like to point out to the Prime Minister, and to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) that the provisions of section 15 seem to go a little further than the Prime Minister has intimated. The provisions of section 15 are:

No certificate shall be given by the Treasury Board until it has been shown to the satisfaction of the board, by affidavit or otherwise, that all the requirements of this Act and the special Act of incorporation of the bank have been complied with.

The expression, 'by affidavit or otherwise' is merely directory as to the character of the evidence which may or may not be accepted. The definite and specific provision of section 15 is that the Treasury Board must be satisfied. It is the right of the Treasury Board—more than that, it is the duty of the Treasury Board—to withhold that certificate until it is fully satisfied.

Mr. MILLER. Does the hon. gentleman think there was anything in this case that was unusual at that time, that ought to have made the Treasury Board act otherwise with this bank than they had been in the habit of acting with others?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend told us a moment ago that none of us could know anything about it, and therefore, from his own standpoint, his question is meaningless. I have no personal knowledge of what took place at that time; he reminded us that none of us could have any personal knowledge; therefore, his question is irrelevant at the present moment. I am pointing out to the Prime Minister that whether an affidavit was made or not is not the question. The question is whether or not the Treasury Board was satisfied, whether or not under the circumstances it had a right to report itself as satisfied. As my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has pointed out, it is not a light matter to give a bank in this country the power to begin business. The statute has very properly required that certain very distinct and definite conditions shall be complied with, and the last condition of all is that the Treasury Board, as trustees for the whole people of Canada, shall be absolutely satisfied.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Treasury Board in this case was satisfied with the deposit of the money and the affidavit.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As it turns out, they were entirely wrong in being so satisfied, if my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is right in his statement of what has transpired in connection with the liquidation of the bank. The Treasury Board were satisfied, but they ought not to have been satisfied, because the actual conditions, not the conditions as stated in the affidavit, should not have permitted that bank to receive a certificate from the Treasury Board. The Prime Minister argued that Mr. Travers was the man who knew more about this than any one else, and therefore when he made a certain affidavit, the Treasury Board, without any further inquiry, without calling for the production of the stock books, without making an investigation which they might have made, should grant a certificate as a matter of course. If that is what the Prime Minister intended to convey to the House, I do not agree with him. I say that, pre-eminently in a case where the man making the affidavit is the man who, to the knowledge of every one in the country, was the promoter of the bank, it would have been a very proper and a very reasonable thing, and not a very unusual thing, for the Treasury Board to say, we have your declaration as to all these matters, but we desire to make further inquiries and to have the production of certain other documents and papers. It is quite apparent to us now that if the government had taken that reasonable and not very unusual course, the condition of affairs would not now be so lamentably against the interest of many people in this country as it is, if we can judge by the press reports, in the case of this bank. However, I do not desire to pass judgment on the action of the government in that regard until we have the papers and until we have possibly some further inquiry into the whole matter.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

For a copy of the full report and finding of the curator of the Farmers' Bank, up to the time of his appointment as liquidator of the same by the shareholders for the requisition of which authority is given to the Minister of Finance by section 122 of the Bank Act.

He said: I suppose the Finance Department has already called for that and has it in its possession; but if it has not, the minister has the right to call for it. A curator's report is as full a résumé of the whole situation as we can get without a minute legal investigation, and would be very satisfactory for us to have.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

For a copy of the by-laws, rules and regulations of the Canadian Bankers' Association as approved by the Treasury Board and now in effect.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA MEDICAL ACT.

Bill (No. 15) to amend the Canada Medical Act—Mr. Black—read the second time.

Mr. BLACK moved:

That it be referred to a special committee composed of Messrs. Black, Daniel, Beland, Paquet, Schaffner, Roche, Neeley, Currie (Prince Edward), Chisholm (Huron), Sproule, Cash, Chisholm (Inverness), McAllister, Rankin and Carvell.

He said: I do not anticipate any opposition to this Bill at all. These amendments have been submitted to the medical councils and associations of every province and have been approved by them all. These associations and councils represent between 6,000 and 7,000 medical men in the Dominion. When this Bill was introduced in 1902, it met with a good deal of opposition, but all that opposition has passed away and from Vancouver to Halifax, as far as the medical profession is concerned, they are in favour of it.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir Wilfrid LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to say to the Prime Minister that the report we were speaking about a little while ago, was the one of 1902. I would ask that he take note of this and see that we get it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Order (No. 6) was asked to stand at the request of the right hon. the Prime Minister on his assertion doubtless made innocently though wrongly, that I was out of the House. It was my desire that this order should be gone on with. It was left to stand until the next private members' day, and I should like to know what disposition is proposed to be made of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. These orders were called at a quarter before midnight, so that this Bill could not be disposed of at the present sitting. We have reached the hour of adjournment and there was no discourtesy intended to my hon. friend in not going on with his measure. There are as many on this side who wish to discuss it, as on the other, and no doubt on Monday next we can reach it.

Mr. BOYCE. When I gave notice of my intention to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a certain motion, I was under the impression from what I had seen in the newspapers that the Finance Minister would be in his place to-morrow, I have since learned that he will not, and therefore announce my intention to bring on the motion at the earliest possible opportunity after his return.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If convenient, my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), would like to bring on to-morrow, a motion with regard to the amounts paid in Ottawa for the use of rented buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What buildings?

Mr. BORDEN. We will send my hon. friend a copy of the motion some time to-morrow forenoon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad if you will do so.

Mr. BORDEN. What business to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I intend to take up some Bills, but if convenient will take up Supply the first order to-morrow—Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 24, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Railway Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Hunt.

ELECTRICITY AND FUEL EXPORTATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CONMEE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 101) to amend the Electricity and Fuel Exportation Act. He said: In introducing this Bill, I desire to make a few explanations. The object of the Bill is to amend chapter 16 of the Act to Regulate the Exportation of Electrical power and certain liquids and gases. That Act was passed in 1907, and it provides for the export of certain quantities of electrical power or energy in cases where there is a surplus over the quantity that may be used in Canada. The purpose of the amendment is to make that Act a little more specific. In the Act as

it now stands the word 'power' is defined by subsection (d), as follows:—

'Power' means electrical power or energy produced in Canada.

Then,

'Fluid' means petroleum, natural gas, water or other fluid, whether liquid or gaseous capable of being exported by means of pipe lines or other like contrivances and produced in Canada.

Then the Act provides that no person shall export electrical power or fluid without a license, and prescribes the conditions under which licenses are to be granted. Subsection 2 of section 3 provides that:

No person shall, without a license, construct or place in position any line or wire or other conductor for the exportation of power, or any pipe line or other like contrivance for the exportation of fluid.

The word 'power' in this case is used in this section of the Act, and is not accompanied by the word 'electrical,' as in subsection (d). In the definition of the word 'power' it is stated that power means electrical power, or energy, produced in Canada, while in this section power is referred to without any reference to electricity. Then, by subsection 4, and especially by subsection 5, the conditions upon which power is to be granted are set up. I may say that cases have arisen in which there has been some little difficulty in administering the Act. In one case that I have knowledge of the company claimed that they were not entitled to provide power. Power, as generally defined by that word 'mechanical,' means mechanical, or hydraulic power, the power of the water wheel, and they held they were not bound to furnish any power of that kind, but that it must be electrical energy or none at all. I assume that the intention in passing this Act in 1907 was to provide for, first, the use of power so far as power was required by Canadian consumers, whether that power was in the form of mechanical power or electrical energy. I assume the intention was that Canadian users should be first supplied, and that then any surplus remaining over and above the Canadian demand might be exported. The object of the amendments are to make that plain. For that purpose I propose to amend section 1 of the Act, chapter 16, by repealing that section and substituting a new section in lieu of it to this effect:—

This Act may be cited as the Power, Electricity and Fluid Exportation Act.

The difference is that in the present Bill it is stated:—

'This Act may be cited as the Electricity and Fluid Exportation Act.'

Mr. CONMEE.

I introduce the word 'power' there so that it may be carried on through the different sections of the Act. Then I propose to repeal paragraph (b) of section 2 of the said Act and to substitute the following:—

Power means and includes mechanical or hydraulic power and electrical power or energy produced in Canada.

The only difference is that the words 'mechanical power' are introduced in that section. Then, section 3 provides for the export of power and fixes the conditions, and subsection 3, as it stands in the Act, reads:—

No person shall without a license construct or place in position any line of wire or other conductor for the exportation of power, or any pipe line or any like contrivance for the exportation of fluid.

It is proposed to amend that section in this way:—

No person shall without a license construct or place in position any line of wire, cable or other means of transmitting power or any conductor for the exportation of power or electrical energy.

The difference between the two is that the word 'cable' is introduced in the amendment, and for the reason that power can be transmitted otherwise than by electrical energy. I know a case where power has been transmitted by cable for mining purposes a distance of one mile and a quarter, and it is, therefore, necessary to provide that such a contingency shall fall under the regulations of this Bill the same as if it were transmitted by wire. Subsection 5 of the Bill deals with the question of supplying power in Canada, and it reads:—

Any such license may provide that the quantity of power or fluid to be exported shall be limited to the surplus after the licensee has supplied for distribution to the consumer for use in Canada power or fluid to the extent defined by such license at prices and in accordance with the conditions, rules and regulations provided by the Governor in Council.

That is the section under which the difficulty to which I alluded a moment ago arises. The company in the case I speak of claim that the word 'power' used in this section does not mean hydraulic, or mechanical power, but that it referred to electrical power, and no other. Now, in amending the section, the language I am suggesting is as follows, which I propose in substitution:—

Any such license shall provide that the quantity of power or fluid to be exported shall be limited to the surplus after the licensee has from time to time, as in this Act provided, supplied power or fluid, and has also provided all proper or necessary means of supplying such power or fluid for use by consumers in Canada to the extent defined by such license.

I think that amendment is very necessary, and I believe it will make the Bill much more workable, for the reason that the provision that power has to be supplied to Canadian consumers does not appear to go far enough. The Bill, as it stands, provides that prices may be regulated by the license, but in this it goes further and provides that the conditions and means by which the power shall be furnished shall be provided by the license. The power is no use to the Canadian consumer if he cannot get it. For instance, in the case to which I refer, where the power was locked up in the power house, and the door barred, and the Canadian consumer could not get it, it would not be of any value even if a price were fixed as he could not use it, and the purpose of the Act was defeated. The question of the means and methods of using as well as to distributing power is just as important as the question of the power itself. I think every one will agree that it must have been the intention in drafting this Act and providing that the power should be supplied, that reasonable means should be employed for supplying it. That being so, I think the Act should be more definite, and should stipulate with regard to these matters.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Would the hon. gentleman explain in what form is hydraulic power transmitted?

Mr. CONMEE. It is transmitted by cable for considerable distances. There may be other means of transmitting it, but in my own experience I have dealt with power which was transmitted three-quarters of a mile by cable, and I know a case where it was transmitted one mile and a quarter, and I see no reason why it should not be transmitted farther. But if it were transmitted 1,000 or 2,000 feet, that would be quite enough to span an international stream and convey it from Canada to the United States. If the power is to be used in the form of hydraulic power for certain purposes, either the machinery must be connected direct with the waterwheel or the power must be transmitted by some means. If you transform it into electrical energy, you have to add two sets of machinery. You have to generate the electric current, and then you have to transmit it to the motor. Thus you greatly increase the cost of the power, and the Canadian consumer should not be placed at a disadvantage in that respect. I can illustrate that in this way. So far as I am aware, it is not practicable to operate pulpwood grinders by electrical energy, and nowhere is it done. Attempts have been made to do it, and there are perhaps favourable conditions at some places; but no engineer or business man acquainted with the operation of such works will for a moment deny that if it is done at all, it is done at a disadvantage and at a very much enhanced cost. In certain cases it is utterly impracticable to use power for that purpose unless you can get direct connection with the waterwheel, either by connecting the grinders with the shaft of the waterwheel, or by belting or cable and that is one very important purpose for which power is used. In the case to which I refer, where some little difficulty arose, that was the trouble. It was at Fort Frances, where there is a power developed on an international stream. 15,000 horse-power from that development is to-day being used on the American side in a power-house built for the purpose of operating wood pulp grinding machines. There the grinders are connected direct with the shafting of the waterwheel, while on the Canadian side the difficulty arose because the company refused to permit any Canadian user to connect with the wheels, although there is a Canadian power-house in which power is developed, and although the plans that were filed, upon which the work was authorized, showed that the grinders were to be connected direct with the waterwheels on the Canadian side as well as on the American side. However, that is only an incident that might occur in any other place as well as there, and it seems to me the Act should provide for it. My reason for referring to these difficulties is that the department having the administration of this Act, chapter 16, interpreted it practically in the light in which I am proposing to amend it, because they asked the company to name the prices at which they would supply power to Canadian consumers by a series of questions. In those questions they asked the price for mechanical and hydraulic power as well as the price for electrical power; and indeed the regulations founded on the Act provide for fixing a price. There is really a necessity for the amendment if the Act is to be made more workable and plain, and if we are to remove difficulties which at present retard the use of power in Canada. I will take the liberty of reading some of the regulations founded on chapter 16, and dated November 7, 1907. Section 8 of those regulations reads as follows :

> Where a supply of electrical energy, gas or fluid is provided in any part of Canada by the contractor for export and home consumption, then the price charged to any person or company in Canada by the contractor shall not exceed the prices at which electrical energy, gas or fluid is sold by the contractor for export in like quantities under like circumstances.

In the regulations the generating company is referred to as the contractor. The protection here provided for Canadian users of power falls a good deal short of what appears to me should have been provided or perhaps was the intention to provide. There is no safeguard

in that clause of the regulations against a great many contingencies, that can arise. All the company has to do is not to sell its power at all, but to use it itself. Then there would be no price at which the exported power was sold, and that provision of the regulations would not come into play. That is exactly what occurred at Fort Frances. The portion of power exported was not sold, but was used by the generating company, and no price has been fixed by them for power on the American side, for either the American or Canadian portion of the power, or for the power which they desire to take from Canada for use, after they have supplied the Canadian consumer. Therefore, I think provision should be made for the fixing of prices, and I propose the following in substitution for section 5 :

5. Any such license shall provide that the quantity of power or fluid to be exported shall be limited to the surplus, after the licensee has from time to time, as in this Act provided, supplied power or fluid and has also provided all proper means of applying such power or fluid for use by consumers in Canada, to the extent defined by such license.

Every such license shall stipulate:

(a) The price at which power shall be supplied for municipal, domestic, commercial, manufacturing and other purposes for use in Canada.

(b) The conditions and regulations under which the respective units of power shall be supplied.

(c) The methods to be employed in supplying power, the methods of distribution and the hours of service.

I submit that it can be no hardship to any company or person dealing with power under these circumstances if he is asked, previous to getting a license, to fix the price at which he will furnish power to Canadian consumers and the conditions and methods of service under which the power will be delivered. It seems to me that should necessarily be provided for, and the amendment seeks to provide for it. Then, there is the following section:

3. Every such license shall provide power for use in Canada for any of the purposes aforesaid upon the request of any municipal corporation or of any bona fide applicant for power or energy, and such license shall supply such power within a reasonable time after such request.

That is practically what the Act now provides, but the word 'municipality' is introduced. It seems to me that where a demand is made by a municipality upon a company for power or to fix the price, the company cannot very well complain that to comply with that request is a hardship. The Act provides that prices may be regulated by the Governor in Council, and that is not interfered with by these amendments. Where that power exists, it can operate no hardships to have it defined. I submit that in the case I am dealing with, we are carrying out practically the intention of legislation which has already passed this House. I refer to chapter 139, intituled an Act Respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, and to the latter part of section 4 of that Act The section provides for the settlement of disputes and the fixing of prices, &c., by the Railway Board of Canada. And the latter lines of the section read as follows:

Such disputes shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 of the Railway Act of 1903, be settled by the Railway Board of Canada on the application of any user or applicant for power or of the company or of the town of Fort Francis.

That same principle is embodied in these amendments. The other provisions in these amendments do not disturb the Act as it stands.

Mr. SPROULE. This is clearly a Bill affecting trade and comes under rule 50, which provides that no Bill relating to trade or alteration of the laws concerning trade is to be brought into this House until the proposition shall have been first considered in the Committee of the Whole House. This Bill, therefore, should be preceded by a resolution.

Mr. CONMEE. I understand the objection raised to be that this Bill should be introduced by resolution because it affects trade and commerce or the revenue. But there is no reference to revenue in it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The point is not that it will affect the revenue, but that it is a Bill affecting trade and commerce, and therefore under rule 50 should be preceded by a resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Bill will have to stand.

Mr. CONMEE. I would ask that it stand as a resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will have to be withdrawn and the hon. gentleman will have to give notice of his resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I raise the point of order as to whether the hon. gentleman will not have to withdraw his speech.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I raise the point of order that he will not be obliged to make his speech over again.

Mr. CONMEE. If this Bill is to be treated as a matter affecting trade and commerce, we are going to have a very live issue of provincial rights to deal with before long.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

THE GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. GERMAN. Before the orders of the day are called I wish to call the attention of the government, and particularly the Minister of Railways and Canals to an article which appears in yesterday's Toronto 'Globe'. It reads as follows:

It is now regarded as a settled fact that this year will see a start on the Georgian Bay canal. A special estimate of three million dollars, allowing for a beginning, has been prepared, and it is expected that it will shortly be brought down. Confirmation of the report is indicated in the remarks of Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux at Montreal, and also in statements that have been made by some of the ministers to members for constituencies particularly interested in the work.

There is more in this article, but I need not read the rest of it. I think this is of sufficient importance to entitle me to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) if there is any foundation for the article, and to ask if he intends to place in the estimates next year the sum of $3,000,000 or any other sum for the beginning of the Georgian Bay canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. So far as I know, no such appropriation has been discussed by council. As it is not in my department, I have no knowledge as to whether the head of the department in which it is, had it in mind to bring in such an appropriation. Personally I would not be disappointed to see both the Georgian Bay and Welland canals started.

Mr. GERMAN. I think I am within the rules of the House, but, if not, I ask to be allowed to speak again. If this is not in the Department of the Minister of Railways and Canals, it is probably in the Department of Public Works. I would put this question to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) or to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who, I presume, knows what is going on in his government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. German) had better wait until the supplementary estimates are brought down, and then he will see.

THE MINISTER OF MILITIA.

Mr. CROSBY. I desire to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he has any idea where the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is at the present time, if he knows what that gentleman is about, and if that gentleman had his permission for being where he is just now? My reason for asking this question is that about a week ago, we were discussing the estimates in this House—which, as we all know, form one of the most important matters that this House has to deal with—and we found that we had to lay aside one estimate of $100,000 for the construction of a barracks in the city of Montreal—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crosby) will have to confine himself to a question.

Mr. CROSBY. But, if you please, Mr. Speaker. I am going to give my reason for asking this question.

Mr. SPEAKER. That may be given on going into supply, but not on the orders of the day.

Mr. CROSBY. But, surely if I am to ask a question, I must give a reason for it. I do not wish to put the Prime Minister to the trouble of answering without giving a reason—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can answer my hon. friend (Mr. Crosby) without putting him to that trouble.

Mr. CROSBY. But, if you please, I would like to give all the information so that the Prime Minister can answer. I would like to let the Prime Minister know where his Minister of Militia is, in case he may not know; then he would be better able to answer. But, Mr. Speaker, if you are going to rule that I cannot ask this question—

Mr. SPEAKER. The rules allow a question to be asked on the order of the day, but not an argument—

Mr. CROSBY. I do not propose to put up an argument—not the slightest. I only refer to this item in supply being laid aside because it was for the reason that the Minister of Militia was not in his place in this House that it was laid aside, and it has not been taken up since that time. I wish to read, if you will permit, from a paper that gives a statement as to where the Minister of Militia is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CROSBY. I hold in my hand a copy of the 'Western Chronicle,' dated Thursday, January 19, in which there is an advertisement of a public meeting to be held in the county of Kings. A by-election is going on there, a very serious one, because in the local legislature of Nova Scotia, the Liberal government have 33 out of 38—

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crosby) should confine himself to a question, or wait until a motion for supply is made.

Mr. CROSBY. May I read this paper?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that it has been settled by the House under our rules that no debate is allowed on the orders of the day, but a question may be asked. This would be more regular on a

motion to go into supply, which, I understand, is to be made in a few minutes.

Mr. CROSBY. If you rule, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot ask this question—

Mr. SPEAKER. I have ruled that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crosby) may ask a question.

Mr. CROSBY. I would rather await a better opportunity.

DISPUTED PATENT TO LAND.

Mr. OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I desire to make an explanation in regard to a matter which was before the House yesterday on a motion of my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor), for certain papers. There seemed to be a question as to a fact which I had stated, and, as I had not the details before me at the time, I was not able to give the House the case as I understood it. If I may, I would like to do so now. The matter related to the issue of a patent to one Fanny Louise Irwin and to certain legal proceedings by the Justice Department to secure the cancellation of the patent on account of it having been issued in error, so that there might be substituted for it, a patent which would convey the title which was originally intended to be conveyed. I find on reference to the papers, that the homestead was taken by one Thomas Vance, who squatted upon it in 1888. He made application for homestead entry on October 19, 1891. He applied for patent on July 22, 1892, and the issue of patent was approved by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands and certificate of recommendation issued by him November 11, 1892. This gave to Thomas Vance an assignable right under the regulations, which provides,—under section 28:

A person whose homestead may have been recommended for patent by the local agent or senior clerk, and who has received from such agent or clerk a certificate to that effect in the form K in the schedule to these regulations, countersigned by the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, or in his absence, by any member of the Dominion Lands Board, may legally dispose of and convey, assign or transfer his right and title therein.

On the 7th December, 1895, the agent at New Westminster forwarded an assignment from Thomas Vance to Fanny Louise Irwin, dated November 30, 1895, and on the 24th December, 1895, the department replied, stating that the assignment in question had been registered in the books of the department and that the land stood in Miss Irwin's name. That is to say, Fanny Louise Irwin acquired, under the law, the right to a patent to this particular land without any notice of any reservation therein. That was the question of fact between myself and my hon. friend from New Westminster. The department was in fault in afterwards granting the patent to Fanny Louise Irwin—but the patent was granted to her because she had already acquired her rights from Thomas Vance and under the law—without notice of any reservation in the right that was given to Thomas Vance. So, Fanny Louise Irwin was in exactly the same position when she applied for her patent, as the assignees of Fanny Louise Irwin are now, in contesting the right of the limit holders to the timber on that limit.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What was the date of the license to cut timber?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not the figures before me, but I understand it was in 1886 that the license was issued.

THE FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to direct the attention of the right hon. the First Minister to an article that appears in the Toronto 'News' of yesterday, and to ask him if the facts are as there stated. I will read the heading and the article:—

HOW TRAVERS GOT ENDORSATION OF PREMIER.

Sent one of the first notes of Farmers' Bank to Sir Wilfrid Laurier. A courteous reply.

An interesting development in connection with the wrecking of the Farmers' Bank was discovered this afternoon when it became known that a letter written by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to the bank was largely used by General Manager Travers to secure shareholders and depositors.

The manner in which the letter was obtained from the Premier of Canada by Manager Travers was by sending to Sir Wilfrid Laurier a new $100 note at the time the bank commenced business. In reply, Sir Wilfrid wrote a letter to the Farmers' Bank, thanking them for the gift and prophesying a bright future for the institution when under the management of such a well known bank official as Mr. Travers. The letter was framed by the general manager, and was also photographed. Whenever a proposed depositor or shareholder entered the bank he was always shown the letter, and told that it was the Premier of Canada's statement to the effect that the bank would be a brilliant success.

I ask if the facts are as stated in that article?

Sir WILFRID LARUIER. On the 1st of January, 1907, I received the following letter:—

Toronto, January 1, 1907.

The Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G., Ottawa, Ont.

My Dear Sir Wilfrid,—I take great pleasure in enclosing to you the first $25 bill ever issued by any bank in Canada.

Please do us the favour of accepting this bill as a souvenir, with the compliments of the Farmers' Bank of Canada.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) W. R. TRAVERS,
General Manager.

To this I answered:—

Prime Minister's Office,
Ottawa, January 4, 1907.

Dear Mr. Travers,—I have your very kind favour of the 1st inst. I feel very much flattered by the honour which has been paid to me by your institution.

I accept the souvenir which you have enclosed with the greatest pleasure, and you will add to your kindness if you present my grateful appreciation to the members of your board.

Believe me, dear Mr. Travers,
Yours very sincerely,
(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

SUPPLY—ABSENCE OF MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CROSBY. Before that motion is put, I desire to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister, if he has any knowledge of the whereabouts of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) at the present time. I would ask whether he is away, if he has permission to be away, and to engage in the work he is now doing in the county of Kings, Nova Scotia. My reason for asking this question is that about a week ago, when we were in supply, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), placed before us an item of $100,000 to build a barracks in the city of Montreal, and nobody in the House knew anything about these barracks, and consequently, we could not vote the supply. We had to drop it for the reason that the Minister of Militia was not in this House, and he has not been in this House from that day to this. As I was anxious to know his whereabouts, I made inquiries, and I found in a paper published in Kentville, Nova Scotia, called the 'Western Chronicle,' of January 19, the following item of news:—

POLITICAL MEETINGS.

Political meetings in the interest of the Liberal party, addressed by the candidate, H. H. Wickware, K.C., Sir F. W. Borden, A. E. Wall, M.P.P., and other prominent citizens will be held as follows: Port Williams, January 21; Delhaven, January 23; Halls Harbour, January 24; Wolfville, January 25.

Now Mr. Speaker, the reason these meetings are being held is that a by-election is going on for the local legislature in the province of Nova Scotia. In this connection, I may inform the First Minister, and other hon. members of this House who may not be acquainted with the conditions in that province, that we have a Liberal administration in Nova Scotia, and out of 38 members, 33 are Liberals. You will see therefore, that there is no reason for anxiety with regard to the probable loss of the province by the Liberals; though I can well understand that intimate relations may exist between local Liberals and the Liberals in the Dominion parliament. However, I fail to see any reason why a minister of the Crown, during a session of parliament, when he should be here attending to the duties for which he is paid by the country, should not be here, performing those duties. I wish to ask of the First Minister if the Minister of Militia and Defence has his permission to absent himself from his duties in parliament, and to engage in a local election. The Minister of Militia has been appointed to the head of the Department of Militia and Defence, and is paid a good salary for performing the duties thereof, and he should be here to attend to them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no hesitation at all in saying to my hon. friend that I knew that my colleague was in Nova Scotia. He did not consult me before going, but he consulted me afterwards, and told me he was engaged in an election. My colleague the Minister of Militia and Defence is not only a member of this House but I understand he is an elector of the county of Kings, and at the present time he is exercising his duty as a citizen of that province, and nobody can find fault with him for so doing.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL AND THE FISCAL POLICY OF CANADA.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to correct the memory of the Postmaster General with regard to a matter which came up in the House on Friday last, in connection with his speech before the Canadian Manufacturers' Association on the previous evening. On Friday the member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), called attention to a portion of the report in the Montreal 'Gazette' of the Postmaster General's speech.

Our commercial ascendency, thanks to the wise fiscal policy adopted by this country twenty-five years ago, is the admiration of the world to-day.

The hon. Postmaster General, in replying to the criticism of his speech by the hon. member from Humboldt, practically denied the accuracy of this report, and, among other things he said:—

In the Montreal French papers of this morning I am quoted as having said that it was the policy adopted fifteen years ago; and that is in fact what I said. There is only a difference in figures, the English papers have a two instead of a one.

That struck me as being an extraordinary excuse for a minister to give for this report in the Montreal 'Gazette,' because the word 'Twenty-five' was not printed in figures but in letters. I therefore took the trouble to look over the

French papers, and I have here two of them which I think the hon. gentleman will not question. One is 'La Patrie' and the other is 'La Presse.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. Evening papers.

Mr. PERLEY. Well, these are the evening papers which support the hon. gentleman. I propose to read from them extracts covering this point. First, I shall take 'La Patrie.' I shall not read the whole article, but simply the sections which refer to this particular matter.

Notre politique fiscale, adoptée il y a quelque vingt ans, est le sujet d'admiration de l'univers entier.

Our fiscal policy adopted twenty years ago is the subject of admiration for the whole world.

In another place, to support the argument which the hon. gentleman evidently was making that evening, it says:—

Mais il ajouta qu'il fallait reconnaitre que le Canada était l'œuvre grande et magnifique de sir John A. Macdonald et de sir George Etienne Cartier.

But he added, it was necessary to remember that Canada was the great and magnificent work of Sir John A. Macdonald and of Sir George Etienne Cartier.

Now, 'La Presse reports:—

Quoique la confédération ne soit un fait accompli que depuis 47 années seulement,—et M. Lemieux rend ici hommage à sir John Macdonald—nous avons joliment grandi, et dans 20 ans, nul doute que le dominion ne compte 25,000,000 d'habitants.

Although confederation had only been an accomplished fact for 47 years—Mr. Lemieux paid a tribute here to Sir John Macdonald—we have grown immensely and in 20 years, without doubt the Dominion will count 25,000,000 of inhabitants.

La politique fiscale adoptée par nous, il y a vingt-cinq ans, fait l'admiration du monde entier.

Our fiscal policy adopted by us 25 years ago makes us the admiration of the whole world.

'La Patrie' reports him as saying '20 years,' while 'La Presse,' which is the organ par excellence of this government in Montreal, reports him as saying '25 years.' When the Postmaster General was in Montreal before the manufacturers at their dinner he evidently made up his mind to give credit where credit is due, and I understand that he was applauded for his breadth of view in acknowledging the great work of his political opponents. I think, Sir, that the minister should be proud to bear evidence on behalf of the great Conservative party instead of being anxious to deny those sound utterances even though one of his supporters, the hon. member for Humboldt, finds them somewhat distasteful.

Mr. PERLEY.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is indeed a very big question. My hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) brought my attention to a report which appeared in the Montreal 'Gazette,' and wanted to know if, speaking on the fiscal policy of Canada, I had referred to the policy which had given Canada her ascendency as a policy adopted 25 years ago. I answered, and I wish to answer my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) again this afternoon, that I did not use the words 'twenty-five years ago,' but that I used the words 'fifteen years ago.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LAKE. It was the fiscal policy of the Conservatives which was enforced fifteen years ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I used the round figures 'fifteen years ago'; it is fourteen years ago since the policy of the Hon. Mr. Fielding was adopted. At all events, I said that I used the words 'fifteen years ago.' Now my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) says that I drew the attention of the House to the fact that some of the newspapers had used the words 'twenty-five,' some others 'twenty' and some others 'fifteen.' I think I have corroboration from him, because he has read from the evening papers, 'La Patrie' and 'La Presse,' words to that effect. But, there is a better means of settling this great difficulty. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) and my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) were present at the dinner. Now, to settle this very serious question, I am ready to throw myself into the arms of the leader of the opposition. If I really used the words 'twenty-five years ago,' I am very guilty indeed for having deceived this House, but I am quite positive, and I am quite sure my hon. friend from Pictou is quite positive, too, that I used the words 'fifteen years ago.' There is another point. My hon. friend seems to take exception to the compliments I paid before this very representative gathering to the memory of Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Etienne Cartier. The Manufacturers' Association of Montreal is an organization composed of the most important members of the Conservative party and one in which the Liberals are to a large extent in the minority, although I have always been on very friendly terms with both parties in that organization. But, my hon. friend seems to be under this delusion that a member of a Liberal government, speaking in the city of Montreal before manufacturers belonging to the Conservative party, is simply playing with them by saying something before them which he would not have the cour-

age to repeat in the House of Commons of Canada. Let me tell my hon. friend that the compliments, and deserved compliments, I as a young Canadian paid to the giants of the Conservative party of 30 and 40 years ago, I am ready to repeat before the House of Commons. I hope that if ever my hon. friend is invited to speak before the Manufacturers' Association, and that if it comes to his mind he should say something in praise of Alexander Mackenzie, the great Reform Prime Minister of Canada, he will not be afraid to pay the memory of that great man a little compliment, as I did to the memory of Sir John Macdonald.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have been appealed to by the Postmaster General, but I regret that my recollection of the occurrence is entirely different from his. There was a gentleman present who bore the outward appearance of the Postmaster General, and who said most distinctly, not 25 years ago, but 20 years ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The 'Gazette' says 35 years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not care what the 'Gazette' says. I know what I heard. It may be that the word 'five' was added, but I know that the word 'twenty' was used, and I know that the word 'fifteen' was not used. The reason that I am positive about it is that I turned to a gentleman on my right and I said it is rather a curious date for Mr. Lemieux to fix. I would have expected, if he were going that far, he should go back still farther. My hon. friend the Postmaster General must be a little confused in his recollections of it. But it really is of no moment; he is at perfect liberty to state 15, or 20, or 25, or 30, but as a matter of fact he did, on that occasion, in my hearing, use the word twenty.

Mr. RHODES. It may not be a matter of great moment, but now that the subject has arisen, I may say that I was present at that dinner, and I heard a gentleman whom I believe to be the Postmaster General deliver an address, and I can say positively that the word 'fifteen' was not used, but that the words 'twenty years' were used, as stated by the leader of the opposition. On that occasion the gentleman who sat beside me remarked that instead of using the word twenty, the Postmaster General should have mentioned thirty-two years. However, as is the custom with the Postmaster General, he was very pleasing and gracious on that occasion, and I thought it a particularly happy thing that he, as spokesman of the government of this country, should pay a well merited tribute to the fact that there was still in effect the policy inaugurated by Sir John A. Macdonald, to whom the Postmaster General made reference. I thought it a splendid tribute by the Postmaster General that he should state that fact at a gathering of that kind, because our Liberal friends are disposed to admit, outside of this House, but not inside of this House, that we are to-day living, in effect, under the National Policy as laid down by Sir John Macdonald. I am sorry that, in spite of the admiration I hold for the Postmaster General, he should see fit to be influenced by the sentiments of a few free trade protectionists, who support the government, and should find it necessary to revamp his remarks. I can understand that in addressing an audience one does not speak with the same accuracy as he would write, but I have a positive recollection of the incident at that dinner, and so far as my ears can be relied upon, the facts are as I have stated.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). The fact that my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) thought this incident of sufficient importance to bring it before the House a second time, is an evidence of the lack of material in the possession of hon. gentlemen opposite to attract the attention of the people of this country. I attended the dinner referred to, and I may say it was a delightful dinner, where all seemed to enjoy themselves, and I was seated in the immediate proximity of the Postmaster General. I do not know what is responsible for the lack of memory and accuracy evidenced by some hon. gentlemen opposite, but certainly those who sat at the guests' table, in my immediate proximity, are aware of the fact that the Postmaster General used the words 'fifteen years.' The mental calculation was made at the moment that was made by my hon. friend from Assiniboia a moment ago who was so technical that he wanted to draw the inference that because the Postmaster General used the words fifteen years he was referring to some imaginary policy the Conservatives had in the year they went out of power. But there were other gentlemen present who did make the calculation, and they saw that, as we were now in 1911, and as the Liberal party came into power in 1896, the Postmaster General was sufficiently accurate in describing the period from which Canada's prosperity began to date. That was the period to which the Postmaster General referred, and that was the date from which Canada's prosperity began.

Mr. SPROULE. The ordinary man listening to what has been said in the House on this subject, and the divergent recollections of the incident, must come to the conclusion that the city of Montreal is not under the local option law.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. HERRON. When may I expect the return ordered by the House some two weeks ago with reference to the communications between the Alberta government and the Dominion government as to the restoration of the lands to the province? I am very anxious to get that return.

Mr. MURPHY. I will have the matter inquired into.

ANGLO-JAPANESE TREATY.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. On Thursday last I asked the Prime Minister with reference to the Anglo-Japanese treaty, and he said he would give an answer on Monday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Correspondence has been going on, and is going on, with reference to the treaty, and as it is not yet completed it would not be advisable to bring it down.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I also asked whether or not a notice to discontinue the treaty had been given. Is there any objection to answer that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Notice has been given by the Japanese authorities of the denunciation of the treaty, and a new treaty is being negotiated between Great Britain and Japan. It is with reference to this new treaty that correspondence is now going on.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand, Japan gave notice of the denunciation of all her foreign treaties.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is my understanding.

WASHINGTON NEGOTIATIONS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the Prime Minister any announcement to make as to the present condition of the negotiations at Washington?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend refers to the tariff negotiations?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have a telegram from Mr. Fielding saying that he expects to reach Ottawa to-morrow afternoon, and he hopes to make an announcement on Thursday.

RENTED GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I wish to direct the attention of the government and the House to a resolution, notice of which was given before the adjournment of the House last evening. It reads as follows:

Mr. SPROULE.

That all the words after 'that' be struck out and the following substituted therefor: 'In the opinion of this House the action of the government in renting certain buildings in the city of Ottawa at prices which give the owners annually from 15 to 18 per cent net on the cost of their property is unbusinesslike, indefensible, and merits the censure of this House.

In 1909 my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works leased on behalf of the government a building on the corner of O'Connor and Queen streets, in the city of Ottawa, known as the Regal Building, for five years, with the privilege of renewing the lease for another term of five years, at an annual rental of $16,095.73. The owners of the property are required by the lease to pay the city taxes, which amount annually to $1,186.07, for two stone walks that were put down by the city corporation $24.13 per annum, and for two roadways $75.75 per annum; and they will, of course, pay the insurance upon the building, which if insured for $50,000 at the rate of 65 cents per annum per $100, makes an annual payment of $325. These sums make a total of $1,610.95 which has to be paid by the owners of the building. Deducting this amount from the annual rental paid by the government leaves the net amount paid by the government to the owners of this property at $14,484.80 per annum. Now, the first question that arises is why should the government rent this building at all? This property was owned originally by the Young Men's Christian Association of this city. They were seeking a purchaser for it for upwards of a year and a half. The right hon. the Prime Minister had taken into his government a brand new administrator in the person of the hon. Minister of Labour, and the government were seeking new quarters for my hon. friend. So, I presume the Minister of Public Works was approached by the Minister of Labour, and although the Minister of Public Works was well aware that this property was for sale and could be purchased by the government if they had any faith at all in the policy of government ownership. But my hon. friend decided that it was much better to rent the property from his supporters; and so the middleman, who has been so much talked about in this House, and in this country, appears on the scene, and purchases the property from the Young Men's Christian Association in 1909 for the sum of $47,500. The owners of the property expended upon it a little less than $32,500, adding two new stories; so that their total investment was $80,000. On this amount the net rental they receive from the government gives them the handsome return of 18 per cent per annum after they have paid all their charges. I cannot understand why

the hon. Minister of Public Works did not arrive at the conclusion that it would be in the interest of the people of this country, if not in the interest of the government, that he should take some of the boasted surpluses that we have heard so much about for the last 15 years, and purchase this property, which it was well known to everybody, was on the market. But my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works is well versed in the methods of dealing with property in the interest of his friends in the city of Ottawa as well as in other parts of Canada, and he concluded that the policy of public ownership of this building would not suit the government. So the middleman steps in and purchases the property. There are some other charges on the property which have to be paid by the government, such as water rates, lighting and heating, the caretaker's salary, and the operating of the elevator. The basement and the first and second floors are occupied, or are supposed to be occupied, by the Minister of Labour and his staff, the third floor by the Minister of Militia, and the top story by the Finance Department. I had the pleasure of going through the building the other afternoon, and I found in the top story one room about 30 feet square in which there was nothing at all. And alongside of it another room, not quite the same size, and in that story at present, notwithstanding the fact that my hon. friend has rented it at this enormous price, and has had it rented for more than 12 months, there are five vacant rooms absolutely unoccupied. The Militia Department, a little lower, is not at all crowded because there are several vacant rooms in that part of the building. The Minister of Labour is brand new of course, and he has filled up his department pretty well except the basement, about one-quarter of which is not occupied. Therefore I am quite safe in saying that a little more than one-third of this building, for which we are paying this enormous rent, is not occupied at all. I do not wish to criticise too closely my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, but every man who has resided in Ottawa for the last few years realizes that property in this city has been rapidly increasing in value, and my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), when he came into power was well acquainted with the city and its outlook. One of the things for which the people of this country, and the opposition in particular, condemn my right hon. friend and his government, is that, notwithstanding the opportunities given them to purchase property at low prices they have allowed these opportunities to go by and rented from their friends at enormous prices. I may say that if my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works had taken out of the treasury $80,000, the amount put into these premises by the owners or had borrowed it at 4 per cent—if he had taken out of the treasury $80,000 to purchase and improve this property and allowed 6 per cent on the investment, it would have been a fair investment, considering the increase in value from year to year, and if he had taken the balance of the amount paid these gentlemen—being the difference between 6 per cent and 18 per cent—in eight and a half years the government would have owned the building altogether and have had in addition $2,320.80 in the treasury. Why did not my hon. friend adopt that policy? It is not only yesterday that these gentlemen have been seeking for properties in the city of Ottawa. They have been on many streets in the city finding properties that were once owned by Conservatives and now owned by Reformers, looking up properties, in the interest, not of the people, but of their friends in the capital. The condemnation I have to offer is that my hon. friend has been more careful of the interests of his political friends than of the great trust vested in him as Minister of Public Works. I am not going to add one statement after another in respect to public buildings, but I present this as a clear cut statement of the unbusinesslike policy of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the rental period ?

Mr. BLAIN. Five years with the privilege of renewing the lease for another five years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a privilege to the government and not to the lessor.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, a privilege to the government that makes it all the worse in my opinion. The assessed value of this property by the city when it was owned by the Y.M.C.A. was $30,000. If he has any criticism to make about the amount expended by the present owners $32,500, I answer by saying that after it was improved and enlarged, the assessment was increased from $30,000 to $55,000 by the city. Therefore there cannot be much doubt as to the amount expended upon it. The opposition and the newspapers have been criticising this government for allowing middlemen to step in between the people and the administration; the Liberal Conservative party moved a resolution condemning this government for allowing these middlemen to enter in and supply goods without public competition. In the Marine Department, in the Department of Railways and Canals, properties and goods were purchased from middlemen who repealed enormous profits in connection with the Intercolonial railway, and in connection with their busi-

ness. In the Department of Militia, articles were purchased at enormous prices from middlemen, and when difficulties arose in some of the departments, American bookkeepers were brought in and paid to straighten out the books of the department at $15 each per day. According to the Auditor's statement of the Printing Bureau scandals, the country lost more than $70,000 by purchasing goods outside the country, and giving the advantage to foreigners. These conditions the people are anxious should be done away with. The policy of the Liberal Conservative party is that no middleman shall live at the expense of Canada; that middlemen shall not be allowed to stand between the people and the government and make enormous profits, in one instance of 185 per cent.

Mr. CONMEE. When was that policy adopted ?

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend must know if he knows anything, that I had the honour of moving a resolution in this House calling on this government to put out of business entirely middlemen, and my hon. friend stood up and voted to keep them there.

Mr. CONMEE. I had reference to the Conservative policy. That was not the policy followed in the building of the Langevin Block, for instance.

Mr. BLAIN. The Langevin Block, whatever may be said for or against it, is a monument of good administration, compared with other buildings to be found here at present. I shall not continue the discussion further. I have put the case fairly and honestly before this House, before the right hon. gentleman and the Minister of Public Works, who is particularly responsible and who had an opportunity of purchasing this property for the government and saving the people thousands of dollars. The people will expect my hon. friend to explain how it is the government leased these premises from their own supporters, when they might have purchased in the open market, and when by so doing they would have saved the country these thousands of dollars.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) will allow me to express my sympathy with him by reason of something which must have happened between yesterday and to-day. I do not know what it is, but something has certainly affected my hon. friend. Yesterday he gave notice of motion :

That in the opinion of this House the action of the government in renting certain buildings in the city of Ottawa at prices which give the owners annually from 15 to 25 per cent net on the cost of their property is unbusinesslike, indefensible and merits the censure of this House.

Between yesterday and to-day he has changed his motion from '25 per cent' to '18 per cent,' and from 'certain buildings' in the city of Ottawa he has come down to one building—

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) say where it was stated at 25 per cent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the motion sent to my office this morning.

Mr. BLAIN. If I may be permitted, the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) is absolutely aside from the facts ; and I will submit my case to you, Mr. Speaker, and my hon. friend can hand to you the copy of the resolution I sent to his office this morning.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I can say is that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) stated last evening that he would have a copy of the amendment sent to me, and that amendment came to me in the form I have just read.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but I say that '25 per cent' is not in that document. It is '20' per cent in that document, and I changed the resolution myself to '18' per cent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was 20 per cent, was it? In the copy the hon. gentleman sent me, the figures look to me like '25'. The typewritten figure has been changed, but apparently it should read '18' per cent.

Mr. BLAIN. Hand it to Mr. Speaker, and ask him to read it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) says it reads '20' per cent. Then, I congratulate my hon. friend on the change from 20 per cent to 18 per cent. I congratulate him further that whereas, yesterday, he proposed to ask the House to condemn the government because they had been in the habit of renting certain buildings, giving the owners a net profit of from 15 to—he says now—20 per cent, he has not only changed it to 18 per cent but has limited it to one building known as the Regal building.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On what evidence does the hon. minister say it was 25 per cent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was 25 per cent, I thought, in the copy sent to me.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When the hon. gentleman makes a positive statement, I should think he would have the evidence. I have the original typewritten copy—

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is it there?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It reads '20 per cent.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very well, put it 20 per cent if you like.

Mr. BLAIN. With the permission of the Minister of Public Works—for I think this is rather a small thing for a minister of the Crown to deal in—I may say that on this side of the House there are several typewritten copies of the same resolution, and in not one of them is '25' per cent stated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And, what are they—twenty?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, 20 per cent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I take the hon. gentleman's explanation—'20' per cent. It shows that, since yesterday he has done a little more figuring and has come down two per cent on the net profits, and two per cent on the net is a very important reduction to make. And will the hon. gentleman deny that in his motion yesterday he charged that the government had paid rents yielding to the owners of these buildings a net return of from 15 to 20 per cent, and to-day he limits it to from 15 to 18 per cent, and leaves out the word 'net'?

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend knows—

Mr. PUGSLEY. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BLAIN. With the permission of my hon. friend—I do not wish to interrupt him, and will not if he does not think it fair—

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am asking a question.

Mr. BLAIN. What is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question is whether, in the resolution, the hon. gentleman has actually submitted to the House, he left out the word 'net' which he had in the resolution submitted yesterday.

Mr. BLAIN. There was no such resolution submitted to the House by myself or any other hon. member on this side yesterday. And my hon. friend knows that very well. At the close of the session last evening, the leader of the opposition rose in his place and courteously stated that the hon. member for Peel would move a resolution to-morrow, if convenient to the government. No resolution was read by the leader of the opposition or anybody else, and no resolution was forwarded to the Minister of Public Works other than the one to which I have referred which bears '20 per cent' since changed to '18 per cent'—and '25 per cent' is not to be found there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We passed that some time ago. What I am asking is as to the word 'net.' In the copy of the resolution sent to me, it was stated that the owners were receiving a 'net' profit. Has the hon. member omitted that word 'net,' in the resolution before the House?

Mr. BLAIN. The resolution that I moved, and that is now in your hands, Mr. Speaker, is an exact copy of the resolution that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) holds in his hand, if it is the copy I sent to him this morning.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the copy I have received from the hon. gentleman the word 'net' appears.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, would the hon. gentleman read the resolution that I placed in the hands of the Speaker?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The resolution read by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain), as I recollect it—

Mr. BLAIN. Oh, 'recollect'! I make the statement that exactly the same words that are in the resolution in the hands of Mr. Speaker now, and that I read are in the copy of the resolution that I sent to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no necessity.

Mr. BLAIN. No, that's what I say—there is no necessity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no necessity of getting excited. I listened to the reading of the resolution, and if 'Hansard' has taken the resolution as read by the hon. gentleman, I think it will be found that he did not use the word 'net.'

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend allow Mr. Speaker to read the two resolutions, his and mine?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker has just sent it to me, and the word 'net' is in the resolution. All I want to know is whether that is the charge of the hon. gentleman, that he was speaking of a percentage as the gross revenue upon the investment If he had said that he meant a net profit, we would have been saved any further discussion.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend knows that I did say net profit, and I repeat that it is in both resolutions. And I am not at all excited, as my hon. friend seems to be just now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. 'Hansard' will show whether my hon. friend used the word 'net' or not. At all events, perhaps he will not deny that in the copy of the proposed resolution which he sent me, he charges me with having rented a number of buildings yielding to the owners this revenue, and that to-day, in his speech, he is limiting his charge simply to one building, namely the Regal building.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend want an answer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. My answer is that two hon. gentlemen will follow in this discussion, and they will give other buildings, and we will increase them to half-a-dozen if necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad my hon. friend has said that, and I can only regret that he did not himself go into details as to all the buildings on which he invited his hon. friends to make their remarks to the House, before I was called upon to reply on behalf of the government. I appeal to you, Sir, and I appeal to members on both sides of this House, if that would not have been a fair course to pursue. What does my hon. friend do? He makes a charge against the government. He is the gentleman who makes the substantive motion, he simply makes a charge in regard to one building, and I, assuming that is the only charge that is to be made to-day, rise for the purpose of replying. Then the hon. gentleman proposes, after I have made my answer as head of the Department of Public Works, to call upon other gentlemen to make their charges, to which I will have no opportunity of making reply during this discussion. Whatever my hon. friend may think of that course, I am quite sure it is not one which will commend itself generally to the good judgment of members of this House.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend think I am responsible for that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Clearly my hon. friend must be, because his statement evidently shows that he is in concert with other hon. gentlemen who are to follow up his charges and refer to other buildings, different from the one to which he has referred. Now let me say that with regard to the charge the hon. gentleman makes that I should have invited my colleagues to approve a considerable time ago of the purchase of the Regal building from the Young Mens' Christian Association, I am quite willing that the charge of the hon. gentleman, so far as that is concerned, shall be judged by the House and by the country. I did not think it was desirable for the government to be going around the city of Ottawa purchasing buildings for the temporary accommodation of the different departments, becoming owners of them, and I am satisfied that had I done so the hon. gentleman, instead of commending me for purchasing those properties, would have been the first to condemn me and to say that I should have made some temporary arrangement for the rental of buildings. It is to be remembered that we have already taken large appropriations for the purchase of land and for the construction of the new departmental block which is to be erected upon Mackenzie avenue and Sussex street. Does my hon. friend think that in view of that fact, when we propose a very large expenditure which will run into three or four million dollars, including land, in view of the fact that we are making provision for housing all the different departments of the government, does he think that I would have been justified in making the purchase of the Regal building for the government? Yet the hon. gentleman says that it would have been much better to do that instead of renting the building. When the new departmental block is finished, we expect we will no longer need the Regal building, or a good many other buildings which are rented in different parts of the city. So much with regard to the charge that I ought to have purchased the property.

With reference to the rental, my hon. friend says that this building only cost the present owner the sum of $47,500. I do not know whether my hon. friend is correct as to that, I have no knowledge of what the building cost. Then my hon. friend states that the owners have expended upon it the sum of $32,500. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that the cost of this building has been under investigation before the Public Accounts Committee; I do not understand that there has been any evidence given before any committee of this House as to what the owners have expended on that building. I would be glad if my hon. friend would give me the source of his information as to the expenditure by the owners.

Mr. BLAIN. I will be very glad to do so, I will be glad to take this matter up in the Public Accounts Committee with the hon. gentleman, and I will be able to substantiate every statement I have made this afternoon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And yet Mr. Speaker, to-day, in answer to a courteous invitation to my hon. friend——

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend accept the challenge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In answer to a courteous request that my hon. friend should give me the source of his information as to the expenditure, the hon. gentleman declines to do so. And yet, Mr. Speaker, without affording to this House the source of his information as to the expenditure by the owners, not giving to this House a particle of information which they should require as to what the owners have expended upon the building—because my hon. friend could not have personal knowledge of that himself—he asks this House to condemn the Department of Public Works because they have paid the rental to which he has referred.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend say the figures are incorrect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know nothing about them, one way or the other, I do not profess to know anything about the figures. But I would be very sorry indeed to ask this House to condemn the department in this matter unless I was prepared to furnish the House with positive proof of the amount which was expended, and to give to the minister and the House the source of my information, if I were in the place of my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. I am prepared to do that in the manner I have suggested.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman, having made the statement, owes it to this House, and owes it to himself, to give the source of his information, so that the House may judge as to whether that information can be relied upon. Now, Sir, with regard to the owners of the property, the hon. gentleman has made the charge that we dealt with a middleman. Let me say to my hon. friend that I throw back at him that charge, and I say there is not a shadow of foundation for it. The department has not dealt with a middleman, the department has dealt with the owner of the property, and with him alone. There has been no middleman concerned with, or dealt with, or negotiated with. When the first negotiations began, when I first heard of the subject of renting this property, it was owned by Dr. Hanna of this city, whether any other gentlemen were associated with him, I do not know. The hon. gentleman speaks of political friends of the government. Sir, I do not know what the politics of Dr. Hanna are, I do not know whether he is a Liberal or Conservative. But I say that we dealt with him as a business man, and simply as a business man. The accommodation which could be provided in this building was convenient for the department, and we had an opportunity to rent the building from Dr. Hanna. We made every inquiry, we had examined it thoroughly, it was reported on by the officials of my department, and we agreed upon the rental. If my hon. friend had taken the trouble to inquire as to what rental is being paid for buildings similarly situated and of similar value in other parts of the city, he would have found that the rental is a very reasonable one indeed. Now, Sir, when we rent buildings for my department we do not enter upon the business without due consideration, and do not agree upon the rental or the terms without exercising the utmost care.

I do not personally intervene until all the information has been acquired, and until the reports of the proper officers in the department are made. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the rental which is being paid per square foot for this building, and that is the only way in which you can judge as to whether the rental is a reasonable one or not. We pay 81·28 cents per square foot of space. We have made inquiries as to what rental is being paid in other buildings, and I find that upon Sparks street, in the 'Citizen' building, a building which would be no better adapted for departmental offices than this, the average rental is 90 cents per superficial foot, and that includes all parts of the building which are rented as against 81·21 cents per square foot for this building.

Mr. BLAIN. What street is that on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The 'Citizen' building is upon Sparks street.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is a difference in the value of property on that street, and the street on which that other building is situated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not very much of a difference. As far as the ground floor is concerned I suppose there would be quite a difference, but the Regal building is admirably situated for a departmental building, and we pay 81·28 cents in rental as compared with 90 cents which the owners of the 'Citizen' building receive. Then we also made inquiry regarding the Carleton chambers upon Sparks street, and we have been informed that the owner of that building receives $1.25 per superficial foot of space or 44 cents per superficial foot more than we pay for the Regal building. Then, Mr. Speaker, there is a building which was rented quite a number of years ago when property was not so valuable as it is today in the city of Ottawa because we all agree with what the hon. gentleman stated that real estate is advancing with great rapidity in Ottawa. Does my hon. friend not know that one of the absolute essential and certain results of the advancement of real estate is that rents go up because it is the rental which a person receives which largely determines the value and, as real estate goes up, of course, the owners charge a larger rental. The Corry building was rented some years ago for the purpose of the Railway Commission, and the amount that is paid for that including taxes is 96·50 cents per superficial foot, or 15 cents per superficial foot more than we pay for the Regal building. If I am any judge I would say that the Regal building is just as well situated as the Corry building is. When the Corry building was rented inquiries were made as to what accommodation could be got in other parts of the city, and what other buildings were available, and after very careful consideration, as I am informed, the Corry building was rented, and the rental for that including the taxes is 15 cents per square foot more than we are paying for the Regal building.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the minister, if, in renting these buildings, he does not take into consideration the location of the property that is on the most valuable streets. He is giving us the rentals on the main street in the city of Ottawa as compared with those on a back street.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Necessarily the experts of the department would do that, but still we also have to consider the description, and the conveniences of the building because all these enter into the consideration. On Sparks street there might be a building which would not be at all adapted, or well adapted, for housing the officials of a department. My hon. friend knows that in each department—or, speaking generally, it is the case—there is a large number of clerks to be accommodated as nearly as possible in the one building; at all events, the clerks who are engaged in a particular branch of a department must necessarily be housed in one building. It is not every building that will accommodate them, and there are very few buildings on Sparks street which will be suitable for the accommodation of the officials of a department. For the Railway Commission building we pay 98·48 cents per superficial square foot or 17 cents per square foot more than we pay for the Regal building. Then, Mr. Speaker, take the Canadian and the Woods buildings. I suppose I shall have to refer to these because I presume that my hon. friend, with that wisdom of which he appears to be so proud, has kept back the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) in order to bring up the Woods building and the Canadian building after I have taken my seat; therefore, it will be necessary for me to make reference to the Canadian building, and the Woods building. I have heard it said that the Imperial Realty Company receive an exorbitant rent for those buildings, I have gone into the matter very carefully, and I am prepared to assert in this House what is my belief that the Imperial Realty Company only receive a net revenue of a shade over 7 per cent on their investment in those buildings. I am speaking now of the Canadian building, the Woods building, and the Queen street building, and I say that they are receiving a revenue of a shade over 7 per cent. I remember, Sir, that before the Committee on Public Accounts, there was an attempt made to show that the Woods and Canadian buildings had only cost somewhere between $200,000 and $300,000. The hon. member for North Ontario called somebody who had had a contract simply for the four walls, and floors of the building, or rather he tried to impress the committee with the fact that the evidence of this witness showed that it had cost $100,000, and this sum practically represented the whole cost of the building. He called Mr. Charles Holbrook of the firm of Holbrook & Sutherland, the gentleman who had built the four walls and floors of these two buildings—the Woods building, and the Canadian building, and I find on page 452 of the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee that Mr. Holbrook makes this statement:

Q. I would like to ask you as a practical man, what would you say would be the value of the Woods building at the present time?—A. I take it about $300,000—from $250,000 to $275,000.

That, Mr. Speaker, is entirely outside of the land which has to be added as a part of the cost. In regard to the other building, Mr. Holbrook says that it is larger, and that it will be worth about $300,000. If Mr. Holbrook is right in putting the value of the Woods building at $275,000, the value of the Canadian building would be very considerably more because it contains at least 200,000 cubic feet more than the Woods building. Assuming that Mr. Holbrook's value of the Woods building is correct, I would think that it would bring the value of the Canadian building up to from $350,000 to $375,000, or $380,000 at the very least to which also would have to be added the value of the land.

The Queen street building, with the land, would be something like $65,000 or $70,000, and if your add these two together and then take the ordinary expenses of insurance, and wear and tear, and cost of management, I believe the net revenue would only be a shade over seven per cent. The hon. gentleman from North Ontario, if he speaks on this question will possibly tell you that these properties are assessed at very much less than the valuation of Mr. Holbrook, but I think it will be generally agreed that the assessment value is not always a correct test of the value of a building. The hon. gentleman from Peel told us that the Regal building, although it cost about $50,000, and although the present owners have spent about $30,000 on it making $80,000, it is only assessed at $50,000, which would show that the assessors do not attempt to get near the value of these large buildings. Then, we have had it in evidence before the Public Accounts Committee that the cubic contents of the Canadian building are something over 1,200,000 feet, while the cubic contents of the the Woods' building are between 900,000 and 1,000,000 cubic feet. We have also had it in evidence by Mr. Ewart, the chief architect, that speaking roughly the fair average cost of a fire-proof building would be 30 cents per cubic foot, and taking the cubic contents of the Canadian building at 1,200,000 feet you would get $360,000 as the fair value of that build-

ing. To that, you have to add the value of the land. The hon. gentleman from North Ontario said this land was only assessed at a few thousand dollars, but that was a number of year ago, and to-day no expert in real estate would say that the land occupied by the Canadian building is not to-day easily worth between $40,000 and $50,000, that the land on which the Woods' building stands is not easily worth between $30,000 and $40,000, and the land of the Queen street building is not easily worth upwards of $20,000. Now, the total rental paid for the Canadian building and the Woods' building and the Queen street building is $72,000 per annum. If you take the valuation of these buildings with the land as being in the vicinity of $800,000 which I believe is a fair valuation for these three properties, you will find that after paying expenses of management and wear and tear and other charges that rental would give a little over 7 per cent, which, the evidence before the Public Accounts Committee shows is what the Imperial Realty Company gets out of these buildings. There is another very good way of testing whether or not we are paying too high a rental for these buildings. If you take the total amount we pay, including one-half the cost of the building of partitions, &c., which was paid by the government, it would amount in the case of the Canadian building to 96·09 cents per square foot. But if you distribute the cost of these improvements over the ten years during which the government has arranged to occupy that property you will find that it figures out at 60·85 cents per square foot, and it is one of the very cheapest properties which the government has been able to rent in the city of Ottawa. Of the three buildings which the government rents from the Imperial Realty Company, it is a remarkable fact that for the Queen street building, as to which there has been no criticism by hon. gentlemen opposite, we are actually paying 98 48 cents per square foot, or more than we are paying for the other buildings. Hon. gentlemen opposite have for a long time been criticising the rent we are paying for the Canadian building and the Woods' building, but they have never had one word of criticism in regard to the building on Queen street occupied by the Railway Commission.

Mr. BLAIN. We are coming to that building later.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend has been a long time getting to it. Now, as to the value of these buildings. It was proved before the Public Accounts Committee that in the year 1908—I am not sure whether that was before the government rented the second portion of the Canadian building, but it was about that time—it was proved before the committee that the Imperial Realty Company which owns this building had, according to the evidence of Mr. Finnie, manager of the Bank of Ottawa, purchased it from Mr. J. W. Woods for $1,000,000.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). That was in stock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was stock, but it must be borne in mind that while Mr. Woods received stock for the building, there were, as Mr. Finnie swore, a number of other gentlemen who bought stock in the company, and who would therefore be interested greatly in the value of the property because they were investing their money in it. However, in 1908, the company was proposing to raise money upon the security of these buildings, either through or from the Royal Trust Company. The property consisted of the Canadian building, the Woods' building, the Queen street building, and two other small properties of comparatively little value. As an act of precaution, the Royal Trust Company caused a valuation of this property to be made, and I shall read the report as to that valuation. The valuation was made by two experienced men, Mr. A. Pratt, formerly city assessor, and Mr. James Mather, a prominent and reliable architect in the city of Ottawa, and these gentlemen were engaged, not by Mr. Woods, or the Imperial Realty Company, but by this large financial institution in order to determine whether in justice to their shareholders they would be warranted in making an advance of $400,000 upon bonds to be issued against the property. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom that these companies lend over 50 per cent of the value of real estate. The Royal Trust Company was of course most desirous to have a correct valuation of this property.

Now, Sir, who are the Royal Trust Company? I suppose that if hon. gentlemen opposite did not know who they were they would be attempting to cast doubt upon their sincerity, and to insinuate that they had colluded with the Imperial Realty Company to boost the value of this property. The Royal Trust Company is a company closely allied with the Bank of Montreal. Its directors are: Right Hon. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, president; Sir Edward Clouston, vice-president; Sir H. Montagu Allan, R. B. Angus, A. Baumgarten, E. B. Greenshields, C. M. Hays, C. R. Hosmer, Sir W. C. Macdonald, Hon. R. Mackay, A. Macnider, H. V. Meredith, David Morrice, James Ross, Sir T. G. Shaughnessy, Sir William C. Van Horne. These are the directors of the Royal Trust Company, and when the Imperial Realty Company went to them in 1908 for a loan of $400,000 on first mortgage bonds, it was

expected that they would either lend the money themselves, or would, as a trust company, give the sanction of their name, which would enable the Imperial Realty Company to borrow this large sum on the property. I am told that the Royal Trust Company themselves underwrote the bonds. Therefore, you will see what value is to be attached to the report of their valuator, and I will take the liberty of reading that report. It is dated Ottawa, December 17, 1908. It is addressed to J. J. Gormully, Esq., barrister, &c., who, I presume, would be the solicitor of the Royal Trust Company, and is as follows:—

RE IMPERIAL REALTY COMPANY.

Dear Sir,—Herewith you will find report as requested on the value of the properties in schedule A belonging to the above company, being parcels numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Parcel number 1 being composed of the easterly thirty-three feet from front to rear of town lot number 25 on the south side of Queen street, numbering eastward towards the Rideau canal; size of land, 33 feet in front by 99 feet in depth. On this land is a substantial fireproof building, 33 feet by 84 feet, 5 stories high, stone front, steel and concrete construction, occupied by Canadian government.

Value of land..	$ 20,000
Value of building..	48,975
	$ 68,975

And yet, Sir, upon that building the total rental which we pay is $5,300, or less than 8 per cent of this valuation. Then the report proceeds:—

Parcel number 2 being composed of town lot No. 62 and the whole easterly portion of town lot No. 61 on the south side of Slater street; size 99 feet by 157 feet more or less. On this land there is erected a first-class fireproof building, 70 feet by 157 feet, 7 stories high, built of Indiana sandstone, brick walls with steel and concrete construction and terra cotta partitions, occupied by Canadian government. This building is known as the 'Woods Building.'

Value of land..	$ 23,314
Value of building..	265,036
	288,350

Now, Sir, if you compare the value which these gentlemen have placed upon the Woods building with the value which Mr. Holbrook, the gentleman who built the four walls and the floors, and who is well qualified to speak, placed upon it, you will find that they very nearly agree. Mr. Holbrook puts the value at from $250,000 to $275,000, while these gentlemen, who were valuing for the Royal Trust Company, put it at $265,036; that is the militia building, and upon that the gross rental which we pay, outside of the heating, the lighting, the elevator and the taxes, is $25,777, or less than 10 per cent. Out of that would have to come the wear and tear of the building, the expenses of management, the insurance and the local improvement tax; yet my hon. friend has taken no account of these, although, according to my information, the same information was given before the Committee on Public Accounts. These reduce the net revenue to the Imperial Realty Company down to a shade over 7 per cent.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that I made no statement as to the taxes, &c., in respect to the Royal building? I mentioned them all, and he will see them in 'Hansard.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am now speaking of my hon. friend's resolution. I am not speaking of the emasculated speech with which he attempted to cut down the force of his resolution, and in which he simply referred to one building when he made a charge with respect to others. I am referring to his resolution, in which he says that we have rented buildings at prices which give to the owners from 15 to 18 per cent net on the cost of the properties.

Mr. BLAIN. May I be permitted to ask whether that statement is correct with respect to the Regal building, to which I referred?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know, because the hon. gentleman has not furnished us with evidence of the correctness of the figures. He has put before us figures as to the correctness of which we have no knowledge. But I am taking the buildings which have been investigated before the Committee on Public Accounts, where document after document and the sworn testimony of different witnesses shattered the charges made by the hon. gentlemen and his associates. What I am taking now is the amendment which the hon. gentleman has asked this House to vote for, an amendment which everything which has taken place before the Committee on Public Accounts shows to be absolutely false. I have taken one of the most important of the buildings we have rented, and I have shown the valuation put upon it by the Royal Trust Company as a basis on which that company proposed to lend only 50 per cent of its value.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is there any evidence on record that the Royal Trust Company put a dollar of their own money into that building? They lent the money on the security of the rentals, but not their own money—other people's money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman says the Royal Trust Company lent other people's money. As I understand, that is what a trust company does every day; it lends the money of other people. But it is trust money; it is the money of the widow and the orphan, which they are

bound to guard more securely and carefully than they would the money of their own shareholders; and there is the implied guarantee that they would exercise the utmost prudence in dealing with it. When I show now, following up the evidence of Mr. Holbrook before the Committee on Public Accounts by the valuation given by these experts of that land and building, according to which it was worth $288,350, that the rental we pay is only $25,777, apart from the heating, running the elevator and the taxes—this is what would come to the owners, out of which they have to pay insurance, cost of maintenance, wear and tear of the building and local improvement taxes. When I show all that and show that necessarily it would reduce the amount down to somewhere between 7 per cent and 8 per cent, surely the hon. gentleman would not ask this House to vote for a resolution, false on its face, declaring that we have been in the habit of renting buildings at prices which net to the owners a revenue of from 15 per cent to 18 per cent.

Parcel No. 3 being composed of lot 63 and broken lot 64 on the south side of Slater street and also being composed of the northerly portion of lot 63 and 64 on the north side of Laurier avenue (formerly Maria street); size about 121 feet in front and 220 feet in depth, superficial area 27,530 square feet. On this property is a building eight stories high and of the same construction as the Woods Building. It is known as the 'Canadian Building,' and occupied by the Canadian government.

Value of land..	$ 41,295
Value of building..	392,575
Total..	$ 433,870

That was the total valuation in 1908, two years ago, since which time the values of the land and buildings has been very appreciably increased. What do we pay for this building? We pay $42,536.90, or less than 10 per cent, upon the valuation these experts have placed upon it, and as I stated with reference to the Woods building, out of this must come the local improvement taxes, the insurance, cost of management and wear and tear. All that has to come out of the 10 per cent. What justification then would there be for my hon. friend putting a resolution of this kind on the table?

Let me go on further with this report. It takes up then two pieces of land on the north side of Laurier, which I need not deal with, because they are not rented to the government, but they put them at $13,300 and $23,565 They are:—

No. 4, Nos. 87 and 89 Laurier avenue, $13,300.
No. 5, lots 62 and E½, 61 Laurier Avenue, $23,565.

And they make the total value of the properties—taking out the two last I have mentioned, of $36,000—$790,000 in round figures. Yet all that we pay for the Woods building, the Canadian building, and the Queen street building, is $72,000 per year, or a gross revenue to the owners of less than 10 per cent upon their value.

Mr. BLAIN. That does not include the Regal building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I am speaking now of the Woods building, the Canadian building, and the Queen street building. The Imperial Realty Company has nothing to do with the Regal building. The Royal Trust Company have nothing to do with it, as my hon. friend must know. I am reading the reports of the Royal Trust Company, which had the properties owned by the Imperial Realty Company examined, on which the latter were asking them to advance on their bonds the sum of $400,000, and this the Royal Trust Company did. The report concludes:

We the undersigned have carefully examined the several properties named in the above report and are of the opinion that the value set opposite each property is a fair cash value thereof, and that the total value of the five parcels of land is $828,060.

Out of that has to be taken the $13,300, and the $23,565, which are not rented to the government, leaving a net valuation of very close to $790,000. The rental upon the three buildings is $72,000, which would be less than 10 per cent on their valuation by these experts, and out of that the owners would have to pay the various charges for insurance, local improvement taxes, cost of management and wear and tear. The net result would be to give the Imperial Realty Company a net dividend of a shade over 7 per cent on the moneys invested.

Of the total rentals paid by the government, those which are paid for the Woods building, the Canadian building and the building on Queen street constitute the largest items. The hon. gentleman, has I suppose, in his mind, the Corry building. I do not know if he has anything in his mind beyond the Regal building, but hon. gentlemen who follow him may take up the Corry building, thus taking a course which, in all my parliamentary experience, is unprecedented.

Mr. BLAIN. It has been done in every debate in this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have never known it to be done. I have known lawyers, examining witnesses sometimes, pass over intentionally many things in the leading examination which they thought might be investigated, hoping they would escape the cross-examining counsel, and then would bring them out in the re-examination. But that is not considered good practice.

Mr. BLAIN. I think I was very fair in giving the hon. gentleman notice that this is not all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Take the Corry building which was rented a considerable time, like the Queen street and the Woods buildings, before I became minister.

Mr. HUGHES. Where is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Immediately adjoining the new Grand Trunk Railway station. It is that tall building which the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners occupy. What does my hon friend say to that? The total square feet in that building is 11,234. We pay a rental of $10,200, and the total, without taxes, amounts to 90·50 cents per square foot. Does he say that is too much?

Mr. BLAIN. I say, from a valuation of the property given in a correct way, it is altogether too much.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does he say, having reference to what other buildings cost, that it is too much.

Mr. BLAIN. I say yes. I say that, speaking of the whole three buildings to which my hon. friend has referred, some of these will show not 18 per cent, as the resolution states, but 25 per cent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is too absurd for serious consideration. This is what we pay for the Corry building. As my predecessor had to do before I became minister, in renting these buildings we have to look around; we have to send the experts of the department to interview this owner and that owner to see where the requisite accommodation can be had and to test the fair value of the buildings by finding out what other property owners receive. Since I became minister, whenever we have rented a building, we have gone to owners on Sparks street, Elgin street, O'Connor street, in whatever locality the building was, and have exercised the best judgment we could and got the building at the lowest possible figure. Here is another building and the rent we pay per square foot is 90·80 cents. The taxes add something to that, bringing the total up to 96·50 cents per square foot.

Now, take the Seybold building. It may be that some charge will be made in connection with that building. The Seybold building has a total superficial area of 12,047 square feet. We pay a rental of $6,500. The heating costs $1,600 and the running of the elevator $966 and taxes $1,811.46. For that building, the owner receives 90 cents per square foot.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). How much did you spend improving it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to tell my hon. friend. I am speaking of what we pay for the building. Not knowing what would be charged in respect of the Seybold building, I am at a great disadvantage in attempting to answer. I do not know whether my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), will follow the example of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), and, without having a particle of evidence to submit, and without making known the source of his information, will declare that the Seybold building cost $10,000, $20,000 or $30,000 or any other sum. He may draw on his imagination even more copiously than the hon. member for Peel did. But hon. members will see at what a disadvantage I am placed, when I attempt to answer a terrible charge of this character, not knowing definitely what that charge may be.

Now, take the Trafalgar building. Is any charge to be made in regard to that, may I ask my hon. friend?

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman want an answer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend seems to be guilty not only in respect to the Regal building, but all along the line.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Statements of that kind do not count for much. I was about to speak of the Trafalgar building.

Mr. HUGHES. Would the minister please locate these buildings as he names them; some of us are ignorant of where they are. I know where the Militia building is, and the one adjoining it, but I am not sure about the others.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Trafalgar building is on Bank street; it is occupied by the Department of Interior and the Civil Service Commission. This building is owned by Mr. Brennan. It has a superficial area of 14,991 feet, and we pay a rental of $11,964, which would amount to about 80 cents—or, to be absolutely accurate, 79.81 cents—per square foot. But that building is heated by the owner, and he also runs the elevator; we pay nothing besides the rent, except water rates; our total rental there is, as I have said, 79·81 cents a square foot. Now, let me ask my hon. friend (Mr. Blain), with his superior knowledge as to what buildings ought to be got for, is that too much or too little? I venture to say he cannot answer.

Mr. BLAIN. I will answer that. I may say, since the hon. minister is putting me in the witness box and cross-questioning me, that the records of 'Hansard' and of the Public Accounts Committee will show, that he paid an enormous amount for the rental of this building, and that the percentage will reach higher than that stated in the resolution I moved this afternoon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a satisfaction, at all events, to know the lengths to which my hon. friend will go. He objects to my putting him in the witness box.

Mr. BLAIN. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has gone into the witness box himself this afternoon, for he told us what the Regal building cost. There is a class of witness who refuse to take the oath, but affirm and expect every one to take what they say, whether they know the facts or not.

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend permit me?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend is careful to keep away from the charge I made against the department, and deals with other matters. But I repeat that if he doubts, as he seems to do, the correctness of the statement in regard to the cost of the Regal building and the amount of money spent in improving it at $80,000, I repeat the challenge I made: I am willing to take the matter before the Public Accounts Committee and ask the minister to appear there. Will he accept that challenge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has jumped before he came to the stile. He asks the House to condemn us in regard to the Regal building without having the evidence. Just at the moment I was speaking of the Trafalgar building.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the hon. minister state what ground he has for suggesting that the statement of a gentleman who makes that statement upon affirmation is not as reliable as if made on oath?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I was rather suggesting was—

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to have an answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, Mr. Speaker, in my experience, when a gentleman goes on the stand under oath, as he would before the Public Accounts Committee, he would be obliged to produce the evidence, he would be obliged to show his knowledge. A witness there could not say: That building cost so much; I have no knowledge of it, but I heard it on the street corner. A witness could not act in that way before the Committee on Public Accounts. But an hon. gentleman in this House might rely on hearsay evidence, which might be unreliable.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman say that my information is unreliable?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It might be. And my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) might be entirely innocent. I would not think for a moment of accusing him of wilfully deceiving the House. But I am sure he has had too much experience to suppose that a body of intelligent men would condemn a government upon what must necessarily be a hearsay statement without having the facts produced before them.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Will the hon. minister permit me a question? Is not what he has given us concerning the valuation of the Woods building hearsay evidence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). They were not put in the witness box; they dare not go.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman makes a statement which it would surprise me much to learn was accurate. It seems to me that when a company of high standing like the Royal Trust Company, proposing to invest in this property on first mortgage the large sum of $400,000 of funds held by them in trust, employs two experienced men to make the valuation upon which this transaction was to be based, I would not regard that as hearsay; I would regard that as most reliable testimony.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Why were not they called as witnesses?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why did not the hon. gentleman call them?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). We objected to the written report going in to the Public Accounts Committee and asked that witnesses be called.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend seems to think that his duty before the Public Accounts Committee is just to get in such facts as suit him, and suit his side. I have always taken the position that the duty of the Public Accounts Committee was to get at the facts and to investigate the truth. If my hon. friend had been desirous of knowing what was the real value of this property, what it was fairly worth, when he found that a valuation had been put in signed by two gentlemen well known in the city of Ottawa, one who had been the city assessor and the other a prominent architect of this city, if my hon. friend had really wished to get at the valuation of this property he would have said to the chairman: I would like these two gentlemen to be subpoened so that I may examine them as to the valuation. But that was not the course the hon. gentleman was pursuing. He dealt with the matter just as if he were a prosecuting attorney, and not a very good one at that, whose duty it was to get out such facts as suited him, and then leave it to the other side to break down his case if they could do so.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Alberta Electric Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Western Central Railway Company.—Mr. Rankin.

SUPPLY—RENTAL OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The order for private Bills having been exhausted, House resumed consideration of the motion for supply and the amendment of Mr. Blain thereto.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I had referred, before the recess, to a number of buildings which had been leased by the department, but there are a few others to which I have not yet referred. One is the Imperial building on Queen street, belonging to the estate of one Mr. Pearson. The net office area is 12,082 feet, and the rental has been $4,200 per annum, which would be at the rate of 35·76 cents per superficial foot. This includes the power for the elevator, but the rest of the charges are borne by the government. We have agreed, upon the renewal of the lease, to make some increase in the rent, because it was lower than the building was fairly worth. Just what it will be I am not in a position to say at the moment. Then, there is another building occupied by the surveyor general's branch of the Department of the Interior, at the corner of Slater and Metcalfe streets. The net office area is 9,811 feet, and the rental $3,000 per annum. That is at the rate of 30·6 cents per superficial foot. We pay the taxes, heating and some other charges, which bring the total up to 45·26 cents per square foot. I gave the Trafalgar building, the rental of which is 79·81 per square foot; the Seybold building, the Corry building, the Canadian building, the Militia, or Woods, building, and the Railway Commission building.

Then, there is another building, a portion of which we are renting from the Molsons Bank, on Metcalfe street. It has an office area of 4,294 feet, and the rental we pay is $2,340, or at the rate of 54·5 cents per superficial foot. We also rent some premises in the Great Northwestern Telegraph Company's building, 1,006 superficial feet, for which we pay $420 rental, which is 41·75 cents per superficial foot. There is another building in which we rent premises; it is in the new station of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. We have rented three flats there for the Railway Commission. The Railway Commission was very much crowded for room in the building on Queen street, and we have had a very strong requisition from the members of the board that we should provide increased accommodation. We made an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company under which they will fit up three flats especially for the use of the Board of Railway Commissioners. At first they asked us a rental of $23,000. We carried on negotiations for, I think, about three months, and finally we succeeded in getting them to accept a rental of $19,500. That includes heating, elevator service and everything except lighting. My hon. friend may say that is higher than the rental we pay for some other buildings. So it is, but we get very superior accommodation, and, of course, we must have regard to the accommodation that is furnished. The building is to be specially fitted up for the accommodation of the Board of Railway Commissioners. I may say with reference to this, as with reference to the Woods, the Canadian and all the other buildings which the government leases, that when the government ceases to occupy these buildings, as it will naturally do when the new departmental block is erected, the owners may have their buildings idle for a considerable time while they are making alterations to accommodate the buildings to the wants of the new tenants who may be desirous of renting.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman give the floor area?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was just about to give that. There are 23,758 superficial feet in the three flats, for which we are to pay, as I said, $19,500 per annum. That is at the rate of about 82 cents per superficial foot, which includes heating and elevator service.

What I have done has been to refer all these matters with regard to rental, since I have been minister, to the proper officials of my department, and I feel sure, from the reports that they have made to me from time to time, and before recommending a rental to be agreed upon by me as head of the department, that they have made careful inquiry as to what rentals are charged by other owners of property in the city of Ottawa, and that they have based their recommendations accordingly. Let me call attention to the matter in another way for the purpose of showing that none of these rentals are excessive. When negotiating with the Grand Trunk Railway Company we made inquiries as to what would be charged for property in the city of Ottawa and as to what would be charged for property in the city of Montreal. I found that for a building conveniently situated in the city of Ottawa the rental would run from 90 cents per superficial foot up to, I think, as high as $1.25 per superficial foot, while in the city of Montreal there are very few

offices and flats in office buildings which are rented at a less rate than $1.50 per superficial foot. If hon. gentlemen desire to ascertain what would be a fair rental for an office in the city of Montreal they could make inquiry with regard to the point. They could go to the Messrs. Rosenthal, to the Canada Life Company, to Mr. Hope, who owns a new building which has recently been put up, to the 'Citizen' Company, and to the owners of other buildings, which are conveniently situated in Ottawa, and I will venture to say that they will not be able to find that it would be possible to rent premises as conveniently situated as those which the government has rented at a less rental than the government is paying for the accommodation which it is now enjoying in these different buildings. And, Mr. Speaker, is not that the test?

Suppose my hon. friend's information is correct as to the price paid for the building formerly belonging to the Young Men's Christian Association by the present owners. As to that I know nothing, and the hon. gentleman has given us no evidence except his statement, which must be based upon hearsay. Is that the ground upon which we should act if we desire accommodation in the city of Ottawa, and, looking around, we find that accommodation can be had in a certain building? Are we to ascertain what the property was bought for? Is it not our duty rather to judge what the accommodation is worth to the government compared with what similar accommodation can be got for in other buildings in the city of Ottawa. I think that is the true test. If these gentlemen purchased the building for $50,000, they got a remarkably good bargain. I venture to say that that building with the land represents a cost to the association of a very much larger sum. The cost of this building to the government, including the heating and the lighting and the elevator service, does not exceed 81·28 cents per superficial foot. For an office 15 feet square, that would be a little over $180 a year. Why, Sir, in the city of St. John, where real estate is not worth within 50 per cent of what it is in the city of Ottawa, $150 a year is regarded as a reasonable rent for an office of that size, which is heated and lighted and has elevator service. I doubt very much if any office accommodation can be got in Ottawa for a less price. My hon. friend has not gone around in Ottawa and sought information as to what other owners have got from other rented properties; he has not ventured to produce a single owner to testify what such premises are fairly worth; and yet, without a tittle of evidence to support him, he asks this parliament to say that I and my predecessors have been guilty of some great wrong for which we ought to be condemned. I think I have shown that we have exercised good judgment and have acted with reasonable prudence, and are paying no more as rental for these properties than would be obliged to pay to the other owners of similar properties. When the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Samuel Sharpe) comes to speak, he will say that there was a witness before the Committee on Public Accounts, who was a city assessor, and who assessed the Woods' building at 13 cents per cubic foot. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is the basis on which the assessors value buildings of that character, which are fireproof in construction, and which have all modern conveniences, elevator accommodation, properly wired for electric lighting and provided with the best heating apparatus, all I can say is that they are assessing such property at only one-half of its cost, and less than one-half of its value. As against the statement of that witness, who is not a builder, we have the evidence of the gentleman who erected the Woods' building that it was worth in the vicinity of $270,000, and that the Canadian building which had 200,000 feet more of cubic contents, would be worth in the vicinity of $300,000. In addition to that, we have the Dominion architect, who estimates the cost of buildings which are not fireproof at not less than 23 cents per cubic foot, and buildings which are fire-proof at not less than 30 cents. As further evidence that these are thoroughly well built buildings, which are fire-proof, let me call attention to the fact that the owners receive the very lowest insurance rate which is put on the most up-to-date fire-proof buildings in Ottawa, being only 45 cents per $100 for a period of three years. There are many business men in this House who know that the insurance companies very rarely insure for more than from 75 to 80 per cent of the value; and these two buildings, which the appraisers of the Royal Trust Company have valued in the vicinity of $790,000, are insured for the sum of $590,000.

Now, Sir, in view of what I have stated with regard to these buildings—the Woods building, the Canadian building, and the Queen street building; in view of the statement of the builder that the Woods building was worth from $250,000 to $275,000, and that the Canadian building would be worth in the vicinity of $300,000; in view of the fact that the appraisers of the Royal Trust Company have put the values of these three properties at about $790,000; in view of the fact that Mr. Woods some years ago disposed of these properties to the Imperial Realty Company, for stock, it is true, to the extent of a million dollars, but a considerable portion of which was sold to bona fide investors at what was regarded as a fair value; in view of the fact that the Royal Trust Company, who are the cus-

todians of the money of widows and orphans, and whose duty it is to see that that money is safely invested, and who, in accordance with the practice of loan companies, do not advance more than 50 per cent of the value of real estate, acted on a valuation of $800,000 when it lent $400,000 on the bonds on these properties; in view of the fact that the net rental, according to the figures I have given, only slightly exceeds seven per cent; I think my hon. friend cannot censure the government on the ground that they rented buildings which net the owners from 15 to 18 per cent. As to the other buildings we have no evidence whatever, as to the cost, but I have given you the average rental per superficial foot, I have spoken of the care exercised in renting these buildings, and I have challenged the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) to produce the testimony of a single witness before the Public Accounts Committee, or elsewhere that these offices are not worth the amount the government is paying, or that equally convenient accommodation could be obtained for less money elsewhere. The hon. gentleman has suggested that in respect to the Regal building, middlemen were employed. I deny it and I say that we knew no one in this transaction except the owner. The government desired this building for the accommodation of one of its most important departments and we rented it at so much per superficial foot, as we thought was reasonable and fair. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) says we rented it from friends of the government. Let me tell him that I have no knowledge whatever of the politics of Dr. Hanna, who owns the building, but on inquiry I am informed that he has never been identified with the Liberal party in this city. So far as I know he may be a Conservative or a Liberal when he casts his vote at the poll.

Mr. BLAIN. Who are his associates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know. Does the hon. gentleman know who they are? If he does he is at perfect liberty to mention their names to the House, and I invite him to do so. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it is too much of a habit of my hon. friend and some other hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side to hurl insinuations in regard to middlemen and insinuations as to graft in connection with public buildings and public works. To-night and at all times I defy that hon. gentleman to show that so far as my department is concerned I have ever, in connection with public buildings or in connection with any other matter, employed a middleman to negotiate for a property. Every such transaction has been carried on between the department and the owners of the property and in the light of day. We did not buy the Regal building because we knew that in a few years when we had the new departmental block erected we would not require it, but accommodation was needed temporarily and we obtained it at a reasonable rent. We dealt directly with the owner and every transaction in connection with it was open and above board, and having negotiated for a considerable time we got it at the lowest rental and upon the best possible terms. I have not examined in detail all the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee, but I have cited the evidence of an experienced builder who erected the walls and the floors, and the evidence of two men whose duty it was to place a reasonable value upon it for the Royal Trust Company. I have given, and I defy my hon. friend to contradict it, what are considered fair rentals in this city and in Montreal, where the rentals per superficial foot for these office buildings are double what we are paying in Ottawa. I feel that I can appeal with the utmost confidence to the members of this House to say that the hon. gentleman who moved the motion has not presented the slightest evidence upon which he can ask the House to vote for this amendment. In view of the facts which I have presented, I think it is an insult to the intelligence of the members of the House to ask them to sustain such an amendment.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE (North Ontario). If, Mr. Speaker, I have any objection to the wording of this resolution, it is that it is too moderate and temperate in tone. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) finds the net return to the owners on the basis of the rent paid by the government as 18 per cent, but I think the facts will show that the rent which the government are paying comes nearer 25, and even 30 per cent in many cases. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Peel deals generally with certain buildings, but the minister failed to answer the specific case made out by my hon. friend (Mr. Blain), although he lashed himself into a frenzy and fury in connection with a charge yet unmade in regard to the Canadian building and the Woods building. There is an old adage that a guilty conscience needs no accuser, and when the Minister of Public Works indulged in frenzy and fury in defending the Woods and Canadian buildings no doubt his conscience told him that, to use his mild term, the government was paying more than a shade over 7 per cent. The whole defence set up by the Minister of Public Works was based upon a wrong hypothesis. He rested his case with regard to the Woods building and the Canadian building on the valuation made by two men on behalf of the Royal Trust Company, but it is sig-

nificant that these two valuators were not produced as witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee to tell us on what their valuation was based. I have heard the Minister of Public Works object to accepting secondary evidence but there never was a clearer case of secondary evidence than the evidence he produced to-night, when the men who pretended to value the Canadian building and the Woods building were not called before the Public Accounts Committee but their written report was put in. I am safe in assuming that their valuation was based, not upon the actual value of the land and the cost of construction, but on the exorbitant and outrageous rentals guaranteed this company for ten years by this government. Any one who has any knowledge of the conditions in this country knows that a fair net return to a landlord is not much more than 6 per cent on his investment; and in Ottawa, by reason of the speculative value of property, landlords do not, according to the evidence of the city assessor, get more than 3½ per cent net. The Minister of Public Works himself in this House said that 6 per cent was a reasonable return on money invested in real estate; but when he rented a building constructed by this government to one of the officials of this government, and was asked what rent he was going to ask, he replied that he would ask for the reasonable return of 4 per cent. Yet he has been paying 25 per cent, in the case of the Woods building, as the landlord's net return, and 30 per cent on the Canadian building.

The hon. minister says that the assessment is not a proper method of calculating the cost of the building. I admit that in most cases the assessment will not show the actual cost of construction. But in this instance the assessor, when put in the box, was asked how he arrived at the estimate he had made, he replied that he compared the property with the valuations of other properties in the surrounding district and on that based his assessment. This assessment, however, was objected to by Mr. Woods. Mr. Woods said: You have assessed too high and I want you to lower the amount; here are my books. And he opened his books and showed the assessor the cost of construction. The books of the Imperial Realty Company showed the cost of construction, and based on that cost, the return to Woods and his associates is 25 per cent on the Woods building and 30 per cent on the Canadian building. In respect of those buildings, the assessor said they had a lifetime of 150 years, yet strange to say we are paying a return on their cost which will amount to a refund of the whole capital in four years in the one case and three and a third years in the other. Yet these buildings have a lifetime of 150 years. For the benefit of the House, I will put upon 'Hansard' the exact figures sworn to by the assessor:

Name of Building.	Asst. Building.	Real Estate.	Total.	Rental.	Permanent Improvement.	Return.
	$	$	$	$ cts.	$ cts.	p. c.
Woods	110,000	5,500	115,500	25,770 20	15,675 74	25
Canadian	134,000	7,800	141,800	42,536 90	45,990 69	30
	244,000	13,300	257,300	68,314 10	61,666 43	

In the case of the Woods building, the assessment of $110,000 was taken, so the assessor swore, from the books of the company which constructed the building. The real estate cost $5,500 and the total cost of building and real estate was $115,500. Yet on this building we are paying a rental of $25,777.20. And in addition we have spent on permanent improvements the sum of $15,675.74. In other words, with respect to the Woods building we are paying a net return of 25 per cent to the landlord and in addition have improved his property to the extent of $15,675. The Canadian building is assessed at $134,000, and the real estate at $7,800 or a total of $141,800. And for a building that only cost $141,800, we are paying a rental of $42,326.90, and in addition we have paid the exorbitant sum of $45,645.69 on permanent improvements. In other words we are paying to the landlord 30 per cent net return on his investment and in addition we have expended over $45,000 on permanent improvements of a building which it only cost $134,000 to build.

The method of calculating rent is one peculiar to the present administration. In all my experience, I never before heard of a tenant renting a whole building by the superficial foot. I could understand renting one office in a building by the superficial foot; but to have the government calculate the rental it pays on the number of superficial feet in the whole building is a most extravagant method of proceeding. Of course the purpose is to give these enormous returns to the landlord by calculating the rent on the basis of the number of superficial feet. The rent is not, as it

should be, based on the cost of construction by the landlord. It is not an amount which should give a fair and reasonable return to the landlord, but it is fixed so much per superficial foot including all the waste and vacant space, such as the elevator space, the stairway space, even the furnace room.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably my hon. friend has in his mind some evidence before the committee to the effect that, including all the corridors, the rental would be 36 cents per superficial foot. The figures I have given are for the rooms actually rented and do not include the corridors or furnace room.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I would suggest that in future the minister should not continually contradict without being sure of his position and the facts. I have sat here many times and have listened to the hon. gentleman, who is usually most courteous, but he has a faculty of contradicting members on this side without being sure of his facts. In connection with this rental, I want to read a passage from the 'Hansard,' of 1909, volume 1, page 615. My hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid), was questioning the minister with reference to this matter:

Mr. J. D. Reid.—It has been reported to me and the proof is that judging from the size of the building I do not believe you could figure out such a rental unless they measured the hall.

Mr. J. D. Currie.—And the roof.

Mr. J. D. Reid.—Yes, and the cellar as well.

Mr. Pugsley.—The honourable gentleman has the unhappy faculty of assuming things to exist which do not exist in fact. The honourable gentleman is entirely mistaken in saying that the corridors were included in estimating the area. We have the most correct measurement of every room in the building.

Now, in the committee, I put this question to the chief architect of his department, who was a witness:

Now when Mr. Pugsley stated that Mr. Reid was mistaken in saying that the corridors were included in estimating the area Mr. Pugsley was mistaken wasn't he?—A. He was mistaken in one of the buildings anyway.

Q. Referring to the Canadian building?—A. Well, the Canadian building, we have had the last lease exactly measured out.

Q. And it includes corridors you told us the last day, and the stairway?—A. That is right.

Q. And the elevator shaft?—A. That is right.

Q. As to the cellar?—A. That is right.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Minister of Public Works specifically contradicted the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), we find his chief architect of the department coming forward and declaring under oath that these measurements include all this waste space. I spoke a moment ago of the enormous sums paid out for permanent improvements on these buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me a moment? Does not he remember that the lease which was based upon the superficial area, and which, as he said, included the corridors and other waste spaces, was on the basis of 36 cents or 37 cents per superficial foot

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). No, I do not remember that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is my information. The figures I have given to-night are the figures given me by the chief architect, which are considerably more than 36 cents but in which all the corridors are excluded for the purpose of comparison and the superficial area actually occupied is alone considered.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I was speaking of the permanent improvements on these buildings, and said that, in addition to the permanent improvements on the Woods building amounting to $15,675.74, the sum of $45,990.69 had been spent on the Canadian building, a total on the two of $61,666.43. Now, Mr. Woods stated—and the letter is on file in the minister's department—that the cost of alterations in connection with the Woods building would be only $16,000 and that he would make these alterations of his own accord and at his own expense. Yet, notwithstanding this letter, which shows that Mr. Woods was anxious to rent the building to the department, we find the department assuming that liability and of a total of $31,351 paying one half or $15,675.74, as I have said—within a few dollars of what Mr. Woods stated would be the whole cost of the alterations. In other words, though we were supposed to pay half the alterations, according to Mr. Woods' calculations, we paid all the alterations in connection with the building.

But these leases are most extraordinary, and have most extraordinary features. As I said, under the first lease, dated October 17, 1903, we find Mr. Woods agreeing to make all the alterations. And before the second lease dated August 30, 1905, was executed we find Mr. Woods offering to make the alterations. He was so anxious to rent to the department that he offered in a letter to the department which is on file there, to put the buildings in condition for them to immediately move into, without expense to the department. But we find the extraordinary fact that the department executed a lease under which they agreed to assume half the expense of these alterations. In other words, in the face of Mr. Woods' letter offering to make the alterations at his own expense, the department assumed half the expense

amounting to over $15,000. The government voluntarily obligated itself, under all the other leases, to pay the expense of alterations, which amounted to $61,666.43, though Mr. Woods had voluntarily offered to make these alterations at his own expense. I say that the officials of the department who are responsible for a lease of that character, and in the face of a letter such as I have spoken of, on the files, cannot be charged with incompetency; I think a stronger term is applicable. It is absolutely dishonest to the people of this country to have a lease executed obligating the government to spend over $60,000 in improvements when the lessor had offered to make the alterations at his own expense.

I have another charge to lay at the door of the minister, and that is in connection with the nature of the improvements, and I say it is a very serious charge, because we know that these leases cannot be executed without authority of the Privy Council. We find a memorandum of the Privy Council which says that the government agrees to pay one-half of the 'interior fittings' and 'necessary alterations.' But many of the improvements paid for are neither 'interior fittings' nor 'necessary alterations,' but consist of such things as storm-sash, permanent walls, expensive stone floors, iron stairways and even elevators—and we pay half the expense of these. By what stretch of imagination can you call elevators 'interior fittings' or an iron stairway 'necessary alterations'? Not only that, but at page 187 of the records of the Public Accounts Committee, we find that we paid half the expense of elevators that had already been installed before the lease was excuted.

Mr. LENNOX. Is that established by the evidence?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Yes, by the sworn evidence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And no explanation of it?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). No explanation forthcoming. The renting of the Woods building was so profitable that Mr. Woods wanted to erect another building and let it out to this easy department with an easy conscience. It was a profitable business. The department determined to rent the Canadian building, and when the rental was fixed the building had reached only about the first story. Yet at the time when the department made up its mind to rent the Canadian building, there was a report from the chief architect that they required no more space. Why does the department negotiate an extraordinary lease of this kind when the chief architect declares that no more space is required by the various departments? Further, the order in council confirming and ratifying this proposed lease speaks only of 'alterations,' half to be paid by Mr. Woods and half by the department. But they were not alterations in any proper sense, but were new work put in as the building was being erected. The architect furnished the plans for each floor as it was constructed. The order in council did not contemplate this. Only 'necessary alterations' required after the building was erected were contemplated. But we paid some $45,990.69 for work put into the new building that was being erected by Mr. Woods. And to-day we are paying $42,536.90 annual rental. So, in three and one-third years we would pay for the whole building.

Then, we have—shall I say?—a more discreditable feature of these leases. We find that the rents are payable months before the execution of the lease, and the owners are drawing rentals months before the buildings were taken possession of.

Mr. LENNOX. Is that sworn to?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). That is sworn to, and the documents show it. The lease dated September 13, 1906, carries rent from the 1st of January, 1906, eight months and a half before the lease was executed. The lease dated April 16, 1908, carries rent from December 1, 1907, four and a half months before it was executed. Under the first lease, dated September 13, 1906, the rent runs from January 1, 1906, although possession was not given of the basement and second and third floors until May following, and of the fourth and fifth floors until February 6, of the seventh floor until January 30, 1906. So we have the government of this country paying rent four and five months before possession was secured and seven and eight months before the lease was actually executed. In other words, the lease was dated on a certain date and the rent was made to run months prior either to the execution of the lease or the taking of possession. Then we find, under the second lease, dated April 16, 1908, the rent is dated back to the 1st of December, 1907. Of the second and third floor, possession was not given until April 8, and of the fourth floor until May, of the fifth floor until December, 1907. Consequently we find the department paying enormous sums in rentals, and they are high rentals, for five months under the first lease, amounting to $11,387.50, before the department has any use of the buildings at all. I say the Department of Public Works is responsible for this condition of affairs. Under the second lease we paid rent for five months, amounting to $6,336.25, before the department ever took possession of the building at all.

Now, the Minister of Public Works spoke about the heating and lighting of the

buildings. I want to show that the heating of this particular building had the same extraordinary features as the rentals had. It is not based on the cost of the service, but is based on the cubic contents of the building. You have to come to the city of Ottawa and enter into the Public Works Department in order to get some knowledge of this peculiar method of paying for the heating of public buildings. It is only these two public buildings in Ottawa, under government supervision, where they hire the heating done according to the cubic contents. And how does it work out? On the sworn testimony of the chief architect of the department, he says he cubed the whole building, outside measurement. The walls are included, and the country is paying four-tenths cents per cubic foot for heating these two buildings, no allowance for outside walls, no allowance for inner walls, no allowance even for the furnace room. We are paying for heating the furnace room according to its cubic contents. Mr. Woods even claimed pay for heating the space under the sidewalk outside the buildings. Well, when we summoned witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee we find the department paying the cost of the coal, the wages of the men, and repairs, which are all the ingredients making up the cost of heating, an amount of $6,047.55. And what was this department paying for that same service? They were paying this Imperial Realty Company $9,163.51, leaving a rake-off of $3,115.96. Now, when these facts were brought out in the Public Accounts Committee they voted down a resolution which I propose to read, calling upon the government to cancel that contract. But the facts were brought out so clearly by their own witnesses, by the chief architect of the department, and by other witnesses, that the department has since cancelled the contract for heating, and has effected a saving to the country of over $3,000 in that respect. Then the Minister of Public Works referred to the lighting of the buildings. Strange to say, the government paid on the meter basis, although a commercial rate is always a flat rate. The city treasurer of Ottawa, when placed in the witness box, said that these were properly commercial rates, they should not have been paid on the meter basis at all, but should have been on the flat basis. Then we find that the department, instead of paying the city of Ottawa direct for the lighting of these buildings, pays the Imperial Realty Company, and the Imperial Realty Company pays the city of Ottawa, and the middleman again comes into evidence, and makes out of the government something like $3,000 or $4,000 a year on lighting contracts alone.

Mr. LENNOX. What minister is responsible for that?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The Minister of Public Works, it is in his department.

Mr. LENNOX. He defied us about the middleman.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). He said there was no middleman in his department, but there is the evidence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. An arrangement made before I became minister, and the amounts paid on vouchers furnished by the city of Ottawa—the identical amounts.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not mention those vouchers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I will.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. minister will mention anything, if he will bring up a transaction like these vouchers. The minister has never looked into it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have looked into it.

Mr. FOSTER. Then for the sake of Mr. Woods, never open your mouth about it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not concerned about Mr. Woods, what I am concerned about is that Mr. Ellis, the treasurer of this city, should have furnished these vouchers professing to show the identical allowance which were paid by the Imperial Realty Company to the city of Ottawa, the identical amounts contained in the accounts which were rendered by the Imperial Realty Company to the officers of my department and which were paid.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The chief architect of the department was put in the witness box before the Public Accounts Committee and gave evidence. Speaking about the electric lighting contracts that this government had with the Imperial Realty Company, and speaking as to the illegitimate and illicit profit that the Imperial Realty Company was making out of the department, Mr. Ewart gave this evidence on page 182:

In view of the evidence that has been adduced before the committee, would you, as chief architect of the department would recommend the cancelling of them?—A. Well, I would.

Then on page 204 we have the evidence of the deputy minister, Mr. J. B. Hunter, who says:

Q. So that if the Imperial Realty Company were not paying the city the amount they were collecting from the department, the department would be entitled to reimbursement?—A. I would certainly go after them and get it. That is our understanding, that they pay the city and we pay them. If they are not doing it I will have to go after them.

Q. In that case you are entitled to reimbursement?—A. We are.

Now, in answer to a question that was placed upon the Order Paper not long ago, whether they had instituted an action against the Imperial Realty Company to recover this amount, the Minister of Public Works, although an astute and clever lawyer, said he had referred it to the Justice Department for an opinion. Now surely, with the minister's experience, and parliamentary knowledge, and astuteness, and cleverness in the law, he did not need to refer a question so simple to the Department of Justice before taking action against the Imperial Realty Company. I desire at this juncture to say a word in regard to the lighting contract where the facts were so conclusively proven, notwithstanding all the obstruction that was possible in the Public Accounts Committee on the part of the Minister of Public Works himself, and of the Liberal members of that committee. In this connection I desire to call attention to a matter that came up not long ago in the House when the Minister of Public Works said that he was not present in the Public Accounts Committee when this contract was ruled out which would have disclosed the whole facts, and that the Imperial Realty Company were getting an illegal profit out of the lighting contract. I quote from page 874 of 'Hansard':

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The Minister of Public Works objected to the production of the original contract because he said it was a private document.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I was not present when the chairman ruled out that contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Did I hear the minister say 'hear, hear'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it was from your own side.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). What does the minister say now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. You will hear from me by and by if you give me an opportunity.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario) (reading):

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The Minister of Public Works, and all his cohorts surrounding him, objected to the production of the original contract, because it would disclose the amount this company was paying the city of Ottawa for its light.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have made the statement that I was not present in the committee when objection was taken to the original contract, and when it was ruled out.

I want to say, with reference to that particular statement, that I have here a certified copy of the proceedings before the Public Accounts Committee, certified to by Mr. Thomas S. Howe, and this is another instance when the Minister of Public Works was so ready to contradict a member of the House without being sure of his facts. I had not this document in my hand at the time, but the minister deliberately contradicted me in this House and stated that I was not stating facts, and that he was not present. Now, we have the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee certified under the hand of the clerk.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend give me the page?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). 874 of 'Hansard.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but the reference to the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I will send you over this document when I read it.

Ottawa, Friday, April 29, 1910.

Committee met at three p.m., Mr. Warburton presiding.

Examination of Mr. Ernest Linton resumed by Mr. Sharpe.

During the examination of this witness he was asked to produce a contract between the Woods Company, Limited, and the Ottawa City Electric Light Company, and he refused to produce the contract.

Whereupon the chairman was asked for a ruling, and he ruled that the witness need not produce the said contract unless he chose so to do.

From this ruling Mr. Sharpe appealed.

The yeas and nays being asked for, and the question being put, the ruling of the chairman was sustained on the following division, namely:—

Yeas—Messrs. Chisholm (Inverness), Congdon, Fowke, Lanctot (Richelieu), Logie, MacNutt, Michaud, Nesbitt, Pardee, Prowse, Pugsley——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend give me the date of that?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). April 29, 1910.

—Reid (Restiguoche), Richards, Schell, Sinclair—15.

Nays—Messrs. Blain, Boyce, Crosby, Goodeve, Lennox, Middlebro, Rhodes, Roche, Sharpe (Ontario), Wallace—10.

The result being fifteen to ten.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true extract from the Minutes of Proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee held on Friday, April 29, 1910.

THOS. S. HOWE,
Clerk Public Accounts Committee.

Ottawa, November 25, 1910.

Does the Minister of Public Works dispute the certificate of the clerk of the Public Accounts Committee? Does he still persist in saying that he was not present obstructing the work of the committee and upholding the rulings of the chairman ruling out legitimate, and pertinent evidence which would disclose the facts with regard to this nefarious contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My recollection now that I have seen this statement is exactly the same as it was when the matter came up previously. My recollection is that the chairman had ruled out the agreement before I came into the committee room.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is my recollection of it. Will my hon. friend pardon me for saying that it is rather a strange thing that my hon. friend has not the proceedings of the committee for April 29.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I could not get them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How could my hon. friend get the certificate and not get the report itself?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Because the proceedings are on file and posted in the book of the clerk of the Public Accounts Committee. He has only one copy of them posted in his book. Does the minister dispute it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do dispute it ; I am satisfied it is not true.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). There is Mr. Howe's signature.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, I am satisfied it is not true. My recollection is just as clear as it can be—I may be mistaken, but I do not think I am. I am sure I am not mistaken because I remember distinctly that what took place was this—

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Mr. Speaker—

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend appeals to me, and I have the right to answer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sharpe, Ontario) has the floor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very well, but the hon. gentleman asked me—

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I asked you what your recollection was ; that is all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My recollection is that when I came into the committee room the hon. gentleman sought to give secondary evidence of the contents of a document which had been previously ruled out by the chairman, ruled out before I entered the room, and that is what I objected to. I took the ground that as the chairman had ruled that document out, as I was informed when I came into the room, my hon. friend ought not to be allowed to give secondary evidence of its contents.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). If that is the hon. gentleman's understanding with reference to the chairman's ruling, how can my hon. friend, in face of that document certified under the hand of the clerk in Public Accounts Committee and which shows that his recollection is in direct conflict with the facts as set out in that certificate, make the statement which he has? But, notwithstanding all the obstruction to which we are subjected in this investigation before the Public Accounts Committee——

Mr. PUGSLEY. To which you were not subjected.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario)——the facts were so patent that at last we succeeded in having them given and placed upon the record in such a clear and distinct way that even the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) and the Liberal members of the committee voted unanimously for a resolution to request the government to cancel the electric light contract and save the country $3,000 or $4,000 a year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which they all voted for.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Which they all voted for!

Moved by Mr. Sharpe, seconded by Mr. Carvell, that whereas the expense to the government during the last year for lighting the Woods and Canadian buildings amounted to $9,465.91, paid to the Imperial Realty Company, which company is not an electrical lighting company; and whereas the city of Ottawa has a standard schedule of prices whereby the lighting would cost only $5,040 or less, thereby effecting an annual saving to the country of $4,425.91 or more; therefore this committee desires to urge upon the Minister of Public Works and the government the desirability of cancelling the present arrangement and recovering the excess unjustly paid to the Imperial Realty Company, and giving the city of Ottawa or some other company the contract at lower rates; and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Minister of Public Works.

The question having been put, it was declared carried in the affirmative.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Unanimously, was it not?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). It was carried unanimously. There was no objection to it.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The minister did not vote against that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, sir, I was in favour of it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Acting on the strength of that resolution unanimously adopted by the committee the government has cancelled the contract and saved the country $3,000 or $4,000 a year, but they have not taken any action yet to recover the amount of the illegal profit from the Imperial Realty Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has cut it down fifty per cent. Some time ago he said that it was $6,000.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). How the hon. gentleman does like to interrupt and draw a red herring across the trail.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no red herring about it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). If the minister will agree to lay the papers and documents in connection with the investigation on the table of the House the House will see that the Imperial Realty Company took a rake-off of at least $6,000 a year. We knew it was $6,000, but we kept well within the mark in order to get the unanimous endorsement of the committee for the resolution that the government should cancel this contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I did was to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he now says it was $3,000 when before he said it was $6,000.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The resolution says it was $4,000, but the actual facts show that it was $6,000 that the company were making out of the government.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Were they middlemen?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). They were middlemen operating by and through and in the Public Works Department.

As we all know, the Public Works Department might have telephoned to the Electric Light Company in Ottawa and secured the same rate of $3,000 a year, but the government chose to pay the company $9,000 instead. In connection with the heating the following resolution was moved :

Mr. Sharpe moved, Mr. Blain seconding, that whereas the heating of the Woods and Canadian buildings, contrary to all established custom of the present and past governments, has been contracted for and let out to the Imperial Realty Company at the price of four-tenths of a cent per cubic foot of the total contents of the buildings, and whereas the cost of the heating of these two buildings last year amounted to the sum of $9,163.51; and whereas the cost of the coal, the wages of the men and the repairs amounted to only $6,047.55; therefore, this committee is of the opinion that the government should cancel the present arrangement, and should do its own heating, thereby saving at least $3,115.96 per annum in this item alone.

The yeas and nays being asked for, and the question being put, the motion was lost on the following division:—

Yeas—Messrs. Blain, Crosby, Currie (Simcoe), Goodeve, Hughes, Lake, Sharpe (Ontario)—7.

Nays—Messrs. Allen, Carvell, Congdon, Loggie, MacNutt, McAllister, McKenzie, Neely, Parent, Proulx, Rankin, Reid (Restigouche)—12.

That resolution was voted down but immediately after the committee rose the department cancelled the heating arrangement, and they are to-day doing the heating themselves at a saving of $3,000 a year to the country, but when the motion being put above it was lost on the division stated in the quotation, and in the majority will be found the names of all the government supporters present. The second resolution has to do with the rentals, and as it summarizes the evidence I shall place it on record.

Moved by Mr. Sharpe, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that whereas the government has entered into certain leases with the Imperial Realty Co., respecting the Woods and Canadian buildings on Slater street, in the city of Ottawa; and whereas the annual rental of the Woods building amounts to $25,777.20 and taxes, in addition to which the government has expended $15,675.74 on capital expenditure on the building, including payment of one-half the cost of elevators in the buildings, expensive Ferrozo floors, iron stairs, &c.; and whereas the annual rental of the Canadian building amounts to $42,536.90 and taxes, in addition to which the government has expended $45,990.69 on capital expenditure on the building, including payment of one-half the cost of elevators erected before the lease was executed, expensive floors, iron stairway, &c., therefore this committee is of the opinion from the evidence adduced that the terms and conditions of these leases are unfair to the government and display an utter lack of care and good judgment on the part of those persons negotiating the same on behalf of the people of Canada.

The question being put, the motion was lost on division as above recorded.

On account of the obstructive tactics employed by the Liberal members of the committee this resolution was moved :

Moved by Mr. Sharpe, seconded by Mr. Goodeve, that whereas one of the chief functions of the Public Accounts Committee is the investigation into all questions as to the fair and reasonable price paid by the government for the various commodities sold and services rendered to the government; and whereas to properly discharge this duty it is absolutely necessary that the greatest latitude be given to members of the committee to inquire into the first cost of such commodities and services to the persons selling same to the government; therefore, the committee deprecates the unwarranted and continued obstruction of the work of the committee by some of its members, and regrets that the rulings of the chairman, Mr. Warburton, in the present investigation before the committee prevented a full and free inquiry into all the facts of the case.

The question being put, the motion was lost on division as above recorded.

Now, to summarize the results of the investigation into this peculiar contract—the government were forced to cancel the lighting contract, and the government were forced to cancel the heating con-

tract, and on these two items alone $8,000 or $9,000 a year was saved to the country. Again, the government were buying electric power from the Imperial Realty Company—a company that never developed any electric power at all, but purchased it from the city of Ottawa, and on this transaction there was a rake-off on the power for the elevator alone of $1,000 a year. In connection with these contracts we have these extraordinary facts : The improvements which were supposed to include only internal fittings or alterations but which included storm sashes. Terrazzo floors, iron stairs, elevators already erected, all permanent improvements amounted to $61,666.46. Again we have had the leases drawn to carry the rentals for months before they were signed, and before possession was taken which involved a loss to the country of $17,723. On the heating the rake-off was $3,159.60, on the power the rake-off was $1,000, the electric light rake-off was at least $4,000 a year, making a total illegal payment to this company of $87,390, which was utterly indefensible, improper, and dishonest. The Minister of Public Works referred to the Royal Trust Company of Montreal, and I desire to say to this House that there were most extravagant speculations by reason of these extraordinary and extravagant, and outrageous rentals the minister was paying to this company. We find that the formation of the Imperial Realty Company was in contemplation when the first lease of the Canadian building was executed. The date of the first lease of the Canadian building was 10th September, 1906 ; letters patent were issued to the Imperial Realty Company on 4th October, 1906; the bargain and sale from Mr. Woods to the Imperial Realty Company was on the 20th of October, 1906 ; the date of the second lease of the Canadian building was 16th April, 1908 ; the date of the supplementary letters patent to the Imperial Realty Company 20th November, 1908 ; the trust mortgage from the Imperial Realty Company to the Royal Trust Company was on the first of January, 1909, just a few weeks afterwards. We find that bonds were issued on January 1, 1909 for $500,000. There was no great difficulty in negotiating bonds for $500,000 with the Royal Trust Company or any other company that had the funds to loan, on buildings the rental of which was paying 10 per cent on a capitalization of over $700,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hardly, if the building was not worth that.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The rentals were for ten years, and the total rentals came to something like—

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lease of one building was only for five years.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). With the option of renewal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The option was to the government, and not to the company, and it might or might not be renewed.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Knowing how easy the Department of Public Works was the Trust Company had no doubt the rentals would continue, and the lease renewed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend think the Royal Trust Company would invest the money of the widow and the orphan on a speculation of that kind?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It would pay it all up in five years anyway.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The total rental was $68,314.10 or 10 per cent return on $680,000. There was no difficulty in negotiating a loan of $500,000 when the government guaranteed the rentals amounting to half as much again as the bond issue. But I want to say something about the bond issue. The bond issue was made on January 1, 1909, and this is a case of modern high finance. Talk about Sheldon and George Munroe, but in this instance the Department of Public Works working in conjunction with a party favourite could put Mr. Sheldon, and Mr. George Monroe in the shade. Here we see the Imperial Realty Company negotiating the bond issue on January 1, 1909, for $500,000 payable the first of January, 1939, or earlier, with interest at 6 per cent payable half yearly, numbered from 1 to 500, repayable by a sinking fund of $8,500 a year. To redeem a bond issue of $500,000 in 30 years they only required a sinking fund of $8,500 a year. They were getting $68,000 a year rent or in other words they were having profits of $60,000 a year, along with a sinking fund of $8,500 a year to redeem this bond issue, and out of this bond issue or mortgage they built the handsome Roxborough apartments. Let me do a little figuring for the benefit of the Minister of Public Works. The annual rental of the Woods building was $25,777.20, and 30 years rent at the rate that the Minister of Public Works is paying these landlords would amount to $783,316. The Canadian building was rented for $42,536.90, and if they continue to rent the buildings at the rate the minister of Public Works rented them for, that building will bring them in $1,276,107 in the 30 years. In other words the total rentals to the Imperial Realty Company, during the currency of the bond issue will amount to $2,059,425.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That assumes that after the government lease has terminated, the

company would be able to rent it at the same rental to other parties.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). When probably the Minister of Public Works will renew the lease.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the company could easily calculate on the same rental from other parties afterwards.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The hon. gentleman knows that, by reason of the growth of the city and progressive values of real estate, rentals are higher to-day than they were when he negotiated the lease; and I have no doubt that at the end of 10 years the company could rent the buildings to the Minister of Public Works at higher prices.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Or to anybody else.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). At any rate, the total rentals of these two buildings in 30 years would net the company $2,059,425. The cost of these buildings, according to the evidence of a city assessor, was $257,300. So that there would be a net profit to the company of $1,802,125 in 30 years, and they would still own the building free of any claim. Among the shareholders of this company are:—J. W. Woods, 550 shares; D. R. Finnie, 800 shares, in trust; G. C. Edwards, 100 shares, in trust; Sir H. M. Pellatt, 250 shares; and Judge McTavish. There are a number of other shareholders, but I have not the list under my hand. Now, the total rentals are:—On the Woods building, $25,777.20; on the Canadian building, $42,626.90; a total of $68,314.10. The government can borrow money at 3½ per cent per annum, and hence with the annual sum of $68,314.10, have borrowed $1,951,830 with which they could have erected these buildings at a cost of $300,000, and then would have had $1,651,830 in the treasury to the good. That is to say: The rent equals net income at 3½ per cent on an investment of $1,951,830, while the company expended less than $300,000 in the construction of both buildings, towards which we contributed $61,666.43 in permanent improvements. Now, I submit, in conclusion, that the people of this country do not desire the various departments, under the control of ministers who are paid high salaries, conducted in this manner. Again we find that the hon. Minister of Public Works was in Winnipeg last July, and while there he made some speeches, in which he said that the only charges brought against the government were in reference to the sawdust wharf and the electric light contract, and these were utterly untrue. The Manitoba 'Free Press,' quoting his speech, under date of July 13, 1910, said:—

Mr. Pugsley touched upon some criticism which he had received from the leader of the opposition (referring to the sawdust wharf and the electric light contracts). The charges dealt with were two, which Mr. Pugsley proved to have been absurd and unfounded.

The Winnipeg 'Telegram' also of July 13, 1910, quotes the hon. minister as making that statement with reference to the electric light contract:—

There was nothing in the transaction that was not straightforward, and the opposition dare not challenge me on the floor of the House, though they make bold to use these insinuations against me in their speeches outside of the House.

When you reflect that one of the good old principles of the Liberal party was 'the ancient and undoubted right of the House of Commons to inquire into all matters of public expense,' you wonder why these hon. gentlemen go to the Public Accounts Committees and use every effort in their power to strangle investigation and to suppress the facts. When Mr. Ernest Linton, the secretary of the Imperial Realty Company, was in the witness box, as there were significant features about these contracts which impressed me very seriously, I asked him if there was any official of the Public Works Department who was residing in the Roxborough apartments. At first he refused to answer, but finally the chairman ruled that he had to answer. Then he said that the only officials who were residing in the Roxborough apartment were the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) and the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And I suppose my hon. friend suggests that we get free rent, does he?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I simply state what was the evidence of the secretary of the Imperial Realty Company, and the House and the country can draw their own inference. I say that the contracts were so outrageously unfair to the interests of this country that the right hon. the First Minister should appoint a royal commission to investigate the whole transaction from beginning to end.

Mr. F. T. CONGDON (Yukon Territory). Mr. Speaker, I think the House would have more highly appreciated the course of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat if he had made the many charges which he has made throughout his speech, at a time when it was within the power of the Minister of Public Works to reply to him. It may be the practice of this House to entertain charges of this kind made in the partial manner in which these charges have been made; it may be the policy of the opposition to call the minister to his feet to reply when only a portion of the charges are made; but I venture to say that no fair-

minded man can have listened to the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat without coming to the conclusion that it is not a fair way in which to make charges of this character. The matters to which these charges relate are such as to be more within the knowledge of the hon. minister than of any other member of this House. He has control of them, he knows of them; matters which are unfamiliar to other members of the House are quite within his knowledge; and I have no doubt that had he the opportunity now to reply to the hon. member, he would answer him as completely and as fairly as he did the hon. member who made the motion. The hon. gentleman has recited the various leases in a way which tends to confuse the House in regard to the subject. One would think, from the manner in which he referred to them, that they all related to the same premises. If a little attention is paid to them, however, it will be found that the earliest one related to the east half of the Woods building, and as to that, the proprietor bore all the expenses of the alterations. The next related to the west half, and contained a clause by which the proprietor was to make the alterations and the government was to pay one-half the cost. The third lease related to the portion that was not included in either of the previous leases. There are two leases relating to the Canadian building, one for the west half, and the other for the east half. Now, to my mind, the question under discussion as to the propriety of the rentals paid must depend wholly upon the value of the buildings rented. It must be remembered that at the time the first lease was made there was a vast increase in the business of this country, and it was absolutely essential that the government should obtain premises in which that business could be properly carried on. No one who is familiar with the conditions in Ottawa as far back as 1903 can doubt that it was utterly impossible for the government to secure another building as suitable for their purpose as the Woods building. At that time that was the only building in this city that could be secured. Of course it is easy to go back to many years ago when real estate in Ottawa could be bought for a song, when building was much cheaper, and take the valuation then as basis for an estimate, but that is not a fair way in which to arrive at a reasonable rental on these properties leased by the government. In making a lease for ten years, the rental is not based wholly on the value of the year of making, but on the return which the building ought to bring during the period covered by the lease. It may well be that the government, in this lease made in 1903, will be considerably the gainer, before its termination, by the fact that the rental was fixed at that time.

I know of no way in which the value of real estate can be fixed except by taking the testimony of men who are accustomed to estimate such values. It would not have been possible to have brought before the committee better evidence of values than that given by the valuators to the Royal Trust Company. It is absurd to say that in 1908 the Royal Trust Company was influenced, in the loan it made to the Imperial Realty Company, by the fact that there were still a few years to run on the leases made in 1903 and 1905. That certainly would be a very small element in determining the value put upon the buildings as security for the loan. Turning, then, to the report of these valuators, we have the most explicit evidence as to what they considered to be the values of these different buildings. We have these values defined in various ways. We have the Queen street property estimated to be worth $68,975. On this the rental paid is $5,300, and I do not think that can be called an excessive rental. The next lot is the Woods property, which is estimated as worth $288,350. There is a lease of that building reserving a rental of $25,777. The next building is the Canadian, estimated by these valuators at $433,870, and the rental is $43,536. Taking these various properties as estimated in this valuation, they aggregate $791,195, and the total rental is $73,000, very considerably less than 10 per cent, and only about 10 per cent if, from the $791,000 you deduct the amount paid by the government on alterations.

My hon. friend criticised the various provisions in the leases and the various transactions with regard to alterations, and apparently confused the leases. No doubt in the first lease the cost of the alterations was paid wholly by the proprietor, but only half in the second lease. And in a second lease it is not unusual for the proprietor to change the terms of the first. No doubt in 1903 every one who knew anything about real estate in Ottawa expected a prompt and quick rise in prices and values. In 1905, when the second lease was made, such a rise had taken place, and from time to time since there has been such an increase that the rentals paid by the government are fair and just, if you take the whole period covered by these leases and strike the average.

My hon. friend talked of a rake-off as though there was such a thing in respect to the heating and lighting. The evidence shows clearly that the Imperial Realty Company meant to obtain a larger amount for these purposes than they were entitled to, but the moment the minister discovered that the vouchers were not in accord with the amounts charged, he suggested that

action should be taken to cancel the contract.

My hon. friend charges some of the members of the Public Accounts Committee which investigated this matter with having obstructed the investigation, and put every obstacle possible in the way of securing a full disclosure. Well, in my opinion, no one can read the report of the evidence taken before that committee without coming to the conclusion that the very fullest and freest investigation was allowed. The very statement my hon. friend makes that the committee unanimously recommended the cancellation of this lighting contract shows that the committee was ready to do what was fair and just. There may have been one or two rulings of the chairman in which the hon. gentleman did not agree, but that frequently happens. In any court of justice one occasionally meets with decisions ruling out evidence, which decisions the counsel on one side is sure not to approve. But you cannot read the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee without seeing that every possible opportunity was given to investigate these matters in every line and branch, and if the members of that committee did not do so the fault was their own.

The charge has been made that middlemen were employed, but there is no evidence to sustain it. The evidence, on the contrary, shows that the original owner was the only party who had any dealings with the minister. Even with regard to the heating and lighting, to which the hon. gentleman refers as though there was a rake-off, the profit, whatever it was, was made by the proprietor, who wrote to the minister that he was charging only what he paid those who did the heating and lighting.

I submit that the ground of this matter could have been better covered by the minister himself than it could possibly be by any other member of this House. Had these charges been made, as they should have been, covering all the various buildings, covering all the items in respect of which any accusation is made by the opposition, and the minister thus given an opportunity of meeting them, there would be some satisfaction in our knowing that the gentleman who possessed all the knowledge and information with regard to these matters was given a fair and just opportunity to meet these charges. It is easy enough to go into figures. An hon. gentleman who can work out such figures as my hon. friend from Ontario has is wasting his time when he spends it on an investigation by a committee of this House. He ought, instead, to be out in the high financial world engaged in making money. It is easy to take figures and estimate the cost of buildings at a less amount than they are actually worth and then estimate the rental on that estimate and say that what is paid is excessive. It is easy to do this and then point out what a saving would have been effected had the rent been based on a lower value than the proprietor would have accepted.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), in answering the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), attempted to read into the resolution something which had not been put there by the mover of it. As a mere matter of courtesy, following the usual precedent, the hon. member for Peel had notified the Minister of Public Works that this question would be brought up. And I would say to the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Congdon), and to the Minister of Public Works and the members of the government, that this investigation has been before the House and the country since last session, so there can be no complaint on the part of the Minister of Public Works that he has no knowledge, when he was notified by the hon. member for Peel, what matter was to be taken up or what the subject of the amendment would be. But I wish to refer again to the peculiar manner of entering into the debate of the Minister of Public Works. He suggested that the member for Peel had been rather ashamed or afraid of what he had undertaken, and had reduced the percentage rental of these buildings by two per cent, and the minister suggested that this was a very serious thing. He did not hesitate to read into the resolution a matter of 25 per cent, and, setting up that straw man in an attempt to deceive the House in the argument he adduced. As the percentage named, was 20 per cent, and not 25 per cent, he attempted to read into the resolution an increase of 25 per cent. In the same way, in arguing the rent per superficial foot of these buildings, the Minister of Public Works does what he attempted to do before in a similar debate in this House. He referred to the Citizen building, but he did not tell this House that any one going in to rent a room there was paying 90 cents a square foot for the space he occupied and that he got heat, light, repairs, snowcleaning, taxes, insurance and all the expenses in connection with the building, together with the advertising of a large central newspaper building of that kind which in itself is no small matter to any man doing business. These were not figured in in the comparison he made of 81 cents per square foot. That covered the entire building. And not only was he paying 81 cents per foot of the building, basement and attic included, but, in addition, he was paying for heating, lighting, repairs, and the removal of snow. This was the lease made in regard to the Seybold building. The Minister

of Public Works refused to accept the certified copy of one of the officials of this House, but I have here a printed report of the Public Accounts Committee, printed by the King's Printer, and dated Ottawa, 1910, No. 3. Though the minister refuses to accept a statement certified by one of the officials, he surely will not refuse to accept the report of one of the committee of this House, printed by the King's Printer. At page 142, I find in a discussion of the very contract we have had before the House to-night, and on which the arguments of the hon. member for North Ontario were based, the following:—

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—The hon. minister has begged the whole question.

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—In what way?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—Because you are presupposing that you know this witness is going to say he will not answer the question.

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—Not at all.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—Excuse me, now, by your interjection you are intimating to the witness that he need not answer, before you know whether he will object or not.

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—Not at all, what I am objecting to is this, and every member of this committee has the right to object to it, to the giving by verbal evidence the contents of a contract which is not produced and which the witness has declined to produce.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOODEVE. I will go on to show that the witness was willing to produce the contract had it not been for the attitude of the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me a moment?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am appealing to the hon. gentleman himself, not to those who are crying 'Order.' But, with the permission of my hon. friend, I will ask him if he does not think that that absolutely corroborates my statement when I say that Mr. Middlebro is seeking to get verbal evidence of the contents of the document? Previous to that time, the document had been produced, and had been taken possession of by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), but the chairman had ruled it out of evidence, and had ordered the hon. member to hand it back. That is the information that was furnished me, and that was why I said before the committee at the time of which he speaks that Mr. Middlebro was trying to get in verbal evidence of the contents of a document.

Mr. GOODEVE. But the minister said, notwithstanding the evidence as certified by the clerk, that he was not present on that occasion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I must correct my hon. friend. I made no such statement. I said I was not present when the chairman ruled out the written contract. I came in afterwards and took objection to the attempt to get in secondary evidence of the contract. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) tried to get in, in a very ingenious way, verbal evidence as to the contents of a contract that had already been ruled out by the chairman.

Mr. GOODEVE. But the evidence shows that the minister was there from the beginning and remained to the end, for his name appears as voting when the vote was taken.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may have been there at the end, but not at the beginning.

Mr. GOODEVE. The minister was present and refused to allow us to hold that contract until we were through with the investigation. That was the whole dispute. We desired that the papers, as in all these investigations, should be freely and frankly laid before this committee and this House. I will show that the minister was there, not as the Minister of Public Works, to assist in making known the facts, but he was there to prevent the witness giving evidence which the witness was prepared to give, and a portion of the committee desired to hear:—

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—The Minister of Public Works, by taking the stand that he has, is taking the stand that he is the private solicitor for this gentleman who is in the box.

That is exactly what I understood, and I was present.

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—How absurd.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—He is, because supposing after you had made this objection, the witness says, 'I do not mind answering at all.'

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—That is not proper evidence.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—Then you have no right to interject your objections until you know whether the witness objects to answering or not. You are taking the position of counsel on this question for the witness.

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—The ground I have taken is this——

Mr. SHARPE.—You have taken it three or four times already.

Yet the hon. minister said on the floor of this House that there was no desire to prevent a free investigation into the questions that were at issue at that time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And I say so still, but it should be by proper evidence.

Mr. GOODEVE. (reading):

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—Supposing the witness says, after you have made that objection, 'I do not mind giving the contents of that document.'

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—He might say it, but he has not the right to say that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—He has the right to say

it if he likes, he is the only man who has the right to say whether he will answer the question or not.

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—No, he is not. Will you say that a witness has the right to enter into a dispute here and to be the judge whether he will give by verbal evidence the contents of a written document?

Mr. BOYCE.—Are you the judge?

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—Yes, and every member of this committee is the judge and the chairman is the judge of that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—Does this gentleman represent the Woods Company?

Mr. SHARPE.—Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—Hasn't he a right to make any admissions he chooses, hasn't he the right to give any evidence he likes if it is true?

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—If it is true. I will answer that in a moment.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—Either yes or no, has he the right to give any evidence he likes if it is true?

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—You cannot always answer a question with yes or no. Neither this witness or any other witness has the right to give the contents of any document without producing the document.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—Concerning his own company, if it is against his own company.

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—No matter who it is against.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—It is against his own company.

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—That has nothing to do with it. Because a man says 'I am a fool' it does not follow that he has any right to say it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.—Do you mean to say that if this man came here and said 'I am getting that electricity for one-half the price I am selling it to the government,' he cannot produce the contract?

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY.—He is not obliged to produce the contract himself.

Yet in face of that evidence we find the Minister of Public Works refusing to allow the witness to give us the necessary information whereby we can learn whether this country is paying unduly through a middleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend deny that long before that the chairman had ruled out the contract and I was objecting to secondary evidence of it?

Mr. GOODEVE. That was your own opinion, to which other members of the committee took exception. The whole evidence goes to show that it was with the greatest difficulty the opposition members on that committee could get the necessary evidence to prove, as eventually it was proved, that there was a large rake-off through middlemen, in the heating, lighting and using of power in this building. I think my hon. friend from North Ontario has dealt very fully with that question, and he has proved conclusively that an investigation into this question is sadly needed. Now, there is another building that has been referred to by the Minister of Public Works, and while I am not going to deal with it along the same lines as the other buildings, I want at least to show the care and the interest that the Minister of Public Works has for those with whom he is doing business, and who are on terms of friendship with this government. On coming down to this session I found, when the Auditor General's Report was laid on the table, this letter at page V—356:

Audit Office, March 31, 1910.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your application No. 991, for $2,500, in favour of the Otis-Fensom Elevator Company, being the cost of installation of one passenger elevator in the Seybold Block, Ottawa.

The Seybold Block is a building rented by the government for use as the local custom house.

We would like to have a copy of the lease, to see how the cost of this permanent improvement is to be distributed between the landlord and tenant.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
FREDERICK HAYTER, for A.G.

In that letter you will see that the Auditor General refused to issue his check for $2,500, the amount asked for the installation of that elevator. A copy of the lease sent by the office of the Minister of the Public Works contained a clause whereby the lessor was to provide a fully equipped passenger elevator, at the cost, of course, of the lessor. Now what is the answer of the Minister of Public Works and his department?

Public Works Department,
Ottawa, April 28, 1910.

Sir,—Replying to you favour of the 25th instant referring to terms of lease of the Seybold block, relating to elevator, I may say that on the report of the chief architect that the elevator which was in the building when leased had got into a condition incapable of repair and endangered the lives of those making use of it, the department called upon the owner of the building to install a new machine, but could get no reply from him. As an elevator in the building was absolutely essential, the department decided to make the installation and pay for same in the meantime until action was taken by the owner.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
J. B. HUNTER, D.M.

You will notice there that the only reason given why the Department of Public Works undertook to install an elevator at the public expense, although they had a contract under seal that the lessor was to supply the elevator, was because, he failed to answer when they called his attention to the fact that he had not lived up to his contract.

Audit Office,
Ottawa, May 3, 1910.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 28, 1910, respecting the in-

stallation of an elevator in the Seybold block, stating that the department had called upon the owner of the building to install a new machine but could get no reply, and that, as an elevator was essential, the department decided to make the installation and pay for the same until action was taken by the owner.

As the elevator was installed under agreement with the department, the responsibility for payment to the contractor rests with the government, and with that view assent has been given to the issuance of the check to the Otis-Fenson Elevator Company.

Under the terms of the lease, the owner agrees to supply an elevator fully equipped and ready for use. Please retain from the owner of the Seybold block any sums of money which may become due to him for rental of the said building until the department has been fully reimbursed for all expenses incurred on account of the installation of this elevator.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
FREDERICK HAYTER,
For Auditor General.

Now, having some experience last year in the Public Accounts Committee, I thought I would like to know whether the order of the Auditor General had been complied with, and whether the rents had been retained to reimburse the government for the installation of this elevator. Therefore I put this question on the Order Paper, 'Hansard' page 1333:

Has the government been reimbursed for the $2.500 paid by them for the installation of an elevator in the Seybold building, as per letter of the Auditor General dated May 31, 1910? If so, how and when?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Department of Justice now has under consideration the question whether owner or department should pay under the terms of the lease.

A most remarkable state of affairs. Here we have a lease regularly drawn made between the government of Canada and the owner of this building in which he agrees to install a passenger elevator——

Mr. PUGSLEY. And what did he do.

Mr. GOODEVE. I will show that he did not do it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question was whether he should be obliged to put in a second one.

Mr. GOODEVE. I have read the letters up-to-date, and we have seen there was no reservation of that money, and we will see why.

Department of Public Works,
Accountant's Office,
Ottawa, August 8, 1910.

Memo. for assistant deputy minister.

The account to be retained from Mr. Seybold is $2,766.29, but I do not understand the order for that retention to be so imperative as to call for immediate action.

We are in actual possession of the building on a long lease, and the rental accruing between the present time and the 31st March next will be more than sufficient to cover the amount.

Under the circumstances, and in view of Mr. Seybold's explanation in conversation with yourself and myself last week, I consider that we might safely pay him the quarter's rent which is now due.

(Sgd.) A. KINGSTON,
Accountant.

We have another letter in connection with that letter, a surprising one, because one is at a loss to know whether the writer, being a lawyer, was retained by the lessor, Mr. Seybold, or whether it is simply as a matter of friendship that he undertakes out of good will to give his advice to this government and tell them what they ought to do under the circumstances.

Ottawa, Sept. 27, 1910.

Hon. Wm. Pugsley, D.C.L., P.C., M.P.,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Referring to the conversation which Mr. J. A. Seybold and I had with you to-day, in reference to the claim which the department has made upon him to pay for the new elevator which was installed by the department in Mr. Seybold's building, which was leased to the government by indenture of lease, dated the 5th day of May, 1908; I beg to state that I can see nothing in the lease which calls upon Mr. Seybold to pay for the installation of a new elevator.

The facts, with regard to the elevator, are shortly these:

The department had this building under lease for the census, and at that time installed a new elevator under the terms of the lease. The lease ran out, and after an interval of a year or so, a new lease was entered into in 1908, and the clause in the new lease which the department evidently relies on, is as follows: 'The lessor also hereby covenants and agrees to provide in said building an elevator, fully equipped and ready for use, to be operated by the lessee.'

The government took possession of the building on the 5th of May, 1908, and for nearly a year, or to be accurate, eleven months, maintained the passenger elevator which was fully equipped and ready for use, as provided for in the lease.

I feel sure that you will agree with me, after a perusal of the lease, that Mr. Seybold cannot be called upon by the government to pay for this new elevator.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) H. B. McGIVERIN.

An hon. MEMBER. Is that the member of parliament?

Mr. GOODEVE. The member of parliament. We have after the reception of that letter a remarkable change. We find that evidently he has great influence with the department because we have another letter which is as follows :

Ottawa, 11th October, 1910.

Sir,—I am desired by my minister to refer to you enclosed communication of Mc-

Giverin, M.P., and to ask for legal opinion whether this department is warranted in withholding, under the clause referred to in the lease, from the rent of this building, an amount to cover the cost of putting the elevator in serviceable condition.

I enclose for your information this department's file in the matter, No. 245, in which you will note a letter from me to Mr. J. A. Seybold, under date of March 24, 1909, calling on him to install a new machine; also correspondence from the office of the Auditor General in this connection, under date of April 25 and May 3, 1910.

I have the honour to be, sir
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) J. B. HUNTER,
Deputy Minister.

The Deputy Minister of Justice,
Ottawa.

Then we have another letter that I would like to read in conjunction with the letter from Mr. McGiverin, and it is from the chief architect :

Chief Architect's Office,
Public Works Department,
November 14, 1910.

J. B. Hunter, Esq.,
Deputy Minister,
Public Works Department.

I am returning correspondence re elevator in Seybold building. In reference to the question of the deputy Minister of Justice, 'I have to ask therefore whether the lessor provided at the time you entered into possession of the property under lease, an elevator fully equipped and ready for use.'

When the department first rented the building for Census Branch, the elevator was a freight elevator, and the lessor changed it to a passenger elevator, but it never gave satisfaction. When the building was re-leased in May, 1908, for customs purposes, the same elevator was in it, and the long room being on the second floor, the elevator was in constant use by the public, but it did not give satisfaction and was continuously requiring repairs, which were made by and at the expense of this department. Complaints were so frequent that the elevator was examined by our chief electrician, and he reported that the mechanism was beyond repair, and the elevator was dangerous. New mechanism has been put in and the elevator is now in good condition.

(Sgd.) D. EWART,
Chief Architect.

Now, after reading these letters in connection with the lease, there is only one inference to be drawn, and not an inference, as the letters themselves actually prove this condition. It is that the building was formerly leased to the Dominion government for census purposes. At that time there was in the building a freight elevator. There seems to be some confusion between the chief architect, and Mr. McGiverin as to who altered it into a passenger elevator, the one stating that it was done at the expense of the lessor, and the other stating that it was done at the expense of the lessee. In either case it was evidently unsatisfactory. That is admitted by both letters, but it is further proven by the fact that when the government undertook to renew the lease of this building they specifically set forth in the lease, notwithstanding the fact that they knew that there was already an old elevator in the building that the lessor should instal a passenger elevator ready for use. Why? There can be only one answer—because, having used the building before and knowing that there was already an elevator, they also knew that the elevator was dangerous, that it was unsatisfactory, and for that reason they put a clause in the lease stipulating that the lessor should furnish the government with a passenger elevator fully equipped and, of course, inspected that it might be used under the laws of the country for passengers. The government went in and took possession, and notwithstanding that they had that document, we find the deputy minister saying that because he wrote to the owner of the building and received no answer he felt that it was his duty to order the installation of a new public passenger elevator at the expense of the people of this country. I find in the Auditor General's Report in connection with that elevator that they paid out $3,031.18 although their lease called for the installation of it by the lessor. The minister objected to the resolution on the ground that they were only paying from 7 to 10 per cent in rental, and yet we find in this one case alone, certified to by the Auditor General, certified to by the chief architect, and the deputy minister of his department, that they voluntarily expended $3,031 or an amount equal to 47 per cent of the rental for one year for an elevator in a building that they had no right to pay for. Even in the Auditor General's Report it distinctly states that they had no right to pay it, and the deputy minister states himself in his letter that they were only paying this in the meantime because they feared the danger of the old elevator that had been condemned. Then we find them endeavouring to shelve this problem, as they shelve other problems, by saying that they had referred it to the Department of Justice. This is another instance of carelessness in the handling of the funds of the people of this country. I think we are not using too strong language when we speak of rake-offs of this kind. I have put in a question, and I hope to receive through the Public Acounts Committee the total amount which has been expended by this government in alterations, repairs and capital expenditures on this building. I was in hopes that I would have had these returns before this question came up in the House, but we will probably find it necessary to

deal with the question later on when we get all these details. In the meantime I want at least to enter my protest against the manner in which the administration of the department with regard to these rented buildings is carried on.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton N.). The observations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Goodeve), who has just taken his seat do not call for any strenuous reply from the government side of the House. He has given us some history in connection with the elevator, which history does not reflect the slightest discredit on the administration of the Public Works department. It turns out that a certain elevator used for passengers in one of these buildings is found to be in a defective condition and that human life might be jeopardized. The deputy minister in compliance with the authority which the lease gave him, called on the proprietor of the building to put the elevator in good condition according to the terms of the lease as he understood them. The moment the deputy minister did that, he put himself in a position to charge the cost of that elevator against the proprietor of the building, should he refuse to take action, and if the government are entitled under the lease to do so, they can deduct the cost of that elevator out of the rental. The deputy minister of Public Works was charged with the responsibility of seeing that the elevator was safe, and would any sensible man suggest that instead of taking immediate action, he should go into a court of law to get a mandamus or injunction against the owner of the building, when in the meantime, those using the elevator might be killed. Had an accident happened, would it avail the deputy minister of Public Works to say that in order to avoid the criticism of members of the opposition and to save a few paltry dollars, he had delayed action in making the elevator safe for the use of passengers. The elevator story therefore may be eliminated from a consideration of the case for it affords no proof whatever that there was any remissness on the part of the government; on the contrary, the action which was taken reflects credit on the department. It is a matter of common occurrence that there is difference of opinion between landlords and lessees as to the construction of an agreement, and pending a settlement of that dispute before a proper tribunal the deputy minister of Public Works removed the cause of danger as any honest conscientious man would do. Surely it is time enough to blame the government when they are found to be in fault, and pending a decision on this point is it not at least decent to withhold criticism. So far as I could learn from the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), the case with regard to the elevator is still sub judice, and as I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Goodeve) is a lawyer, he will know well that the etiquette of the profession forbids him to come here and make a speech and discuss the evidence in a case which has yet to be dealt with by the courts. I understand the hon. gentleman to be a lawyer and a good and experienced one, and I would expect him to leave this evidence alone until we have had a final decision in regard to the matter. I appeal to the members of this House as jurors who have to deal with the amendment presented by the hon. member for Peel to say that no evidence has been submitted in support of his indictment. The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), tried to make a great point out of the part the Minister of Public Works took in the inquiry before the Public Accounts Committee, and I regret that hon. members of the opposition who sit on that committee are continuously complaining without reason, upon the alleged obstructions that are thrown in their way. I have been a member of that committee for some years and I challenge any hon. member of this House to say that I have objected to any honest or proper inquiry that ever took place there. I am in the hearing of hon. gentlemen who sit with me on that committee and I challenge them to say that I ever unduly obstructed any proper inquiry. I speak, of course, only for myself, but I think I may be taken as perhaps a very ordinary sample of the Liberals who sit with me on that very important committee. I do not refer to what may have happened in years past when I was not a member of the committee, but my experience leads me to conclude that the practices then were not very different from what they are to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite are making a great mistake if they think the people of this country will take much stock in this howling about obstruction unless they can produce more substantial proof of it, than they yet have been able to. I followed with some interest and concern the inquiry before the committee, and I give credit to the hon. member for North Ontario for having pursued this question with a great deal of energy and industry, but he only made one point before the committee and in that he was sustained by the Liberals as well as by the Conservatives. It came out in the inquiry that the department was imposed upon with regard to the lighting and that practically a fraud was being committed from day to day and from month to month. I do not know how long it lasted, but it came out flatfooted that fraud was being committed, and we all joined hands in passing a resolution that that wrongdoing should at once cease and that if there had been any money im-

properly received, it should be paid back. I voted against every other resolution moved by the hon. member (Mr. Sharpe), at the close of the inquiry, because I did not think he had sustained the allegations he had made. I do not think he sustained the allegations he made about the heating or about the renting and I am still of the same opinion after hearing the evidence rehashed to-night. Speaking in a general way, I submit that the government of the country is in no different position to an individual, when they go into the market to rent buildings. They have no business to look for cheaper rentals than any other man. True, the ordinary man would not require such large buildings, and therefore the buildings required by the government are naturally few, in a city of this kind, and you consequently would expect to find the rentals for such buildings higher than for ordinary buildings.

Gentlemen of my own profession know that law books are dearer than other kinds of books, because there is only a limited market for them. Doctors, I suppose, have a similar experience. The class of buildings the government require in the city of Ottawa are a special class, different from any other kind of buildings, and for different purposes. Therefore, the supply is limited, and those who have the supply can afford to put the price at a pretty steep figure. I suppose they know that and take advantage of it. All I wanted to know at the committee was whether the government was paying as much as others in the way of rental, no more and no less. I made that inquiry, and having satisfied myself that they were not paying more than the humblest individual in Ottawa who had to rent a building, I was content that the government should pay the same as other people, and therefore voted against the resolution of the hon. member for North Ontario. I am satisfied that there was not a scintilla of evidence given in support of the indictment of the hon. member for Peel. It was shown that we were paying 81 cents per superficial foot, or 90 cents, as the case might be. Is there any evidence that we could have got the accommodation for any less? If it can be shown that by the exercise of due diligence the department could have obtained a superficial area to suit the purposes of the government for one cent less they are to be condemned for not obtaining it. But when there is not a scintilla of evidence to show that they could have done any better than was done, what is the use of indicting them? They paid the price which the market demanded. and they could not get it lowered. I submit that there is not a particle of evidence of wrong-doing. Even if the rental was a little high, if the members of the government, and particularly the department under consideration to-night, exercised the best judgment they possessed in the interests of the people of this country, and gave the people the benefit of their judgment, honestly and squarely, are they to be indicted or condemned for having paid a cent per superficial foot one way or the other in renting buildings of the magnitude of those they have to deal with?

Mr. BLAIN. Does not my hon. friend think 18 per cent a little high?

Mr. McKENZIE. There is not a particle of evidence that there is 18 per cent. My hon. friend from Peel has given us what is known in Scotland as a Scotch trial—he first hangs the accused and then tries him. The hon. gentleman asks for a verdict and he tells the jury: I have no evidence; I am putting the facts as I have them, and some time next week I will give you the evidence. Although not a lawyer, my hon. friend is not without experience and strong common sense, and he is one of the men who give tone and respectability to the opposition side of the House, and yet I must charge him with having a very crude idea of how cases should be tried.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask my hon. friend whether he disputes the facts I presented to the House this afternoon with respect to the purchase price of the property and the amount expended on it, to make the cost of it $80,000 in all to the present owners?

Mr. McKENZIE. I certainly cannot accept such evidence when we know nothing about it. I am not saying that my hon. friend's statements may not turn out to be correct, but so far they are not facts at all. There is no evidence before us, and we are bound in all fairness to deal with the Minister of Public Works upon the evidence submitted to us. He is charged with all manner of political crimes in connection with the leasing of these buildings, and surely he has a right as a minister of the Crown to ask his supporters and every honest man in this House to condemn him on facts, and not upon the bald statements which my hon. friend may make, however honestly he may make them. My hon. friend was asked to disclose the source of his alleged facts, but he refused to do so, telling us that some day in the Committee of Public Accounts he would give us those facts.

It is altogether unnecessary for me to go over any of the ground that was traversed by the Minister of Public Works himself. The answer he gave to the allegations contained in the indictment of the hon. member for Peel was so complete that there is nothing left for the jury even to pass upon As the old saying is, there is nothing of it left to be buried. There have been many insinuations of bad faith and what hon. gentlemen of the opposition call rake-off

in connection with these matters. With regard to the electric light contract, is there a particle of evidence that there was any laxity or any wrong-doing in connection with it so far as the minister or any of the officials of the department is concerned? I think it quite proper that there should be further inquiry into that matter. I have seen the papers, and I am surprised that any official of the city of Ottawa should be allowed to be a party to a transaction of that kind. Whether wittingly or not, the city of Ottawa has become a party to a dishonest transaction in enabling certain individuals or firms to obtain money to which they have no right, and I hope the Department of Public Works will, before long, be able to tell us that proper steps have been taken to recover any moneys that have improperly gone out in that way.

When insinuations of this kind are made one is almost tempted to go back and to see whence came those men who are so very honest, what are their names, and what was their former occupation. I do not like it, and it is not according to my idea of public duty or public business to go into muck-raking of any kind. I ask the hon. member for Peel, when he goes home to-night, to think over the last 30 or 40 years, and to inquire how the public works of this country were built and what is become of certain public inquiries at certain stages of this country's political history. Having done that, if he thinks he can come forth and be the first to throw stones from a political standpoint I shall be willing to follow out some of the points he has endeavoured to make against us to-night, but I am satisfied that, from every standpoint, the arraignment he has endeavoured to make is completely unfounded, and that if this matter came before a judge in any court he would withdraw the charges from the jury and say that there was nothing left on which to found a verdict.

Mr. G. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has spoken about the elevator in the Seybold block and he was quite right in saying that an elevator was necessary there because human lives were in jeopardy and that the department could charge the proprietor with the cost. But unfortunately it did not charge the proprietor with the cost, and consequently did not do what the hon. gentleman said it should have done. It is hardly necessary for me to comment on the hon. gentleman's remarks with reference to the Regal building because he says no evidence was given by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) with regard to that matter, if the hon. member for Cape Breton is willing to swallow that 18 per cent rent, his capacity in that respect is unusually strong.

Mr. McKENZIE.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no proof whatever that it is 18 per cent or even 10 per cent except the hearsay statement of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain).

Mr. PERLEY. What strikes me as the worst feature in this transaction is the business inefficiency it has shown on the part of the Department of Public Works. The minister says that they take great care in the making of these leases. Well, they certainly take great care to pay too much. I listened with much attention to the hon. member for Peel with regard to this Regal building. As respects the other buildings I have very little knowledge, but I know a good deal about the Regal building and property in the vicinity, and in my opinion my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) showed conclusively that the government was paying 18 per cent to the owners. I have no fault to find with the proprietors for having got all they could—it was a business transaction, but I have fault to find with the department for having been so unbusinesslike as to give this enormous rental. The hon. minister said there is no proof of that. Why, that the exact cost of the building was $47,500 is a matter of public knowledge, can be seen in the registry office. All they did afterwards was to add another story or two to the building, and when completed I am safe in saying that $80,000 would be a full market price for it in this city. The minister has tried to cloud the issue by talking about rents by the square foot for other buildings rented by this government. That is a most unfair way in which to discuss the question. When I rent an office in a building by the square foot, I get the use of the elevator free, pay nothing for the hallways and as a rule get the use of the light and have the heating without charge. But in this Regal building, the government is doing all these things. All the proprietors have to pay out of their rent is the insurance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman say that in the figure I gave of 81·28 per square foot, I have included the hallway? Take the Regal building and all the buildings, the figures given are for the portions actually occupied for offices and do not include anything except the actual office space.

Mr. PERLEY. I still say, and I submit to the minister, that the proper way to judge this rental is to compare it with the rental of other buildings rented as a whole, and not take it by the square foot at all. Every one knows that in Ottawa, as in other places, a man who buys property in the heart of the city is very glad to rent the whole building to net him 5 per cent or 6 per cent per annum, because he gets the increased value which comes regularly and steadily in all these cities. I happen to

know from personal knowledge of a lease of property behind this Regal building, slightly larger than the Regal building, and it is on Sparks street, and for that reason worth a great deal more, and it has been rented for $7,000 per annum within the last few days, and out of that the owner has to pay the insurance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What building?

Mr. PERLEY. The Bryson, Graham building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How large?

Mr. PERLEY. Slightly larger than this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How many stories?

Mr. PERLEY. Three or four, immediately behind and in a much more valuable part than the Regal building. I did not intend to speak on this motion, but rose to make that statement. I consider that it is only right and proper that the lease of the Regal building should be compared with a building rented as a whole, and it is not good business capacity on the part of this government to pay over $14,000 per annum net to the owners of the Regal building when other people are able to rent buildings in Ottawa of greater value for half the money.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford). With reference to leases, it is hard to make comparisons, but the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) has said that some of these buildings were rented to net the proprietor from 18 per cent to 25 per cent. Now there are many towns in which commercial buildings are renting to pay more than that on the actual investment though perhaps not on the actual value. Values are continually changing. I know properties in Toronto that have been rented as high as 80 per cent on the cost, but still would not bring more than 7 per cent on the actual value, considering the value of the land and the value of the building, and so far as I have been able to judge with reference to departmental buildings here, they have nearly all to be constructed almost specially for the purpose of the departments. Take the building just mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) which he compares with the one leased by the government. The probabilities are that the building he mentioned was rented as it was without any particularly extensive repairs. And the probabilities are that the building rented to the department required extensive repairs in the way of elevators and other improvements for the department.

Now, these extensive inside repairs would cost a good deal of money. My hon. friend says they only added a couple of stories. Well, a couple of stories properly added to the building, with the repairs necessary to fit the building for occupation by a department of the government, might cost a great deal of money, and it is perfectly fair to add the actual cost. Suppose they bought the building for $47,000, and expended $25,000—say $75,000 altogether. They might have so improved that building as to make it worth $50,000 more in the eyes of any real estate valuator. It is a common practice among real estate valuators to take the gross rental at 10 per cent in order to pay the investor 6 per cent net on his money. The building must be in very excellent condition in which a gross 10 per cent will net the owner 6 per cent by the time he pays his ordinary wear and tear repairs. Now, as to the Canadian building and the others that were inquired into so much in the Committee of Public Accounts: I was in the committee a good deal of the time, and when the Minister of Public Works says that when the question was raised that the chairman ruled out of order, he was not there, I believe he is absolutely right. The vote was taken on a question of sustaining the chairman's decision.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And the report shows it.

Mr. NESBITT. The members on our side did not dispute the right of members on the other side to inquire into this question, and to compare the cost of lighting and heating with that in any other buildings of a similar size in town, or to get the cost of lighting and heating—of lighting more especially—from the electrical department of the city. But I remember saying that they had no right to inquire into the private agreement between the Realty Company and the lighting department. I said, and I still say, that that was beyond what we had the right to inquire into. I thought these hon. gentlemen had every right to compare the cost of lighting and heating with that of similar buildings elsewhere in the city. Now, as a matter of fact, when the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) and others proved that these people were getting what he calls a rake-off, that is, getting a profit out of the light, we immediately joined with them and the Minister of Public Works cancelled the contract. It appears that the contract was made many years ago when the government were using only a part of the building, and, for the sake of convenience, the owner agreed to light the part used by the government at the same proportionate cost that he was paying. They did not suspect him, I suppose; in any event, they did not know—at least, I do not think they knew—that they were paying more for the lighting than he was paying. It turned out by the evidence before the committee, that, apparently, they were, and the contract was immediately cancelled.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not a member of this committee, and perhaps I may be allowed a question for information. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Nesbitt) said that he was opposed to inquiring into what the Realty Company had paid for the lighting?

Mr. NESBITT. I said that was a private contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How would the hon. gentleman have found out about the rake-off?

Mr. NESBITT. It was simply the case so far as that is concerned.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But if you were not at liberty to inquire into it, how could you ever correct it, suppose that an unjust amount were charged to the government?

Mr. NESBITT. We took it in comparison with what we knew of the cost of other buildings.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am asking for information. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the committee ought not to have inquired into what the Realty Company were paying. But if they did not get it in that way, they would not have saved the country three or four thousand dollars.

Mr. NESBITT. They did not get at it that way; they guessed at it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I may be allowed: up to the very close of the inquiry it appeared as if Mr. Woods had had some old contract with the city and that the department had simply paid to the Imperial Realty Company the bills which had been rendered to it. But, towards the close of the inquiry, I learned that the city, through the electrical department, presided over by Mr. Ellis, the treasurer of the city, had, quarter after quarter, rendered accounts charging the Imperial Realty Company with the quantity of electrical current at meter rate which were turned in by the Imperial Realty Company to the government and charged against the department, these accounts rendered by the municipal electrical department to the Imperial Realty Company being marked settled by the municipal department of the city and sent in to my department as vouchers. The moment that appeared, I instructed the deputy minister to say that we would take steps to cancel the contract and to recover the excess money paid by the department under these circumstances. The committee did not further investigate the matter, but the resolution was passed unanimously. I took the necessary steps by communicating with the city and demanding an account of what the Realty Company had really paid to the city and sent the matter to the Department of Justice. That is the way it finally wound up.

Mr. NESBITT. I understood that, owing to the opposition to the heating contract, that also was cancelled. I understand, however, that the heating would cost more this year than it did under the contract; and, so far as I can find out, there will not be a saving to the country owing to the government doing its own heating. And you can easily understand that any private party could get this heating done by keeping the men working longer hours—you know the agitation that constantly arises here for shorter hours for government employees. Hon. members can judge of the matter for themselves, but, I understand, as a matter of fact, that the heating this year will be more expensive than under the old contract. As to the lighting, we do not know yet, but I question seriously if there will be so much saved on the lighting contract as was supposed to be saved when we cancelled the contract. We shall know at the end of the year, no doubt, how much will be saved. I understand there is a flat rate, and, if there is, there may be a considerable saving on the lighting contract.

The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) made quite a fuss over putting in an elevator. I quite agree that the government did exactly what any sensible business man would do in his own interest under similar circumstances. Rather than run the risk of actions by the employees, they put in a new elevator, and they purposed taking it off the rent, judging by the deputy minister's letter. But I suppose this lessor objected very seriously to them doing that; so the government, instead of jumping into a lawsuit, which is easily done by any government, and generally getting the worst of it, referred the question to the Justice Department. Now what else would they do, as sensible men? I think they did perfectly right in that respect. There was one little thing that I thought entirely uncalled for on the part of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), and I may say that I was very much surprised to hear him say it. He might have said it in the heat of debate, but all the same, it was a nasty little stab. He said that the hon. the Minister of Public Works was living at the Roxborough apartments, and that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) was also living at the Roxborough apartments. Now as a matter of fact I know that the Minister of Public Works, when these agreements were cancelled, and during all the time they were in force, was living at the Aylmer apartments, because I was living there myself. It was after then that he went to the Roxborough apartments, this fall, after they

were finished. My hon. friend smiles, he is very suspicious. 'Evil be to him that evil thinks' is an old proverb that you probably all know. Now I am not so suspicious of other people as he is; and I repeat, that was a nasty, dirty little stab, to say about the Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Carleton, absolutely uncalled for, because it was made in such a way that it could not be got at. I was very much surprised to hear it.

Now I want to say a word with reference to this Public Accounts Committee. I go to the Public Accounts Committee, frequently, and I have heard so many suspicions voiced at it, so many insinuations made against it, such a hue and cry about what was going on in this committee, that I have become disgusted. There never was really anything proved to justify it. They bring witnesses there from all over Canada; it must cost something, I do not know who pays for this evidence. These men come from all over Canada, and you find there a half dozen gentlemen questioning them as if they were thieves. Why, if you were to go into an ordinary court of justice the judge would not allow witnesses to be badgered, and questioned, and subjected to all sorts of insinuations. It reminds me of an ordinary division court where there are a lot of cheap lawyers trying to plug some poor devil that owes a dollar. Now we do not try to oppose these gentlemen in ordinary reason and common sense, but they don't allow the witnesses fair play. I always like to see fair play anywhere. I don't like to see half a dozen men pile on to one poor innocent fellow, that is likely scared to death when he is in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. NESBITT. The chairman of the committee is a gentleman, and he treats everybody on that committee as gentlemen.

Mr. BLAIN. Does he not defend the witness?

Mr. NESBITT. Why, if he did, they would rag at the chairman worse than they do at the witness. The only thing that I can see for the witness to do is just to tell these gentlemen: Go to some-where else. But there seems to be no ordinary reasonable usage accorded a witness, especially if he happens to be a little timid when he gets up in the Public Accounts Committee; and then my hon. friend from Carleton generally steps in and tries to protect him a little, and perhaps somebody else steps in. Then our friends opposite say that he is obstructing the work of the committee. Now, I remember distinctly when that examination was going on, and I am quite sure the Minister of Public Works was just as polite as any man could be to the members of the committee. He only tried to observe ordinary decency towards the witness, and only to that extent did he try to protect him. Now hon. members on that committee, so far as I could judge, as a spectator, at least, were really nagging the witness unnecessarily, they were trying to put words into his mouth, just as is often done in some little country court. The lawyers on that committee are trying to get from the witness just such an answer as they want: Answer that question I put to you, yes or no. They don't give the poor fellow any opportunity to answer the question in a reasonable way, and many a question cannot be answered yes or no, and answered reasonably. Now I can tell our hon. friends opposite that if they will be reasonable, we will assist them in every possible way to investigate any question in the Public Accounts Committee; because I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we are just as much interested as they are in seeing the affairs of this country carried on economically and properly.

Mr. SPROULE. I hardly think so.

Mr. NESBITT. Has the hon. gentleman ever seen me give any indication that I was not willing and anxious to see the affairs of this country conducted properly and honestly?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member is asking me a question. Personally, I have not seen him raise objections which I thought were wrong, because I have not been on the committee much lately; I am not on the committee. But over and over again, I have seen hon. members supporting the government on that committee interpose what I consider absolute obstruction for the purpose of preventing information coming out.

Mr. NESBITT. Well, it is like everything else in the world, it depends largely on how you look at it, on the point of view, as it were. I suppose the hon. gentleman means my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., when he speaks of obstruction. Now, I have never seen my hon. friend from Carleton, unreasonable, unless the members of the opposition were attacking a witness unreasonably. I believe the member for Carleton, is just as anxious to see the affairs of this country conducted economically as anybody else in this House, I have always thought so, and I still think so. Now, as to the rentals paid for these various buildings by the Public Works Department. I cannot conceive that the Department of Public Works are anxious to pay these gentlemen more for their buildings than they can make out of them in other uses. You must bear in mind the peculiar position the department is in. They must have a building fit

for their purpose. It is all right for hon. members to say that the government might go on and erect a building. So they could, but there is always such a hue and cry all the time about expenses, that the department finds it better in many instances to rent these buildings instead of buying them. For instance, take that building that is earning, as they say, 18 per cent. It would not pay the government to buy that building, it is not suited for their purpose even with the repairs. It is not the sort of building the government would put up for an office building. Therefore, they would have been shortsighted in my judgment to have bought the building. I believe that the government will, as soon as they reasonably can, erect a building to accommodate all the departments. It is a great pity that there was not sufficient foresight many years ago to retain the land around where these buildings are, so as to provide sites for all the public buildings in this vicinity. But, the government had to do the best they could to provide accommodation for the department. With reference to the calculation made by the hon. member for North Ontario, I quite agree with the hon. member for the Yukon, that the hon. gentleman is wasting his time in this House. There are many concerns in the world that, I venture to say, would give him $50,000 a year if he could float corporations and bonds in the same way as he calculated the government ought to float them. He assumed that the building would cost $650,000 and he said that there was no trouble to get a mortgage on that for $500,000. I would like to see my hon. friend go out and get it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Do the government guarantee it?

Mr. NESBITT. For how long?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Ten years.

Mr. NESBITT. Part of it for five years and part for ten years. What would that do? I would like to see my hon. friend take these bonds anywhere and try to float them.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). In ten years the total rental would amount to $683,141.

Mr. NESBITT. What about the repairs and interest on the money?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The government were doing the repairs.

Mr. NESBITT. That brings me to this point: The government did the repairs when they found it was absolutely necessary to get the lease. They did not agree to do the repairs in connection with the first lease. They had to undertake to do the repairs in order to get the second lease, just as any one in this House would do if he were forced. They had to do it and we have not the slightest doubt that the government did the best they could in the interest of the country in renting these buildings and that they did not pay one dollar more for repairs than they were forced to pay by reason of their having to secure accommodation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Public Works has invoked the sympathy of the House, and it has been invoked on his behalf by other hon. gentlemen for the reason that the minister has not the opportunity of making a reply to the very forcible observations of my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe). My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is too old a parliamentarian not to know that he could have asked any one of his friends who have spoken here this evening to move the adjournment of the debate and enable him to answer my hon. friend from North Ontario if he had any answer to make. He knows that perfectly well, and he cannot deny it now. Therefore, it was rather idle to appeal to the sympathy of the House on that account when he might, in five minutes, by asking one of his colleagues to move the adjournment of the debate, have obtained the right to make any answer that he saw fit. Further than that, in so far as I am concerned, I will not object to his making any answer that he has to make at this moment to my hon. friend from North Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thank my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) for his courtesy, and after the other hon. gentlemen get through I will make a general answer to what has been said.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, my hon. friend can take the alternative; he may move the adjournment of the debate, or so far as I am concerned I have no objection at all to his answering my hon. friend from North Ontario at once; but I hope he will extend the same courtesy to some hon. gentleman on this side of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) opened the debate by simply confining his attention to one building out of a number. I followed my hon. friend and not knowing then what would be said with reference to other buildings I did refer to them. Now, then, it seems to me that a fair way to do would be that after other hon. gentlemen get through I may be allowed to reply.

Mr. LENNOX. Oh, no.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the hon. gentleman afraid to allow me to reply?

Mr. LENNOX. I am not afraid of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) in any way,

but I want to have a fair understanding. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) offers to allow the hon. minister an opportunity to speak now if he thinks fit, and that is a very great concession. The minister knew perfectly well the line of argument that was going to be taken. He anticipated the argument that was taken this afternoon, and if he has anything to say, now is the time for him to say it. Speaking for myself as the minister addresses me, I say that I am not afraid of anyhing which he can do, and I shall have a word or two to say myself before the debate closes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection to my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox), saying to me or towards me, all that he desires to say, and later on, if the House will accord me the courtesy to make a reply, I shall be very glad. If the House should decline to do that, well and good; I would be quite willing that the hon. member for Peel, who moved the amendment, should have an opportunity of speaking in reply to me if he desires.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say, with the permission of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, that I stated to the House that the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), would follow with some other evidence of the extravagance of the government and the hon. gentleman dealt with it before he sat down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not deal at all with some features in connection with the lighting contract which were specially brought out by the hon. member for North Ontario.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do it now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad to when hon. gentlemen get through.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, if the minister does not avail himself of the opportunity that I now present to him to give his answer, I shall continue my remarks. The opportunity still exists, because all he needs to do is to get some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That does not require the consent of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Certainly not, and he required no consent all this evening. While this appeal has been made on his behalf, he has required no consent and he knew that perfectly well. I desire just to say one or two words, in the first place, in reply to the very temperate observations which have been made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). He will permit me to say that if I had not been convinced before of the absolute inefficiency of this government, his own speech would give me the most ample demonstration. What does my hon. friend say? He says that this building—taking what is called the Regal building in the first instance—was bought for $47,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, he does not. The hon. member for North Oxford admitted nothing of the kind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Public Works is very prone to contradict when he ought not to contradict. I listened very attentively to the hon. member for North Oxford and he mentioned the sum of $47,500 in my hearing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He mentioned what the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), had said. The hon. member for North Oxford will verify that I am sure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood the hon. member for North Oxford to base his argument on the price of this building at the figure of $47,500.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). And $25,000 for repairs added to it.

Mr. NESBITT. I did say that hon. members had said that the building had cost $47,000 and $25,000 for repairs and I went on to say that that was not necessarily the value of the building.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that perfectly and I repeat what I said a moment ago, that the hon. member for North Oxford based his argument upon the assumption that this building had been purchased for $47,500. He said that, even so, it was a good thing for the government to enter into the contract which they had entered into for the rental of the building. He supposed that the repairs had cost $25,000. My hon. friend from Peel places them at $30,000, and he said that the building as it stands to-day could not have cost more than $80,000, which would assume the outside cost of repairs at $32,500. According to the statement of my hon. friend from Peel, which has not been contradicted, the government is paying for that building, after deducting taxes and insurance, a rental of $14,480 every year, so that in six years the government will have paid out in rental more than the actual cost of the building to-day. And yet the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), thinks that is good business. He says the government could not have afforded to buy the building, while in the same breath he tells us that the addition of $30,000 worth of improvements and repairs would probably add $50,000 to the value of that building, which would bring its value approximately to $100,000. Under those circumstances will any sensible man tell me that it is good business not to buy that build-

ing, but to go on paying this large rental, so that in the short term of six years, the government will have paid more than it would cost them to buy the building and put the repairs upon it.

Mr. NESBITT. What about the repairs in the interval?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would simply answer that question by saying: Well, what about them? Suppose they would amount to $15,000, would the hon. member still think it good business to continue paying this enormous rental? Does he realize, assuming the cost of that building to be $80,000, that the rental is 18 per cent of the cost of the building? If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Nesbitt) is correct that the $30,000 worth of repairs and improvements added $50,000 to the value, the government are still paying 15 per cent on the value of that building to-day, and the hon. gentleman thinks that the government, with unlimited resources at its disposal, should enter into a number of contracts of that kind with real estate owners around the city of Ottawa. With all deference to his judgment as a business man I would not be inclined to accept his view, and I venture the statement that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Nesbitt) had a business matter of this kind to deal with out of his own resources he would not think of pursuing the course which the Minister of Public Works has pursued in this instance. I know too well the business experience and ability of the hon. member (Mr. Nesbitt) to think for a moment that he would think of doing such a thing.

Now, let us look at one or two other illustrations of the absolute inefficiency of this government in connection with all these rentals. During the past ten years we know that the government have been thoroughly aware that as time went on the existing departmental buildings would not afford the necessary accommodation for the needs of the public service. What has the government been doing in all these years? Some years ago they purchased a huge block of land on McKenzie avenue with the idea of erecting a great departmental building which would afford accommodation for the transaction of the business of this country, and they invited the architects of Canada to send in plans, but up to the present day absolutely nothing has been done except to expropriate the land and leave it there idle, while they are paying rentals of 15 per cent, 20 per cent, 25 per cent, or even 30 per cent on the values, to real estate owners in this city. Will the hon. gentleman from North Oxford suggest that that is a striking illustration of the business efficiency of this government? According to the sworn evidence of one of the assessors of the city of Ottawa, the Woods building and the Canadian building together cost about $240,000 outside of the land.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend believe that?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will come in a moment to something which the Minister of Public Works will believe, and as I am making this speech I propose to make it in my own way. Now, so far as the Woods building is concerned the figures with regard to it, according to the sworn evidence of that assessor, were taken from the building account of the man who erected the building. That is the evidence as I heard it quoted to-night, but I have not yet verified it myself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is wrong. I think the witness said he could not say whether he saw the books or not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He said he saw the books.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think he said he did not see them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, until the minister is absolutely sure about it he had better not interrupt me. At all events the assessor gave the valuation at about $240,000. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) spoke also of $62,000 (in round figures) worth of repairs and improvements which have been paid for by the government. I do not know whether some of this $62,000 is or is not included in the total cost of $240,000, but I will give the Minister of Public Works the benefit of the doubt, and I will say it is not included and therefore I will fix the total cost of that property at $302,000. What rental is the government paying to-day? It is paying a net rental of $68,000 a year in addition to lighting and heating and elevator service and taxes. A lease for five years has been entered into for both these buildings, and five years rental at $68,000 a year amounts to $340,000, so that if the government of Canada instead of paying that remarkably excessive and exorbitant rental of $68,000 for five years had themselves erected the building, they would own the building at the expiry of the five years' lease and have $40,000 besides. But, the Minister of Public Works thinks there is something wrong with the computation I have made. Well, I will take the evidence of his own officer. By the way, I find that the hon. minister has not departed from his usual custom. He is quite as inaccurate as usual in the correction he made. I find on page 4 of the evidence:

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has the hon. gentleman the printed copy or the typewritten copy?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have the printed copy, so plain that any one who runs can read it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason I asked the hon. gentleman is that page 4 of my evidence does not refer to this matter at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will read it:

Q. I asked you about your assessment and you said $110,000?—A. So it is, but that is not an assessment I made.

Q. What is the assessment you made?—A. I told you before I do not remember.

Q. Where did you get $110,000?—A. After consulting Mr. Woods and looking at his book we reduced the building to $110,000.

I had not verified the evidence; I was depending altogether on the quotation which my hon. friend from North Ontario had made from it; but I find that this is only another instance in which my hon. friend from North Ontario was right and the hon. Minister of Public Works was wrong. Now, the hon. minister disputes that valuation, although he pays, so far as the Woods building——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me? With regard to the Canadian building, Mr. Duffy, the assessor, speaks as follows.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The Woods building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the Canadian is the most important.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend has any question to ask me, I will allow him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend permit me to read that?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, I will not. I will permit my hon. friend to ask me any question, but I will not allow him to introduce a speech into mine.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will ask the hon. gentleman a question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does it relate to the Woods building, which we are discussing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the Canadian building.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The controversy between my hon. friend and myself related to the Woods building, and I expressly and definitely limited my statement to that, and excluded the Canadian building. Therefore I am not going to have any side issue with reference to the Canadian building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did not my hon. friend a moment ago give a valuation of both buildings and lump them together?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did, but I said at the same time, so far as the Woods building was concerned, that the valuation was based on the statement of the assessor, who had examined the books. My hon. friend seems to be curiously obtuse to-night; he is not usually so obtuse. Every hon. gentleman in this House knows that I referred in that regard to the Woods building, and to the Woods building alone. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works finds fault with that, although it is based upon the statement of the man who erected that building, and who ought to know the value of it, and who had the assessment reduced after the assessor had examined the books containing a statement of the cost of the building. That is not true of the Canadian building, and I never said it was. I said, so far as the Canadian building was concerned, that the valuation to which I alluded represented the best judgment of the assessor, according to his sworn evidence. But we will come to something more—not the cost of the building, but the value of the building according to the sworn statement of an officer of the department over which my hon. friend presides. That statement is to be found on page 189 of the evidence:

Q. Mr. Ewart, have you ever made a valuation of this building?—A. That is the Woods building?

Q. Yes?—A. Which building, the Woods building?

Q. The Woods building?—A. Yes, I valued the militia building at $196,380.

Q. And when?—A. Well, I valued a part of it, you know, away back in 1903, that was when I reported, when I first went over the building, and I valued it at 20 cents per cubic foot, and then you take the whole building, you know, 981,900 cubic feet, which, at 20 cents, makes $196,380.

Q. And that is your valuation down to the present time?—A. Well, I would say that is what the building would cost ready to be occupied.

Q. Would that include the improvements put on it by the government?—A. It would include the partitions and work of that kind.

Q. And what about the Canadian building? A. I valued that at $287,631.

Q. When was that valuation made?—A. That one was made lately. I valued it at the same rate per foot; I consider that style of building is just about the same.

We are not depending here upon the assessors. We are depending upon the sworn evidence of the chief architect of the department, an expert in such matters; and if you add together the total valuations which he places upon these buildings, you find that they amount to $484,000. Now, let us look for a moment at the rentals. These rentals, as I have already said, are exclusive of light, heating, elevator service, and taxes, which the government pays besides. Here you have a net rental

of $68,000 upon a valuation fixed by the chief architect of the department at $484,000, or a rental of approximately 14 per cent upon the actual valuation of the buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend think that the land should not be included?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have left out the land, for the reason that I am coming to something else, and that is this; in seven years the rentals upon these two buildings will amount to the entire sum of $484,000 or thereabouts; so that at the end of seven years of payment of this net rental of $68,000 the government will have repaid to the owners of these buildings all that they cost, and will continue for a further indefinite period of seven or fourteen or twenty-one years, as long as this arrangement goes on, to hand over at every consecutive period of seven years the entire cost of these buildings to these landlords. Does my hon. friend from North Oxford or any other hon. member of this House say that the government of Canada, with all this land expropriated in the city of Ottawa and ready to be built upon, is pursuing a wise and businesslike course in paying out rentals of that character? I venture to say that the argument made by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) and my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), with great force and ability, has not been met in the slightest degree by any hon. gentleman opposite. Why, the very item of light which was gone into by my hon. friend from North Ontario, shows in striking degree the utter ineptitude and inefficiency of the administration of public works. Listen to the resolution which was proposed in the Public Accounts Committee and carried unanimously—assented by every member of that committee and no doubt also by the Minister of Public Works himself:—

Moved by Mr. Sharpe, seconded by Mr. Carvell, that whereas the expense to the government during the last year for lighting the Woods and Canadian buildings amounted to $9,465.91, paid to the Imperial Realty Company, which company is not an electrical lighting company; and whereas the city of Ottawa has a standard schedule of prices whereby the lighting would cost only $5,040 or less, thereby affecting an annual saving to the country of $4,425.91 or more; therefore, this committee desires to urge upon the Minister of Public Works and the government the desirability of cancelling the present arrangement and recovering the excess unjustly paid to the Imperial Realty Company, and giving the city of Ottawa or some other company the contract at lower rates; and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Minister of Public Works.

I do not believe it has ever fallen to the lot of any minister of the Crown in Canada to receive a rebuke of that kind from his own party following. But what was the attitude of the hon. gentleman, and his followers when my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) was endeavouring to get at the facts upon which that resolution was founded? Their attitude in the Public Accounts Committee was this, that it was absolutely no concern of the people of this country what the Imperial Realty Company were paying for that light for which they were charging the people $9,000 and upwards. I have the words under my hand. It is none of our business, said an hon. member of that committee, to make any inquiry into that. The Imperial Realty Company can get that lighting done at any price they may see fit by the city of Ottawa, and the only thing that remains for the people of Canada is to hand over to them by quarterly payments the sum of $9,000 and upwards per year. The Minister of Public Works took credit, and hon. gentlemen on his behalf took credit, for the cancellation of that contract after the resolution had passed. Why it would have been absolutely impossible for him to have taken any other course.

But when there was a municipal electric light company carrying on business in Ottawa, and a private electric light company as well, how was it that the minister year after year permitted this country to pay out the sum of $4,000 and upwards in excess of what it should have paid, when a simple inquiry through the telephone, as my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Sharpe) has said, would have elucidated the fact that the government were paying every year $4,000 too much.

Take the whole combination of circumstances placed before the House and the country by the debate to-day, and we get a fair, but perhaps after all only an imperfect idea of the manner in which the public revenues of Canada are being squandered, not only in the Department of Public Works, but there is good reason to believe in certain other departments of the government.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). I have no intention to discuss the general question as it has been discussed by the several hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this debate, but I desire very briefly to examine some of the statements made by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), and I have a very special reason for criticising the attitude of my hon. friend and the basis on which he founded the very emphatic and dogmatic statements he made this afternoon. I followed my hon. friend attentively, and I took down notes, which I think he will endorse. My hon. friend said that the cost of this building to the owner, when he purchased it from the Y. M. C. A. was

$47,500. This was a private transaction between private parties, and it is very difficult for me to understand how the member for Peel (Mr. Blain) could state so very definitely what this building cost its present owner. The second statement he made was that the improvements put upon this building to make it suitable for the department cost $32,500, and he gave the total cost to the present owners as $80,000, on which he calculated the rental paid by the department was equal to 18 per cent. He made a deduction on the general rent received of $16,095, for taxes, insurance and other things which had to be paid by the owner, which brought the net rent to $14,485; and, dividing the sum of $80,000 by $14,485, he drew the conclusion that the department was paying in rent 18 per cent of the total value of this property. That statement was endorsed by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) and again by the leader of the opposition, and I have a very special reason for bringing this matter to the attention of these hon. gentlemen.

In connection with the position taken by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), I submit that no question has ever been raised about the lease of that property to the government, no complaint of any description has ever been made to any department of this government, and no opportunity has been given, nor has any hon. member availed himself at any time of any opportunity to bring this matter to the consideration of any select committee of this House. And yet, upon an absolutely private contract to purchase property by a respectable, intelligent and worthy citizen of Ottawa, hon. members opposite base positive statements that the building cost so much and that the department is paying 18 per cent annually on that value. I am personally friendly, and have been very closely acquainted for years with the owner of the Regal block. I did not know this afternoon what the building cost him; I did not know what rents he was collecting; I did not know the nature of his contract. But, being closely allied with him for years, I did know that he was the owner of the property that he had been negotiating with the government with a view to their utilizing it, and that he had arrived at a definite agreement with the government on that subject. When I heard the mover of this resolution (Mr. Blain) state positively, dogmatically, that he knew what this property had cost this private individual, and knew, also, the cost of the improvements put upon it by this individual, I questioned very much the accuracy of the statements. I question them more now since having taken the opportunity, during the afternoon recess, to approach my friend and acquaint him with what had been stated here in the House. And I will give the statement made by this gentleman on the subject. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) has thought proper to expose in this House this gentleman's business, and has attempted to show that he had entered into an extortionate agreement with this government and had demanded from them, by some influence, an unfair rental. My hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) has taken a special interest in the remarks of the hon. member for Peel. May I suggest to the hon. gentleman he should seek to bring this matter to the consideration of the proper committee of this House. If he did this he would be sure of the basis of his statements of facts. Now, against the public statement of the hon. member for Peel, let me put the statement of the owner of this building. And let me say that I would not have discussed this matter with the gentleman, nor would I have taken the responsibility of saying a word in his defence if he had not said: You are quite at liberty to inform the House of Commons that I am ready to be a witness before the committee, and to give all the facts in connection with the building. Now, the hon. member for Peel says that the building cost $47,500. The owner says, and is ready to make the statement on oath, that it cost $50,000. The hon. member for Peel says that the improvements placed on the property to make it satisfactory for the use of the department cost $32,500. The gentleman who placed these improvements there and owns them says they cost him $90,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Hon. gentlemen smile. Well, they have the opportunity to defend any position they take before the proper tribunal, and with the owner under oath to tell the truth about the matter. The total cost of the property, said the hon. member for Peel, was $80,000; the total cost of the property, says the owner, was $140,000. The net rent for this property collected by the owner, says the hon. member for Peel, is $14,485. The owner, who understands exactly what insurance premiums and taxes he has to pay, says that the net rent is $13,966. So, as against the conclusion of the hon. member for Peel, we have to divide $140,000 by $13,966; and, instead of getting a proportion of payment by the government of 18 per cent, we find it is 9·9 per cent. I know by acquaintance and association that this gentleman is an honest, reliable, truthful citizen, and, so far as I am concerned, I am prepared to believe what he says and am quite ready that my hon. friend from Peel should call upon this gentleman to prove his case.

Another very important statement that my hon. friend made was that this man

procured this agreement through middlemen? Will he tell me who they are?

Mr. BLAIN. I never made any such statement. What I said was that the government were aware that this property was in the market for sale, and that the price paid for it was $47,500, which could be proved; and I said it would have been better for the government to invest some of their surplus in buying such a property as this rather than pay the enormous rent they are paying.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I am glad to take my hon. friend's word on the point. I thought I had taken notes correctly, and that he had repeatedly said that no doubt the middlemen had profited by these transactions. But I take his word, for I am bound to say that I know, just as the minister said,—and this also I have on the authority of the owner of this property—that the owner negotiated his own agreement personally and himself entered into the contract with the department.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Certainly.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman state that Dr. Hanna is the sole owner of that property?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I did not say so

Mr. BLAIN. Does he know who are his associates?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I do. And will my hon. friend inform the House who they are?

Mr. BLAIN. Let the hon. gentleman give the names; he states that he knows who they are.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). My hon. friend has asked me whether any one is associated with Dr. Hanna. I believe there is to a very small extent; but I can say that only one other man and himself together own that property.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the hon. gentleman give the name?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I know his relation, but I do not know the name. Will the hon. gentleman dispute that?

Mr. BLAIN. I am not disputing; I am asking a question.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). My information is that one other man and Dr. Hanna own the property.

Mr. BLAIN. Did my hon. friend ask Dr. Hanna, in gathering this information, who the other gentleman was?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I did.

Mr. BLAIN. Did he state?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I have said that I know the relation, but I do not know the name. My hon. friend has an easy opportunity of knowing who he is. All he has to do is to take the proper course and bring this gentleman before the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Bring the gentlemen who sold the property, and they will swear that they sold it for $47,500.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Of course it would be better to give these gentlemen an opportunity to be present. Another statement made by the member for Peel (Mr. Blain) this afternoon was that the owners of this property who made this contract were political friends of the present government.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Well, then my ears have deceived me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I doubt if the hon. gentleman spoke at all.

Mr. BLAIN. I told the truth, and that is what the hon. gentleman did not do—I am not referring to my hon. friend from Nanaimo.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Well, I dare say there was some reason for the minister this afternoon denying positively that any middleman who had anything to do with this agreement, and that the men associated with it were not, to his knowledge, supporters of the Liberal party. Now, there must have been some reason for the minister making that emphatic statement. I desire to say that I have known this gentleman for many years, and as his friend I repeat that he has never in his life been associated with any political party. It is impossible for any individual in Ottawa to say that this gentleman has, to his knowledge, been associated in any degree, so far as I know, with any political party in this country.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Public Works stated that his information was that this gentleman belonged to the Liberal-Conservative party.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Well, the Minister of Public Works may have information that I do not possess. But I dispute that the hon. gentleman opposite had any sound reason or basis for the very positive statement he made this afternoon. No gentleman could possibly be authorized to stand up in this House and say to a dollar what another man paid for his property; no responsible member in this House could possibly state that a certain

amount of money was spent on improvements on any personal property. I was astounded at the positive statements he made with regard to what was only a private transaction by a private citizen. Now, I repeat that the opportunity is presented to my hon. friend to call up these people before the proper committee and give them an opportunity to defend themselves. I think the opposition are intituled to make a thorough inquiry into these expenditures, that is what the country expects them to do. But I submit that they are too indiscriminate in their methods, they magnify cases out of all proportion, and in consequence of their excesses, it has become a disgraceful thing for an honest citizen to do business with this government and with this country, without having his name branded as a thief and a robber. There may be cases when there is reason to think that everything has not been done in the interests of the public, but that is a different thing from the indiscriminating manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite paint every thing black with a big brush. I believe every statement that this gentleman made, and the arguments upon which we are asked to censure against this government are as fallacious as they can possibly be.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand my hon. friend to state that the amount paid by Dr. Hanna and his associates for the property purchased from the Young Men's Christian Association, exceeds $47,500?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I have given the figures, $50,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Now as to the question of improvements, I would like to have that made clear.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). $90,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to state that Dr. Hanna and his associates, after they purchased the property, and before they leased it to the government, expended $90,000 upon it?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). That is the statement of my friend, and he is prepared to swear to it before a proper committee, and that the taxes carried by this government, instead of being $14,000 were $13,966, and that the interest earned is 9·9 instead of 18 per cent. Now, that is an example of the arguments upon which we are asked to pass this resolution—no opportunity for this private citizen to know anything about it, without the individual being acquainted with the transactions.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say that I will give Dr. Hanna and his associates an opportunity of making this statement under oath, and then we will deal with this matter further.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). My hon friend is asking this House to pass a resolution of censure upon this government for making payments that he admits now he has not taken the trouble to inquire into.

Mr. BLAIN. I admit nothing of the kind. I will be prepared, when an opportunity is given, to show where my information came from, and I will then leave the House to judge whether my information is correct.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Blain).

Messieurs

YEAS:

Armstrong,	McCall,
Arthurs,	Magrath,
Barnard,	Marshall,
Best,	Meighen,
Blain,	Middlebro,
Borden (Halifax),	Nantel,
Boyce,	Northrup,
Broder,	Owen,
Burrell,	Paquet,
Campbell,	Perley,
Chisholm (Huron),	Price,
Crosby,	Rhodes,
Crocket,	Roche,
Crothers,	Russell,
Currie (Simcoe),	Schaffner,
Daniel,	Sexsmith,
Doherty,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Donnelly,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Edwards,	Smyth,
Elson,	Sproule,
Foster,	Stanfield,
Fraser,	Staples,
Goodeve,	Taylor (Leeds),
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Taylor (New Westminster),
Henderson,	Wallace,
Herron,	White (Renfrew),
Hughes,	Wilcox,
Jameson,	Wilson (Lennox and Addington) and
Lake,	Wright.—61.
Lennox,	
Lortie,	
Macdonell,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	McCraney,
Aylesworth,	McGiverin,
Beauparlant,	McIntyre,
Béland,	McKenzie,
Bickerdike,	McLean (Sunbury),
Black,	McMillan,
Brown,	Marcile (Bagot),
Bureau,	Martin (Regina),
Carrier,	Martin (Wellington),
Cash,	Mayrand,
Champagne,	Meigs,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Michaud,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Miller,
Clark (Red Deer),	Murphy,
	Nesbitt,

Congdon,	Neely,
Conmee,	Oliver,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Papineau,
Delisle,	Pardee,
Demers,	Parent,
Douglas,	Pickup,
Dubeau,	Proulx,
Ecrément,	Prowse,
Emmerson,	Pugsley,
Ethier,	Rankin,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Richards,
Fowke,	Rivet,
Gauvreau,	Robb,
Geoffrion,	Ross (Middlesex),
German,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gervais,	Roy (Dorchester),
Gilbert,	Roy (Montmagny),
Girard,	Rutan,
Graham,	Savoie,
Harty,	Schell,
Hodgins,	Seguin,
Hunt,	Sinclair,
Knowles,	Smith (Middlesex),
Kyte,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Lachance,	Smith (Stormont),
Lafortune,	Sperry,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Talbot,
Lapointe,	Todd,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tolmie,
LeBlanc,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Lemieux,	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Loggie,	Turgeon,
Macdonald,	Verville,
MacNutt,	Warburton,
McAllister,	White (Victoria, Alta.) and
McCoig,	Wilson (Laval).—104.
McColl,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Fielding,	Osler,
Paterson,	Porter,
Borden (Sir F.),	Forget,
Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
King,	Bristol,
Templeman,	Cowan,
Harris,	Beattie,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Turriff,	Thornton,
Guthrie,	McCarthy,
Sealey,	Kidd,
Gorden (Kent),	Ames,
Clarke (Essex),	Clare,
Carvell,	Stewart,
Low,	Thoburn,
Law,	Reid,
Boyer,	Barker,
Lovell,	Lancaster,
Gladu,	Worthington,
McLean (Huron),	Lewis,
Martin (St. Mary's),	Blondin,
Devlin,	Bradbury,
Molloy,	Maddin,
Tobin,	Monk,
Allard,	Lalor,

Amendment (Mr. Blain) negatived motion agreed to and House went into committee of supply.

Mr. BLAIN. May I be permitted to ask the Minister of Public Works if he can furnish the committee with a statement respecting the clock purchased by his department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I have the information from the chief architect which I shall gladly send to my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like my hon. friend to put it on 'Hansard,'

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is as follows:

September 9, 1908.

C. G. Schulze, Esq.,
Halifax, N.S.

In confirmation of my telegram of this morning, your tender of the 25th ultimo to supply an eight-day striking tower clock for the public building at Lunenburg, installed complete and in first-class working order and in strict conformity with the description attached to your tender for the sum of $1,800 is hereby accepted.

Please put this work in hand at once and have the clock delivered with the least possible delay, and let me know how soon you expect to have it delivered so that any carpenter work which may be required in connection with it may be put in hand in time to avoid any delay.

I should be glad if you would let me know what blacksmith work will be necessary in connection with the installation of this clock.

(Sgd.) CHIEF ARCHITECT.

Ottawa, January 20, 1911.

Memorandum re tower clock, public building, Lunenburg, N.S.

In June, 1908, Mr. C. G. Schulze of Halifax, Nova Scotia, was requested to submit a tender for supplying and installing a suitable striking tower clock equal to the best style of clock made by the firm of J. Smith & Sons of Derby, England. The clock, including an 800 pound bell, to be fitted up in the building complete with the exception of the necessary carpenter work, &c., which work would be done at the expense of the department.

In August, 1908, Mr. Schulze submitted a tender amounting to $2,420 for a tower clock, and he was informed that the clock offered was too expensive and that judging from the prices previously paid by this department a suitable clock should be obtained for about $1,600. He was asked to submit a specification for a striking clock fitted up complete for the sum named, $1,600.

In September, 1908, Mr. Schulze's tender and specification to supply and fit up a striking clock for the sum of $1,600 was received. The specification of this clock was satisfactory, and Mr. Schulze's tender of $1,600 was accepted, exclusive of the necessary carpentry, &c.

The carpenter work, &c., consisted of the building of a floor in the tower on which to set the clock, the preparation of a platform on which to set the clock, the cutting of openings in floors and the building of boxes for the clock weights, the repairing and making good of all damage to plaster work, wood work, painting, &c., and in order to

have this properly carried out an officer of this department was sent from Halifax to Lunenburg to point out to Mr. Hedley N. Pyke what had to be done and to obtain his tender for this work. Mr. Pyke submitted a tender amounting to $240, which price was considered reasonable and the work was awarded accordingly.

The cost of carpenter work in connection with the installing of tower clock at the Antigonish public building was $307.

The cost of carpenter work in connection with the installing of tower clock at the Canso public building was $270.

I have to state that the size of dials of a tower clock have considerable to do with the cost of same, as the machinery to drive the hands on a large dial has to be more powerful than that for a smaller clock.

The Canso tower clock cost $1,250, and the dials of that clock are 4 feet in diameter.

The dials of the Lunenburg clock are about 5 feet 6 inches.

Public works chargeable to income—Ottawa printing bureau—New boilers, &c., $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote to make provision for the procuring and installation of new boilers, a new smoke stack and increasing the height of the chimney at the government printing bureau. The total estimated cost is $11,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Why does the minister only ask for $10,000, when the estimated cost is $11,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I expect that the chief architect expects to spend $1,000 before the 31st March. He can do that out of the vote for the current year and allow the other $9,000 to lapse.

Mr. CROCKET. We are voting $10,000 for this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. These boilers are very much needed.

Mr. CROCKET. Are these to replace old boilers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. We voted a similar amount last year for the same purpose. If it was needed, why was it not spent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The only answer I can give is that it was felt possibly that we might put off the work for another year.

Mr. CROCKET. Have tenders been called or will they be called for these boilers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have not been yet.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand that it is the intention of the government to erect a new printing bureau. Is that a fact?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been some talk of it. I think that my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy), has the matter under consideration, but even if that were done, it would be necessary to keep the present building in an efficient and safe condition, because the new building would take considerable time to erect.

Mr. SPROULE. This has the same defect which many of these items indicate; that it is voted year after year. It could not have been urgently required last year or otherwise I assume it would have been spent. The fact that it was voted last year and not spent, is evidence that it is not wanted. We have it this year again, and we do not know but what the same thing may occur next year. It is a small amount, but we find the same thing with regard to other public works, such as harbours, rivers and public buildings. I do not think that it indicates good business management, because if it is urgently needed and we vote the money, it ought to be spent and if it is not needed, it should not be in the estimates.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Knowing something about machinery, I cannot help wondering how it is that the boilers are all played out at once, and that it is absolutely necessary to put in $10,000 worth of boilers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that the boilers which are now there, were put in when the building was erected many years ago.

Mr. CROCKET. At what cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract for the construction of the building was made in 1887, and the boilers which are in the building were put there at that time. The chief architect says that the four boilers require replacing. They are getting in pretty bad condition, and the reason that new boilers have not been put in during the present year is that the chief architect let the matter run on supposing that the old ones would do for a year longer, but he now feels that they must be replaced.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the capacity of the boilers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect cannot say without making inquiries as to the horse-power.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Could the minister tell us what the old boilers cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I presume that they were put in as a part of the contract for the building away back in 1887. No doubt by looking up the old accounts the cost could be easily arrived at.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That amounts to something about boilers. I cannot help feeling that $10,000 for four boilers bricked is an enormous sum to pay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That includes a new smoke stack, and raising the chimney.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That amounts to very little.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the estimate for the boilers?

Mr. DANIEL. I presume that the chief architect is not a boiler inspector, and that he relies on some other official for his recommendation. Has the minister the report of the boiler inspector, and when was it made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have a regular inspector of boilers who reports periodically, and I understand it is about three months' since his report was made.

Mr. MARSHALL. How long have the present boilers been in use?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Since 1887.

Mr. MARSHALL. What size are they?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret I have not the report of the boiler inspector here.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is strange the minister should ask for $10,000 to purchase boilers, and that he has no idea what kind of boilers he is going to purchase. Will the minister ask for tenders for these boilers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My intention is to ask for tenders.

Mr. SPROULE. Since the minister has not the information, and it is near one o'clock the item had better stand, and the committee rise.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why not continue until one o'clock?

Mr. SPROULE. The peculiar obstinacy of the minister's nature will get him into trouble if he should insist on going on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We could do quite a lot of business in 20 minutes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. At a quarter to twelve last night the Prime Minister told us that it was too late to discuss such an important matter as the duty on farm implements.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was not consulted.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister did not object ; he showed passive acquiescence.

Mr. CROTHERS. No time will be saved by going on at this late hour ; you will not pass an item to-night.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I recognize the capacity of my hon. friends opposite to talk, and I, therefore, move that the committee rise.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Pugsley, House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. Wednesday.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 25, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock

BANKING AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE—QUORUM.

Mr. MILLER moved:

That a quorum of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce be reduced from 21 to 15 members in accordance with the recommendations of the first report of the said committee.

Mr. FOSTER. This matter might be allowed to remain over for a day. There should be some reason given for this proposal. What is the number of that committee ?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know exactly, but I think there must be 70 or 80 members.

Mr. FOSTER. Fifteen would be a mighty small quorum.

Mr. MILLER. I am willing to let it stand till to-morrow.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What are the reasons for the reduction of the quorum ?

Mr. MILLER. Quite a number of committees meet in the morning of which members of the Banking and Commerce Committee are also members. This morning we had sittings of the Agricultural Committee, the Public Accounts Committee, the Banking and Commerce Committee, and the Printing Committee. We are in the habit of calling the Banking and Commerce Committee at half past ten o'clock, while most of the committees meet at eleven, and sometimes we are able to get through a good deal of business in the 30 minutes before the other committees meet. In the Banking and Commerce Committee, as I suppose in some other committees, we do not have a large attendance and it seems to be more difficult to get the members together at half past ten than at eleven o'clock. Often the committee would have to be dismissed or else do business without a quorum. The matter was fully discussed this morning before rather a large attendance of the committee and it was the unanimous opinion that the quorum might be reduced.

BILLS RELATING TO TRADE, QUESTION OF ORDER.

Mr. SPEAKER. A question of order was raised yesterday upon the introduction of a Bill by the hon. member for Rainy River, entitled: 'An Act to amend the Electricity and Fluid Exportation Act.' The hon. mem-

ber for East Grey questioned the propriety of proceeding with the measure without the principle of the same having been first submitted to a Committee of the Whole House, by virtue of Rule No. 50. This Rule reads as follows:—

50. No Bill relating to trade, or the alteration of the laws concerning trade, is to be brought into the House, until the proposition shall have been first considered in a Committee of the Whole House, and agreed unto by the House.

Not having had an opportunity of perusing the Bill itself, I could only judge from the observations made by the hon. member for Rainy River in introducing his Bill, as to its scope and intent. In the meantime I requested that the Bill should stand until I could look into the point raised.

The hon. member for Rainy River having submitted his draft of the Bill to me, I find that it amends Chap. 16 of the Statutes of 1907 in some material particulars: that it relates to trade in electric and mechanical power is manifest. Clause 4 of the Bill repeals section 5 of the original Act, and provides regulations as to methods of distribution and the hours of service. Subsection 3 of clause 4 makes it compulsory for licensees under the Act to supply power upon the request of any municipal corporation or of any other bona fide applicant for such power.

I, therefore, rule that the said Bill does relate to trade as contemplated by Rule 50 and can only be introduced after having been first considered in Committee of the Whole House.

FISHERY AGREEMENT AT WASHINGTON.

Mr. BRODEUR. I beg to lay on the table of the House the regulations and the minutes of the agreement reached between this country and the United States in reference to the fisheries in contiguous waters.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that printed?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that it should be.

Mr. BRODEUR. Very well, I move that Rule 74 be suspended and that these documents be printed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. As we do not want to have too many printed documents to refer to, it seems to me that something more might be included in the papers which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has brought down, so that we would have the whole matter under our hand. The first suggestion I have to make is that, as the amended sections of the fishery regulations are given, it would be useful to have with them the present sections, so that we could tell at a glance what alterations have been made. Then, I think the protocols might be included so as to give us a concise and ready reference.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think most of the regulations are in the protocol itself, but for the sake of intelligent discussion, I think it would be well to have all the regulations included, and I will bring them down to-morrow.

IMMIGRATION STATISTICS.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of the Interior why the number of immigrants entering the country each month are not published in the 'Canada Gazette' at the end of the month in accordance with a resolution passed on the 5th of May, 1887, which will be found in the Journals of the House for that year, at page 92. I do not know that it has ever been changed.

Mr. OLIVER. I will have to ask my hon. friend to allow me to postpone my answer until to-morrow.

QUESTIONS.

(The questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC DEVELOPING COMPANY.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar):

1. How many acres of land has the government sold to the Grand Trunk Pacific Developing Company?
2. At what price per acre was the land sold?
3. Has the government bought any land from the Grand Trunk Pacific Developing Company?
4. If so, how much land was bought and at what price per acre?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Dominion lands—16,516·70 acres of land. Indian lands—14,160 acres of land, being parts of Digby and Kaien islands, Lakanian and Lakwilgiapoh islands and eight small islands near Digby island and south part of the Trimpsean Indian reserve in British Columbia were sold by the Department of Indian Affairs to the Grand Trunk Pacific Town and Development Company on the 15th of June, 1907, for $107,650.

2. Dominion lands—At $3 per acre, and one-quarter interest in net proceeds of sales. Indian lands—At $7.50 per acre, saving the rights of the province of British Columbia.
3. Dominion lands—No. Indian lands—No.
4. Dominion lands—Answered by No. 3. Indian lands—Answered by No. 3.

TORONTO ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Is it the intention of the government to discontinue the lighthouse at Toronto island, known as Gibraltar Point light, which has been in use for the last 100 years or thereabouts? If so, why?
2. Have any protests been received against such removal?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. The Lighthouse Board has recommended the discontinuance of the said lighthouse. But no action has yet been taken by the government on such recommendation.
2. Yes.

GRAND MANAN FISHERIES.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. What have been, respectively, the maximum and minimum prices per hogshead charged to Canadian fishermen for bait out of the weirs at Grand Manan, New Brunswick, during the months of May, June, July, August, September, October and November, 1910?
2. How many licenses for weirs at Grand Manan were issued during the last twelve months?
3. Are any of such weirs erected on the herring spawning grounds?
4. If so, what are the names of the persons holding licenses therefor?
5. Is it the policy of the government to allow the erection of weirs on the herring spawning grounds?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. There were no herring at Grand Manan in May or June.
In July the prices ranged from $7.50 to $10.
In August $10 to $11.25.
In September $7.50 to $10.
In October $15.
In November $15 to $16.75.
2. Sixty-four.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. No.

FISHERY REGULATIONS.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries been informed of the prosecution of one Charles K. Golden, of Chebogue, Yarmouth county, for alleged violation of fishery regulations?
2. If so, who laid the complaint, what was the charge, by whom was the complaint tried, and when?
3. Is the department aware whether defendant pleaded guilty or was convicted on the evidence of witnesses?
4. What penalty was imposed, and has a return thereof been made to the department? If so, when?
5. Has any portion of the fine been refunded? If so, when?
6. Has defendant Golden been previously convicted of, or charged with, violation of fishery regulations to the knowledge of the department? If so, of which and when?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Yes.
2. Fishery Overseer A. M. Hatfield. Breach of the lobster fishery regulations. The stipendiary magistrate at Yarmouth. During the past fall.
3. He pleaded guilty.
4. $20. No complete return of the prosecution has yet been made, as the defendant asked for an extension of time, which was granted him.
5. No.
6. An examination of the records for the past three years shows no previous conviction.

THE 'JOHN B. YOUNG.'

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Is the government aware of the alleged stranding of the schooner 'John B. Young' on Amherst island, Magdalen islands, in May, 1910?
2. What assistance, if any, did the government or Department of Marine and Fisheries render in getting the said schooner off or in towing her to Lunenburg?
3. What expense, if any, in that connection did the government or department incur?
4. What amount, if any, did the government pay for such purpose, and to whom?
5. Was the grounding of said schooner attributed by the captain or owners to any defect in the aids to navigation? If so, to which?
6. Was an inquiry held into the cause of the grounding of said vessel? If so, by whom and with what result?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Yes.
2. None. The vessel was reported to be a total loss.
3 and 4. The department paid to Mr. Joseph Ed. Noel $87.75 for board and lodging of wrecked crew.
5. Yes. A statement was made that Entry island lighthouse was not in operation at the time of the accident. As a matter of fact the lighthouse was being removed to a new site and was temporarily replaced by a less powerful light.
6. No inquiry was held.

IMPORTS OF BRICKS, TILES, &c.

Mr. MADDIN:

1. What amount of bricks, tiles, clays and manufactures of same was imported into Canada during the calendar years of 1909 and 1910, from the United Kingdom and the United States respectively?

2. What amount of these goods during 1909 and 1910 was entered at Montreal, Halifax and Sydney, respectively?

3. What is the present duty on fire bricks?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. The imports into Canada from Great Britain and the United States of the undermentioned articles during the calendar years 1909 and 1910 were as follows:

—	Unit of qty.	Country.	1909. Quantity.	1909. Value.	1910. Quantity.	1910. Value.
Bath Brick	$	Great Britain		1,372		2,269
		United States				17
Building brick	M.	Great Britain	1,738	21,680	1,993	26,447
		United States	26,234	173,680	27,056	248,035
Paving brick	M.	Great Britain	5,244	64,719	7,717	95,058
		United States	5,941	74,647	2,786	29,936
Drain tiles, not glazed	$	Great Britain		336		187
		United States		2,275		4,298
Drain pipes, sewer pipes and earthenware fittings, chimney linings or vents, chimney tops and inverted blocks, glazed or unglazed	$	Great Britain		34,200		35,179
		United States		135,809		140,259
Manufactures of clay, n.o.p.	$	Great Britain		122,173		197,796
		United States		131,763		164,117

2. The imports into the ports of Montreal, Halifax and Sydney of the undermentioned articles during the calendar years 1909 and 1910 were as follows:

Montreal.—						
Bath brick	$	Great Britain		1,872		1,666
		United States				
Building brick	M.	Great Britain	462	6,718	340	3,282
		United States	3,407	39,760	2,704	38,190
Paving brick	M.	Great Britain	4,543	54,318	6,979	84,181
		United States	1,334	14,280	114	1,122
Drain tiles, not glazed	$	Great Britain		191		
		United States				350
Drain pipes, sewer pipes and earthenware fittings, chimney linings or vents, chimney tops and inverted blocks, glazed or unglazed	$	Great Britain		11,207		7,299
		United States		1,580		140
Manufactures of clay, n.o.p.	$	Great Britain		63,916		77,877
		United States		10,189		14,944
Halifax.—						
Bath brick	$	Great Britain		51		35
		United States				
Building brick	M.	Great Britain	19	286	202	1,980
		United States	22	264		
Drain tiles, not glazed	$	Great Britain		407		794
		United States		15		17
Drain pipes, sewer pipes and earthenware fittings, chimney linings or vents, chimney tops and inverted blocks, glazed or unglazed	$	Great Britain		1,842		1,835
		United States		284		198
Sydney.—						
Paving brick	M.	Great Britain			27	405
		United States				
Drain pipes, sewer pipes and earthenware fittings, chimney linings or vents, chimney tops and inverted blocks, glazed or unglazed	$	Great Britain				
		United States				70
Manufactures of clay, n.o.p.		Great Britain		8,756		8,158
		United States		2,529		2,782

3. Fire bricks, of a class or kind not made in Canada, are free of duty. Other fire bricks are dutiable at the rate of 12½ per cent, under the British Preferential Tariff, and at the rate of 22½ per cent under the 'General Tariff.'

POSTAGE ON PERIODICALS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

Does the government collect any extra postage on the 'Review of Reviews,' an American monthly magazine, entering Canada from the United States? If not, why not?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No. The said publication enters the Canadian mails under regulations applicable to all United States publications.

MUTILATED MAIL MATTER.

* Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. Is the government aware that great quantities of mail matter are said to be daily mutilated, contents of letters exposed, and parts of envelopes torn off so as to render the mail matter open to inspection, and in many instances the documents and correspondence torn or destroyed?

2. What action, if any, has the government taken to investigate the careless handling of mail matter?

3. Has the government made any effort to use other means in small post offices than tying letters together with string for outside points? If not, why not?

4. Has the government made inquiry into the numerous complaints received by them within the past six months relating to the carriage and delivery of mails? If so, what are some of the improvements made regarding same?

5. What reasons, if any, are given for mail matter between Kingston and Ottawa requiring days to make the trip?

6. Has any investigation been made regarding said delays? If so, who is responsible for them, and what action has the government taken to remedy same?

7. What is the usual length of time that letters sent to the Dead Letter Office are held before returning them to the sender, and is it not possible to return them more promptly to the owner?

8. Are registered letters handled under different instructions than ordinary letters? If so, what is the nature of said instructions?

9. What arrangements has the government made with certain newspapers and corporations whereby said papers and corporations can have printed on their envelopes 'Postage paid in cash, by order of Post Office Department?

10. How are such envelopes furnished, and if by the government, what is the charge per thousand, what inspection is made in the general use of said envelopes, and how many firms and papers in Canada use these stamps?

11. Has the Atlantic mail contract been renewed? If so, to whom is the contract let, and what are the general terms of the said contract?

Mr. MURPHY.

12 What position does W. J. Johnston hold under the government, and what are his duties?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. No, but at times complaint has been made as to the damaged condition of mail matter, and upon investigation it is generally found that such damage is occasioned in part by the natural wear and tear incident to the various handlings to which mail matter is necessarily subject, and to the fact that paper used in the manufacture of covers in which such matter is inclosed is of inferior quality, and not sufficiently strong to resist the ordinary friction and pressure which it must sustain by coming in contact with other mail matter during course of post.

2. Whenever complaint is made of the careless handling of mail matter the same is at once carefully inquired into with a view to fixing responsibility and preventing a recurrence.

3. No practical substitute for string has yet been devised for tieing packages of letters.

4. All complaints respecting carriage and delivery of mails are carefully investigated, and when it is ascertained that the irregularities complained of could properly be charged against the postal service, such steps as are possible in order to prevent a recurrence are taken.

5 and 6. The department is not aware that other than the schedule time is required for the transmission of mail matter between Kingston and Ottawa.

7. There is no specified time, the instructions being that all letters sent to the Dead Letter Office are to be dealt with as expeditiously as possible.

8. Yes. Registered letters are letters for which a receipt is given to the sender at the post office at which they are handed in, and for which a receipt is taken before delivery. A record is also kept at each of the post offices and railway post offices through which such letters pass.

9 and 10. No such arrangements have been made. In order to facilitate the posting and despatch of third-class matter mailed in large quantities the postmasters of city offices may, on prepayment of postage in cash, accept printed matter such as circulars and catalogues under conditions as set forth in section 78 of the Official Postal Guide.

11. This question refers to matters relating to the Department of Trade and Commerce.

12. Financial superintendent, to whom is assigned the supervision and inspection of the accounts of the city and semi-staff post offices, issuing necessary instructions to the officers employed therein, and the performance of such other duties of a

financial nature as the Postmaster General may designate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a portion not answered because it related to another department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. About the Atlantic mail contract. I will call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to that contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suggest that that portion be allowed to stand.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, and I will call the attention of my hon. colleague to it.

FACTORIES FOR EXPLOSIVES.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. How many factories for the manufacture of explosives are there in Canada, and where are they situated?
2. How many people are employed therein?
3. What is the total capital employed in the industry?
4. What number of deaths have been caused by explosion in such factories since 1896?
5. What is the number of people who have been injured during same period by the same cause?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This department has, through inquiry, become aware of the existence of 23 factories in Canada in which explosives are manufactured. The following list shows the locations of these plants and the explosives manufactured:

Name of Company.	Where Situated.	Explosives Manufactured.
G. & N. Fuse Work	Arnprior, Ont	Fuse and detonators.
Ontario Powder Company	Tweed, Ont	Dynamite.
Hand, T. W	Hamilton, Ont	Fireworks.
Bradley Torpedo & Oil Co	Petrolia, Ont	Nitro-glycerine.
Corey, H., & Sons	Petrolia, Ont	Nitro-glycerine, oils.
Petrolia Torpedoes	Petrolia, Ont	Nitro-glycerine.
Prescott Explosives	Prescott, Ont	Fulminate of mercury.
Energite Explosive Co	Haileybury, Ont	Cheddite.
Dominion Explosive Co	Sand Point, on Ottawa river	Blaster's friend.
Dominion Cartridge Co	Brownsburg, Que	Sporting ammunition, detonators and electric fuses.
Hamilton Powder Co	Boenil, Que	Dynamite, gelignite, cordite, monobel.
Hamilton Powder Co	Windsor Mills, Que	Black and sporting powder.
Standard Explosive Co	Vaudreuil, Que	Dynamite and black powder.
The Northern Explosive Co	Lavergne, Que	Dynamite.
Back-a-Back Powder Co	Sherbrooke, Que	Back-a rock powder.
A. L. Howard Co	Capelton, Que	Fulminate of mercury.
French Electric Blasting Fuse Co	703 Merchants Bank Building, Montreal	Blasting fuse.
Acadia Powder Co	Waverly, near Halifax, N.S	Dynamite and black powder.
Hamilton Powder Co	North Fleet Bay, B.C	Black powder, dynamite, gelignite, monobel.
Western Explosives Co	Tunstall Bay, Bowan Island, B.C	Black powder, dynamite.
B. C. Powder Co	North Arm, Burrard Inlet, B.C	Dynamite.
Giant Powder Co	Telegraph Bay	Dynamite.
Dominion Arsenal at Quebec.		

2. This department has no record of the number of people employed.
3. This information is not on record in the Mines Department.
4. While the department has no official record of the number of deaths caused by explosion in these factories since 1896, it is known that at least 25 persons were killed in explosions at four plants in 1910.
5. As per question 4, the information is not on record, but it is known that at least 20 persons were injured in one explosion in 1910.

PRINTING BUREAU.

*Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Is it a fact that a portion, if not the greater portion of paper purchased by the Printing Bureau is not water-marked and consists largely of what are known as culls?
2. Are there any employees in the Stationery Branch of the Bureau who have had a sufficient factory or mill experience to qualify them to distinguish culls?
3. If so, has any such person examined the paper purchased during the past six months, and what was the result of such examination?
4. Has there been purchased lately between 40 and 50 tons of board, out of which to manufacture cases for use by census enumerators?
5. If so, from whom was it purchased?
6. Has all or a great portion of it become warped?
7. Has it been accepted and paid for? If so, how much was paid?
8. Who is requsition clerk at the Bureau.
9. When was he appointed and upon whose recommendation?

10. What are his qualifications for the position?

11. Has any loss been occasioned by reason of this requisition clerk, and what is the extent of such loss?

12. In proportion to the time he has held the position how has his work compared with the previous clerk?

13. On whose authority was the previous requisition clerk, Mr. A. E. Chamberlain, requested to send in his resignation?

14. What assistance, if any, is given the present occupant of this position that was not given Mr. Chamberlain?

15. What salary is now paid the requisition clerk?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. No. The Printing Bureau does not purchase paper 'culls.' Various grades of paper—required for different services—are purchased under contract, but in order to give all dealers and manufacturers an equal chance to compete, registered water marks, or trade marks, are not specified in the invitation to tender.

2. Several of the employees in the stationery office have had sufficient experience to enable them to distinguish 'culls.'

3. Yes. The results have shown that the papers are of good quality and value. All papers are examined and tested when received at the Bureau.

4. Seventeen tons of mill board, for general use, were lately bought from the St. Lawrence Pulp and Paper Company by tender.

5. Answered by reply to No. 4.

6. No. About half a ton became warped and it was replaced by the company without expense to the Bureau.

7. Yes. The contract price, forty-five dollars per ton.

8. H. M. McClory.

9. The 28th November, 1910, by the King's Printer who had personal knowledge of his fitness for the position.

10. Twenty years a practical printer in the Bureau, of which 13 years were spent at the case, 5 years as a monotype operator and nearly two years as a clerk in lithograph room.

11. No.

12. Very favourably.

13. The King's Printer.

14. None.

15. $18.35 per week, the same rate as that at which he was paid before becoming requisition clerk.

NAVIGATION LICENSES ON GREAT LAKES.

Mr. MACDONELL :

1. Is it true, as stated in the public press, that the Treasury Department at Washington has recently made a rule to the effect that only citizens of the United States will be allowed to hold navigation licenses for American vessels on the Great Lakes?

Mr. MACDONELL.

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to enforce a regulation prohibiting United States subjects from holding similar navigation licenses on Canadian vessels on the Great Lakes?

Mr. BRODEUR :

1. The government has no information on the subject beyond what has appeared in the public press, and to that extent only has the government been advised of the matter.

2. The matter will receive the consideration of the government should circumstances require it. In the meantime the existing legislation will continue to be strictly enforced.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY, HALIFAX TERMINALS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the notices of motion are called I would like to ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister whether the Minister of Railways has had any opportunity of considering the matter to which I called attention a day or two ago? I allude to terminal facilities required by the Intercolonial railway at Halifax for the purposes of a better dock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that the Minister of Railways has not been able to take cognizance of this matter yet, but before next week I hope to give my hon. friend an answer.

MARITIME MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) had an opportunity of considering the matter which I brought to the attention of his department during his absence, and which stood at the request of the Prime Minister? I allude to the representations of the Halifax Board of Trade with respect to the delay in the transmission of the mail to the maritime provinces during the summer months.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have a pile of papers before me, and I know that this matter is waiting. I will see that all diligence is had in attending to it.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the full names of the permanent and temporary employees appointed at Quebec since the 1st of January, 1905, in the following departments: Post Office, Customs, Inland Revenue and Public Works; the age and place of residence of each of these employees at the time of their appointment, the dates and nature of changes, promotions or increases of salary granted them since their appointment.—Mr. Lachance.

For a copy of all correspondence, documents and papers relating to the late strike on the Grand Trunk Railway between the

said railway and the striking conductors and trainmen, or between either and any person or persons authorized or professing to act for either, or between the government or any minister or deputy minister, or any one on his behalf, and either of said parties or any one professing to act on behalf of either, since the 29th day of November, A.D., 1910, and particularly all documents, papers, correspondence and agreements relating to the reinstatment of any of the men who had been on strike, and the appointment of Judge Barron.—Mr. Northrup.

TERMINAL ELEVATORS.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina) moved :

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the investigations recently made by the government into the conditions existing in the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and in view of the disclosures as a result of such investigations, it is in the interests of the western grain producers and of Canada generally, that such measures be adopted by the government as will more effectually prevent the improper admixture of grain delivered to the several terminals and transfer elevators through which the grain of the western provinces may pass.

He said : In bringing this matter to the House, I have no apology to make. It is a question which is of great importance to western Canada, and of equally great importance to Canada as a whole. In western Canada it affects not only the men who raise the grain, but every citizen in that country, whether he be an agriculturist, a merchant, a professional or a labouring man. Every one there is affected by the quantity of grain produced, and the marketing of that grain. It is also a matter of the greatest importance to Canada that the grain produced in our country should reach the markets of the world in the same condition as that in which it leaves the farms of the west. We have had a number of delegations waiting on the government during the present year, but none of these was of greater importance than the one which came from western Canada representing the agriculturists in that part of the Dominion. They made a number of requests, one of which was that the tariff should be revised downwards. In that respect I am in entire accord with our western agriculturists.

They also made a request with respect to the operation of the Hudson Bay railway, with respect to the introduction of co-operative legislation, and with respect to government operation or control of terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. I venture to say that of all these questions, not even excepting the question of the tariff, the matter of the proper control of the terminal elevators and the proper handling of grain in the terminal elevators, was probably the most important question concerning western Canada that was submitted to the present government by the western delegation. This question has been troubling the residents of the west for a number of years past, and there is no question on which there has been so much discussion since the old trouble of the scarcity of cars. We had some years ago in the west the greatest difficulty in obtaining cars to market our grain with. That difficulty, I may say, during the past two years, has been practically removed; I know of no complaint with respect to getting cars for the shipment of grain in 1909 or 1910. But the trouble in the terminal elevators continues to go on. The provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan are those most vitally affected by the manner of the control and handling of grain in the terminal elevators, but the province of Saskatchewan is particularly affected. I want to give the House a few figures to show how important the production of grain is in that province, and how important it will be to that province in the years to come. I am not doing this as being at all provincial; but the fact is that at the present time the province of Saskatchewan produces more wheat than any other province in the Dominion, it produces three times as much wheat as Manitoba, and I am often at a loss to understand why all the wheat that is marketed from the western country should be called Manitoba wheat, when the fact is that we produce in Saskatchewan so much more wheat than Manitoba.

Mr. FOSTER. You must have got your seed from Manitoba.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). No doubt as regards the quality of wheat, the province of Manitoba compares favourably with that of Saskatchewan. But I want the members from Manitoba to understand that there is another province producing wheat in western Canada besides Manitoba, a province that produces three times as much wheat as Manitoba is doing, or has ever done. Consider the Saskatchewan wheat production for three years, 1903, 1906 and 1909, for the purpose of making a comparison.

SASKATCHEWAN'S PRODUCTION OF GRAIN IN BUSHELS.

	1903.	1906.	1909.
Wheat..	15,121,015	37,040,097	90,255,000
Oats..	9,164,007	23,965,528	105,465,000
Barley..	665,593	1,316,415	7,833,000
Flax	285,697	710,698	4,448,700
	25,236,312	63,042,739	208,001,700

Now there is a fact to note. The crop of 1909 placed Saskatchewan first, not only among the provinces of the Dominion, and not only in the production of wheat, but also in the production of oats, and third among the states of the American union.

Let me give you the figures. In 1909 the state of Minnesota produced the most wheat of all the states of the American union:

WHEAT.

Minnesota	94,000,000
North Dakota	90,700,000
Saskatchewan	90,255,000
Kansas	87,000,000

OATS.

Illinois	159,000,000
Iowa	116,000,000
Saskatchewan	105,465,000

Mr. SPROULE. From what source does the hon. gentleman get his figures?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). From the Department of Agriculture of the province of Saskatchewan. I have seen them cited in a number of newspapers, and I am satisfied they are correct.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought he gave the figures applying to the province before it was organized under a government of its own.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My hon. friend is correct for the year 1903, which was before the province was formed. But the calculation was made in the provincial department of agriculture over the corresponding area of the province. However the figures for 1903 do not make much difference.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman know how the estimates he has read for the province of Saskatchewan agree with the estimates given by the Dominion Department of Agriculture? Is there much difference between the two?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I have not made a comparison all the way through. I know, however, that the estimate of Saskatchewan wheat is given as somewhat less in the report of the Dominion Department of Agriculture, which gives the only figures I have knowledge of.

But the difference is not of much account. There is this further point to consider, that so far as the productivity of the soil is concerned, we occupy in Saskatchewan no mean position. Take again the figures for 1909. The crop reports for 1909 place Saskatchewan first, not only among the provinces of the Dominion of Canada, but also among the states of the American union, in the average per acre production of both wheat and oats. Now that is a fact of considerable importance, not only to our own province, but to the whole Dominion, when we consider how small a proportion of our arable area is yet under cultivation. Let me give the figures.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina).

WHEAT.

	Bushels per acre.
Saskatchewan	22·1
Minnesota	16·8
North Dakota	15·7
Kansas	14·1
United States	15·8

OATS.

Saskatchewan	47·1
Illinois	36·8
Minnesota	33·0
Iowa	27·0
United States	30·3

So that in respect to the productivity of the soil, our province occupies a very proud position. With these figures before us we can imagine what are the vast possibilities of that province with regard to the production of grain. In the year 1909 we had under cultivation only 7,016,272 acres; in 1910, slightly over 8,000,000 acres. The area under cultivation in 1909 was only equal to a little more than the area of our road allowances. And when it is considered that the area of the province of Saskatchewan, south of the city of Prince Albert, exclusive of lakes and rivers, is 80,000,000 acres, by far the larger part of which is as good land as that now under cultivation, it may easily be seen what a vast production of wheat will take place in that province in ten years, provided the population increases as it has increased in the past. To show the soundness of my contention, I would cite the statement made by Mr. William Whyte, of the Canadian Pacific railway, a gentleman who has lived long in the west and knows the west from Winnipeg to the coast as well as any man. Mr. Whyte says:

> Saskatchewan is now producing one-tenth as much grain as all the United States, and in ten years will produce as much as all the states put together.

When we reach the point that Saskatchewan alone produces as much wheat as the whole of the United States, Canada will have made good her claim to be the granary of the British Empire.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. member (Mr. Martin, Regina) any figures showing the relation between the product and the number of producers? In one respect, that is quite an important point.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I regret that I have no figures to show the average for each producer. Having given these figures, I think the House will agree with me that the question brought forward this afternoon in the form of this resolution is one which merits the attention of every representative of the Canadian people.

Hon. members will recollect that in 1906 a royal commission was appointed to investigate the grain trade. That commission held sittings all over the country and endeavoured to follow the grain from the time it was

marketed in the west until it reached Liverpool. They finally made a report, and to show the relative importance of the question which is the subject of this motion and other questions, I may mention that this report declares that the main question then was that of getting cars. In 1906 the farmers simply could not get the cars to get their grain to market. The results were what every one who has been in the west knows. I have seen towns along new lines of railway when farmers living as much as fifty or sixty miles distant had driven in with their grain. They found they could not get their grain into elevators, and neither they nor the elevators could get cars to ship the grain. So, these farmers, were kept waiting there for days, taking the profit off the grain and preventing them from getting the money to pay the bills of merchants and machine men. Let me quote a few words from the report of the royal commission to show the House how the commission dealt with some of these questions. I refer, first, to page 8:

As our inquiry in the country proceeded it became apparent that the troubles that the farmers complained of, and also those complained of by the elevator companies, could be overcome by a plentiful supply of cars.

As I said, we have now the plentiful supply of cars, but we find that we have not fair treatment at the terminal elevators, so that this question of the terminal elevators is the most important question before us now.

A farmer dissatisfied with selling or shipping his grain through a country elevator could, with a plentiful supply of cars, load and ship direct to Fort William. Furthermore, as we have already explained, with a plentiful supply of cars an elevator operator would be able to pay the farmer a higher price for the grain sold on the street.

And so the report goes on with regard to car storage and car distribution. The commission dealt also with the question of special binning. An amendment was included in the Manitoba Grain Act of 1908 dealing with that and with special flag stations.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the hon. gentleman please state what special binning means?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I could not explain that better than by reading the sections of the Manitoba Grain Act, and the suggestions made by the commission.

Mr. LENNOX. That is not necessary. At what place is the special binning done?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). It has reference to the binning in the terminal elevators, keeping separate the different grades of grain and the shipments of different farmers and elevator companies. Now, when it came to the question of terminal elevators, the Grain Commission made certain recommendations. They advised the government that government ownership was not the proper solution of this difficulty, and rather favoured government control. Pursuant to their report, legislation was passed by this parliament in 1908 which was considered by many men who were well able to speak on the subject as being a complete cure of the evils that existed in the handling of grain in the terminal elevators at that time. I may explain that one of the main evils found by the commission in the terminal elevators was that they were practically controlled by other grain companies who thus were interested in the grain going through the elevators. That, to my mind, is one of the greatest difficulties of dealing with this grain question of the west, apart from government ownership and operation. If we could get legislation that would remove this element of personal and private gain in handling the grain, the question would be solved. Whether that is practical legislation or not, I am not in a position to say.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. gentleman say that the same people who handle the grain as an elevator company are handling grain for themselves?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). That is the idea. Hon. gentlemen will notice, as I quote from this report, that the charges I refer to are borne out by the facts. Referring to page 18 of the report, I find the following :

The private corporations operating the terminal elevators at Fort William are composed largely of the shareholders, officers and directors of grain firms and country line elevator companies in Winnipeg, and as such have a direct financial interest in much of the grain passing through their elevators at Fort William. We find that the Canadian Pacific railway elevator at Port Arthur is operated by a private company, but is used exclusively for the handling of off-grade grain of different descriptions, and does not stand in the same relation to the general grain trade as do the other terminal elevators.

And there are other authorities on the same point. It is generally conceded throughout the west that the elevators are controlled by men who have an interest in the handling of the grain there. On the same page the commission goes on to say what are the principal improvements, in their opinion, needed in these elevators :

The matters to be considered in connection with the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur in our opinion are the establishing of complete control of the cleaning and binning of grain in all elevators, and the establishing

of a weighing department that will take over the weighing of all grain where public weighing is called for.

It was upon that recommendation that the legislation of 1908 was passed by this House. I may also refer to what they say with respect to government ownership and operation of these elevators. It is to be found on page 19 of the report :

Requests were made of us in the country that the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur should be taken over and operated by the government in view of the fact that so many of them were operated by private corporations interested in the grain trade. We also had a communication from the department under date January 23, 1907, inclosing a petition of members of parliament addressed to the honourable the Premier, requesting that we be instructed to specifically 'inquire into and report whether it is in the public interest that terminal elevators . . . continue to be operated by the common carriers or allowed to pass into the hands of or be operated by persons, firms or corporations engaged in the grain business.'

Then they go on to say:

In reply to this communication we addressed to Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, Minister of Trade and Commerce, a letter, dated February 1, a copy of which is appended hereto. We can see no reason for changing the conclusions arrived at at that time and we believe if our recommendations are carried out they will give the public the same confidence and protection in the operation of these terminal elevators as if they were owned by the government.

In that communication to Sir Richard Cartwright, the commission recommended rather government control of elevators, government inspection and not government ownership and operation. Their recommendation is given on page 39 of this report:

We find it has been the tendency at Fort William for elevators to go under the control of private companies and we believe this tendency will continue. These private companies, through their allied companies buying grain in the country, are able to secure shipments of grain to their terminal elevators, and are thus in an advantageous position to compete with the elevators of common carriers, who have no control over the destination of grain carried by them.

8. We believe the operating of terminal elevators by private companies under the present regulations would be detrimental to the interests of the trade, and would tend to destroy public confidence in the results obtained therefrom. Our reasons for believing this are, that the elevator companies (if they so wished) would be able to manipulate the grades for their own benefit, and not to clean the grain up to the dockage set by the government inspector.

9. The fact that an elevator is owned and operated by a railway company does not with the present regulations, in our opinion, necessarily insure protection to the public. We would like, however, to see the elevators at present owned, or to be owned, by the railways operated by them.

That, of course, brings up the question of the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator at Fort William.

Mr. FOSTER. Who were the members of that Commission ?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). John Miller, of Indian Head, a farmer, W. L. McNair, of Keyes, Manitoba, a grain man and Geo. E. Goldie, of Ayr, Ontario, a miller.

It has been said that a solution of this difficulty might be arrived at by linking the elevator companies with our transportation system, making them in fact a part of that system. I believe that would remedy the difficulty to a very great extent, because if you did that, you would get rid of the one main difficulty in our way that these terminal elevators are controlled by speculators interested in the grain trade and in the products they are carrying, so that it is to their interest to manipulate that product in such a way as to deliver from the terminal elevators a worse sample than is sent out by the western farmer. I think myself that if the transportation companies handled all our grain, we would have very little to find fault with now, because all the evidence I have been able to find, the report of the Grain Commission, the evidence submitted by the Dominion Millers' Association and the admissions of the farmers themselves, go to show that the grain that comes out of the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator at Fort William is in much better condition and is marketed in better condition than the grain that comes out of elevators owned and operated by private companies. I mention that, only as one solution that has been suggested for this difficulty.

It has also been suggested to make the elevator men warehouse men pure and simple. I have mentioned this aspect of the question already; its object is to eliminate personal private gain which is the incentive to manipulation.

Another solution suggested is government control. We have had government control since 1908. According to the investigations and the confessions of these elevator men, made in the last year, that system undoubtedly proved a failure and we have to look now for some other system, either government ownership or some better system of government control so that the grain will be marketed in proper form and reach the market in proper condition. To start with, we are able to show, as I will prove from the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce with respect to the investigations held last year, that government control as at present enforced, has proved a failure.

Failing a proper system of government control there apparently only remains government ownership and operation. It has been suggested that we should bring into force the Minnesota legislation. I had intended to make some study of the Minnesota legislation, but have not yet been able to do so. I am told that in Minnesota the legislation permits mixing of grain. That is the principal difficulty in the way of enacting the Minnesota legislation in our country because the very thing we are endeavouring to prevent, is the improper mixing of grain in these elevators.

Let me deal with what has been proven to have taken place in terminal elevators. The system of government control went into force in 1908. It was tried for two years. We did have in 1909, as some hon. members will remember, a resolution in favour of government ownership of elevators, introduced by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner). That resolution is found in the 'Hansard' of 1909 at page 3993. It reads:

That in the opinion of this House the present system of operating terminal and transfer elevators is detrimental to the interests of the western grain producers, and that the government should take immediate steps to operate terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and the transfer elevators between those terminals and the Atlantic seaboard.

At that time the legislation of 1908 providing for government control had been in force only some few months, I think since September 1, 1908. Only a part of one crop had been handled under that system, when in April, 1909, the hon. member introduced this resolution. I took some part in the debate and moved an amendment to his resolution which is to be found at page 4034:

That all the words after 'that' be struck out, and the following be substituted therefor:

The amendments of last session to the Grain Act whereby all transfer and terminal elevators were put under government control have produced good results. And if, on further experience, it is found that the present system of supervision is not adequate to prevent the undue mixture of grain in such elevators, this House will be prepared to accept such further legislation as may be needed to that end.

I moved that resolution at that time for the reasons I have already stated, that it was only fair to give the system of government control inaugurated by the legislation of 1908 a fair trial, and the handling of part of the crop of one year was, I contended, not a fair trial. The system has now been given a fair trial with the result that it has proved itself absolutely inadequate to meet the situation. It seems to me still that a system of government control properly inaugurated and carried out should as effectively control and handle the grain trade and protect the interests of those interested, as any system of government ownership. Under government control, you have two sets of officials, one checking the other. I believe that at Fort William and Port Arthur there were seventy odd officials doing nothing, but checking up the grain, weighing it in and weighing it out, and during the past fall, after the disclosures to which I am about to refer, the Department of Trade and Commerce inaugurated a system of registration under which a man who brings in grain must register the amount and before he ships it out, must get his warehouse receipt so that the amount registered in must equal the amount registered out. Under such a system, it seems to me, that it should be possible to prevent the mixture of grain, but that result has not been attained, and now we are in a position where some legislation must be passed to properly protect the interest not only of western Canada, but of the whole Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. We now have some one before us whom we can question. When the grain growers were here, they had it all their own way, and we could not put any questions. I wish that either the hon. member who has the floor, or some other hon. member would give a very brief and clear sketch of the operation of handling the grain from first to last so that we could see the different processes in operation. Then we would be able to judge as to whether the checks and supervision were adequate. I would like to know what methods are employed in regard to the grain from the time it leaves the farm until it gets into the hands of the ultimate buyer, and also something of the difference between the terminal and transfer elevators.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). If my hon. friend wants a correct idea as to the handling of grain, either at the terminal or transfer elevators he will, I think, have to ask some member of the House who is a practical farmer. The system is most intricate and I am told that no one can understand it unless he investigates for himself. Although I have given the matter some considerable attention I do not understand it yet, and I think the only way in which one can get a true conception of the system is to have it explained by some one employed in the elevator who has an intimate knowledge of the system.

I cannot understand how the manipulation of grain that has been proven, could have taken place under the very eye of the large number of officials who were there to prevent it. If the officials have been hon-

ourable and painstaking in their intentions then the fact that it did take place, must lead us to believe that the system is intricate and that it requires care on our part in legislating towards improvement. In the amendment of 1908 providing for government control, subsection of section 126a of the Manitoba Grain Inspection Act provides:

The inspector shall keep the proper records of all grain received in store in any terminal elevator, which records shall show the particulars of each parcel or car lot of grain received, the date received, the grade, dockage, if any, and the number of the bin in which such grain has been stored; and shall keep similar records of all such grain shipped from any terminal elevator, which records shall also give the name of the vessel or the number of the car into which such grain has been delivered.

That section provides a fairly detailed system of the method of checking in grain and checking it out. Then subsection 7 provides:

In the month of August each year stock shall be taken of the quantity of each grade of grain in the terminal elevators.

That subsection was inserted, I presume, for the purpose of enabling the government inspectors to check up the amount of the different grades of grain that were in the different elevators on the 31st of August.

On the 12th of December, 1909, the inspectors inspected and measured the grain in some of these terminal elevators and they found a shortage particularly of Northern No. 1. An investigation was then conducted into the dealings of the Canadian Pacific railway elevator, the Consolidated elevator, the Empire elevator, and the Port Arthur elevator. With respect to the Canadian Pacific railway elevator, after looking into the matter very carefully it was decided that there was no case. Mr. C. C. Castle, the warehouse commissioner had charge of this investigation and he reported to the Trade and Commerce Department on April 22, 1910, and in his report he gives certain facts with respect to what was found in connection with the manipulation of grain and the sending of false returns to the government as to the different quantities of grain in the elevators on the 12th of December that year. With respect to the Canadian Pacific railway elevator he states:

The managers of each of the elevators against whom discrepancies were alleged, viz., Canadian Pacific Railway, The Consolidated, The Empire and the Port Arthur Elevator companies, were called in but no satisfactory explanation was given by them except in the case of the Canadian Pacific railway, who immediately after seeing me had their records with those of the inspection department carefully checked over; the errors found were of a purely clerical nature, so that all differences have been satisfactorily accounted for in this case. Mr. Frank E. Gibbs, grain inspector at Fort William, personally cross-checked his entries with those of the Canadian Pacific railway and certified to the correctness whereupon the matter was dropped.

But, in the case of the other elevators it was a different thing. For instance, as to the consolidated elevator Mr. C. C. Castle says:

Mr. Gibbs gave evidence that in the weekly sworn return to the commissioner for the week ended 26th November, 1909, the amount of No. 1 Northern wheat inspected out of that elevator exceeded the amount shown on the weekly return to the warehouse commissioner by 80,000 bushels. He also showed that a measurement had been made of the grain in store in the elevator on the 12th December last and such measurement indicated that the total quantity of No. 1 Northern wheat in store exceeded the amount shown by the weekly returns at that time by about 61,000 bushels.

The conclusion was in all these cases the elevator companies had taken No. 2, and No. 3, and No. 4, northern and mixed it with No. 1 northern and consequently shipped out far more No. 1 northern than they had taken in.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Is Mr. Gibbs a government inspector?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Yes, he is the government grain inspector at Fort William. In the case of the Consolidated Elevator Company the investigation apparently fell through, by which I mean, it did not go to the same extent it did go in the case of the Empire Elevator Company, and the Port Arthur Elevator Company. The Consolidated Elevator Company said that the increased amount of No. 1 Northern was on account of an error of their accountant in compiling the weekly statement to the government, and they also pleaded that they had loaned certain wheat to the Lake Shipping Association. Mr. Castle after investigation decided that this was not a very flagrant case, but he, however, laid information under section 25 of the Act charging the elevator company with sending in false returns to the government. Mr. Castle says:

However, I did feel that the officers were grossly negligent in sending in this statement, and felt it my duty to lay an information before the police magistrate here for sending in an untrue statement. The matter came up before the Hon. T. Mayne Daly, P.M., here to-day, and he fined the company the sum of $50.

As to the other two cases it will no doubt be interesting to some members of the House to give detailed figures with respect to the condition of affairs in these elevators, and I take my information from the report of Mr. Castle the warehouse commissioner. In the case of the Port Arthur elevator company the facts are as follows:

The shipments of No. 1 Northern exceeded receipts by 169,066 bushels.

In No. 2 Northern there should have been on hand 291,742 bushels, and there were only 175,096 bushels, a shortage of 116,646 bushels.

In No. 3 Northern there should have been on hand 346,460 bushels, and there were only 166,255 bushels, a shortage of 180,205 bushels.

In No. 4 Northern there was a shortage of 4,968 bushels.

This company was charged with sending in false returns to the government, it pleaded guilty and was fined $2,500. The question may arise as to why the manager of this elevator company was not prosecuted for something more serious than sending in false returns to the government. It was thought that the official who sent in the false returns should be prosecuted for perjury and also prosecuted under the Act for mixing the grain. I will quote what Mr. Castle says in regard to that and I think it will be agreed that it would be an exceedingly difficult matter to succeed in establishing a charge of perjury on account of the difficulty of telling exactly what amount of grain was in the elevator at that date. If you are going to prosecute a man criminally, you must have very definite information as to the amount of the grain. Mr. Castle says with regard to that, that he was advised by the government solicitor, I think Mr. Hudson of Winnipeg, that a prosecution for perjury or for mixing grades would be difficult to sustain, and he concluded his report in the case with the following statement:

> In viey of this, I do not consider that any action of this nature should be taken at present, but that a weigh up of the elevator should be made as soon as it could be done practicably and in the event of it then being ascertained that there is any serious discrepancy still existing in the grades, the question of cancelling the license should be considered.
>
> Mr. Hudson advises me that in his opinion this is the proper course—not only in this case, but also in regard to Empire and Consolidated Elevator Companies.

The Empire Elevator Company was also charged with making a false return. In that case the shipments of No. 1 Northern exceeded the receipts by 437,884 bushels. There was a large shortage of No. 2 northern.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What was the total amount dealt with by the company on which there was that surplus?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I cannot tell my hon. friend the amount of grain that went through that particular elevator, and I cannot give him that information. What I am saying is that there was that much more of No. 1 Northern shipped out than they actually got in, and they got that No. 1 by grading with it No. 2, No. 3 and No. 4 Northern. Of No. 2 Northern there was a shortage of 347,643 bushels, showing where they got the bulk of the grain. Of No. 3 Northern there should have been on hand 155,975 bushels, whereas there was only 5,502 bushels, showing shortage of 150,473 bushels. So that out of No. 2 and No. 3 you will get practically the amount of the excess grain that was shipped out as No. 1 Northern.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). It was just a change in classification?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Yes. In the case of No. 4 Northern there was a discrepancy of 43,969 bushels. In Mr. Castle's report there is some explanation given of the discrepancy between the amount of the additional No. 1 that was shipped out and the shortage of No. 2, No. 3 and No. 4. They do not exactly balance. Now, these facts appear to me amply to establish the charge that manipulation of grain has been going on in the terminal elevators. Our grain from the west has not been reaching the Liverpool market in the condition in which it left the western farmer. As a matter of fact, I believe a lower grade of grain is reaching Liverpool than is shipped by the farmers in the west, and that fact is due to the manipulation of the grades in the terminal elevators. Mr. Hudson, the solicitor who appeared for the government in the investigation, said this at its conclusion:

> This case proved what the grain growers have been contending for years—that there was a mixing going on.

Mr. BRODER. Is that grain only what is exported, or does it include the grain that finds its way into the hands of the millers in the east?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I think it must include both. There is no distinction drawn between the grain that goes to the milling interests of Ontario and the grain that goes to the foreign market. Now, all this manipulation went on in the terminal elevators under our so-called system of government control, with a large number of government officials there for the purpose of controlling and inspecting the grain with a view to preventing such manipulation. I said a few minutes ago that at the time the legislation of 1908 was passed it was generally agreed among men who understood the grain business, and who had investigated the subject, that the manipulation of grain and the troubles we complained of in the terminal elevators would be fairly well stopped, if not absolutely so, by the system of government control which was provided for in that legislation. In order to support that contention, let me

refer to what Mr. John Millar, a member of the Royal Commission of 1906, stated at Weyburn on February 20, 1909. He said this:

The weights both in and out of the terminal elevators had been found satisfactory, but the grain going out seemed to contain rather too much extraneous matter, as some of the cleaners were not of the best. It was pointed out that there was a tendency for the elevators to go into the hands of private companies who were themselves handling grain, and the report of the commission had recommended that these and the transfer elevators farther east should be placed under strict government control. This had been done, and he believed the producer now had as much protection as government ownership would give him.

Another authority, the Hon. W. R. Motherwell, the Minister of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan, said:—

The government control secured over these elevators by amendment to the Manitoba Grain Act last session by the federal parliament has given the producer practically every safeguard and security which government ownership could possibly give.

As I said in the year 1909, when this matter was before the House, as a general principle I do not believe in government ownership. I do not believe that it is the function of government to carry on the business that properly belongs to private individuals. The function of government is to legislate to protect the people and to adopt, in connection with the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, such legislation as will leave these in the hands of corporations, provided the interests of the people are properly protected. But after hearing the matter discussed the past two or three years, after hearing the representations made by grain dealers and grain producers, I have gradually come to the conclusion that we will never be protected properly in the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur until we have these elevators owned and operated by the government. I may be wrong, and if any settlement can be devised to properly protect the grain growers without government ownership and operation, that is what I would prefer. But failing that, I want government ownership and operation.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say in his resolution that he is in favour of the government ownership and operation of elevators?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My hon. friend can read into the resolution whatever he likes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am asking the hon. gentleman whether that is what he wishes this House to vote for or not.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I have endeavoured to express my opinion to the House. I have made the statement that while I am not in favour of government ownership as a general principle, I still feel, from the experience we have had, that we will not be properly protected until we have the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, owned and operated by the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Why does my hon. friend not state that definitely in his resolution?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My hon. friend can read this resolution as he pleases. I moved this resolution because I believed we should have legislation which will put us in a better position with regard to the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur than we are in at present. If my hon. friend does not want to vote for government ownership and operation, he is at liberty to vote against it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). In the case of the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, I believe a good case could be made out for government ownership and operation because the business is a profitable one. Apart from the mixing of grain, it is profitable from the point of view of storing the grain. Let me give you some figures which will prove this, and in that connection let me emphasize this point, namely, that all the grain of western Canada must go through the spout, it must go through these elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, so that the business is practically a monopoly, and secondly the storage business is very profitable.

During the year ending December 10, 1908, 80,000,000 bushels were put through the elevators, which, at ¾ cents per bushel, makes	$ 600,000
There was in store on January 1, 1909, to remain there perhaps four months, 7,000,000 bushels, which, at 4¾ cents makes.	332,500
In addition, say 3,000,000 bushels to come in after January 1, before navigation opens, yielding 3¾ cents per bushel	82,500
Total	$1,015,000

So that the amount received for storage alone should be sufficient to pay all the operating charges, and give a reasonable return on the capital invested. Of course, if these elevators were in the hands of the government, the storage charges might have to come down, because on this side of the lakes they are lower than at the terminals. Suppose you take the winter storage at Fort William and compare it with the storage on this side of the lakes :

Elevating and 15 days free storage, ¾ cent and 1/30th cent per day for 4 months, total 4 cents per bushel, or 4¾ cents on 1,000,000 bushels..	$47,500
Elevator rates this side of lakes from 1st December to 1st May, including ½ cent elevation, equal to 1½ cents on 1,000,000 bushels, being the rate on this side of the lakes..	15,000

Making the extra charges at Fort William on 1,000,000 bushels $32,500 ; which shows that the storage rates there are abnormally high.

I shall not detain the House much longer, and must apologize for having been so long, but there was, I understand, judging by reports in the newspapers and discussions in the lobbies, a draft Bill under discussion between the government and the grain growers when the western delegation was here in December. That draft Bill, I am informed, contains some provisions which might be beneficially put in the form of legislation. I understand it was suggested that a commission should be established, to be located at Fort William and Port Arthur which would have entire charge of the grain passing through the elevators at these two points, and have full control over the administration of the two companies which own these elevators. With respect to government control, I do not see why a properly constituted commission, composed of men who thoroughly understand the grain trade, with proper facilities for carrying out the Manitoba Grain Act and the Inspection and Sale Act, and with ample powers given them under any amendment that may be introduced with respect to these two Acts—I do not see, I say why the elevators cannot be properly controlled and the manipulation of grain prevented by that system.

Mr. LENNOX. That would be commission appointed by the government, would it ?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I cannot say whether by the government or not, but I presume it would be. I do not know who else would appoint it.

Mr. LENNOX. Would that be part of the system the hon. gentleman advocates by way of carrying out this process of marketing the grain—a commission appointed by the government to carry out the operation instead of leaving it to private parties ? Or in what way does he expect to get the commission ?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Of course, when I referred to a commission, I had in mind a government commission, as I understand it, without ownership of the elevators. My hon. friend, I think, is referring to the matter of ownership.

Mr. LENNOX. No, but I thought the hon. gentleman was expecting to put them under the control of the government with a self-appointed commission—virtually, the government operating through a commission.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). It seems to me that whether the government owned the elevators or put a commission in charge, there would have to be a body of men to carry on the business and to apply the Inspection and Sale Act, and the Manitoba Grain Act in respect to these elevators.

Mr. LENNOX. I am sorry to interrupt, but the question I was referring to was whether the government would own the elevators or not. The government in that case, would have to own them or lease them, I presume ?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox), is quite correct. If the government decided to take these elevators over, they would have to own them or lease them. But I do not see how they could get along in any case without a commission or some body of men to supervise and operate them. I understand that it was also suggested between the farmers and the representatives of the government that more drastic penalties than those under the Acts referred to might be imposed under these laws.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Before the hon. gentleman proceeds, would he please explain whether the commission he refers to as being in charge of the elevators is a commission after government ownership has taken place or is it not ? I understand him to say that he saw no reason why a commission such as that suggested, should not make a success of preventing the anomalies that have occurred. Is that to be a commission under government ownership and operation or not ?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). When I made the statement referred to, I was speaking of a commission without government ownership.

Mr. MEIGHEN. And the hon. gentleman said he saw no reason why it should not succeed. Why then, does he say that government ownership and operation is sure to be the only solution of the difficulty ?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I have tried to make myself plain during the whole course of my address. Whether it is a commission or not, I believe that without government ownership and operation of these elevators, we should not have our grain properly dealt with. But, as I said a few minutes ago, I am prepared to support any legislation that I think is in the interest of the western grain producers and that

will assist in getting our grain to Liverpool in better shape than at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN. But what I do not understand is this: If the hon. gentleman says that it will not be a success, except with government ownership and operation, how does he make that consistent with the statement that he does not see why a commission without government ownership should not succeed?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen), need not attempt to show that I am advocating a commission to handle the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. I have said that I do not see why a system of government control is not as good as a system of government ownership. I have said also that the present system of government control is not a success, but that if any hon. gentleman can suggest a system of government control, that will prove a success, I will support it rather than government ownership, which I do not believe in as applied to utilities. At the same time, my opinion is, and has been for some time, that we will not get proper control of our grain in these elevators until some radical amendments take place and I believe that government ownership and operation will eventually require to be resorted to in order to properly protect the western grain producers against the men who are manipulating grain in these elevators.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is the hon. gentleman making any distinction between government ownership and government operation?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I am not sure in just what connection I used the expression 'government ownership'. As a rule, when I speak of government ownership, I mean government operation. If the hon. gentleman would draw my attention to any particular statement that I made, I would be better able to answer his question.

But, I wish to get through. I know that this is a delicate question with hon. gentleman opposite. I am a little surprised that the resolution which appears on the Order Paper in the name of one of these gentlemen from Manitoba had not tacked to it something perfectly consistent with the idea of protection. That would be in line with the plan adopted by these gentlemen in introducing a resolution with respect to lowering the tariff on agricultural implements.

But, before I was interrupted by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) I was going to refer to the matter of drastic penalties. I believe that, if, instead of the fines imposed by the present Act, imprisonment or drastic penalties of that kind imposed, the manipulation of grain might be more effectively prevented. I desire to refer to a statement made by Mr. F. W. Thompson, of the Ogilvie Milling Company, Montreal, as reported in a despatch to the Montreal 'Gazette' of November 29. Referring to the millers of Canada, he said:

> We have always been unalterably opposed to the mixing of Manitoba grains, and will be glad to see such amendments made by parliament to the Manitoba Grain Act as will effectually put an end to any possibility of mixing. The simplest and most effective way, in my judgment, to bring this about would be to impose such penalties as would largely exceed any possible gain to the guilty party.

So, there is some reason to believe that by heavier penalties we might help to solve this difficulty. It has also been suggested that, in case of violation of the Manitoba Grain Act, or the Inspection and Sale Act, the leases of the elevators should ipso facto expire—the breaking of the law would cancel the lease. And I have already suggested the elevators might be taken out of the hands of operators who have an interest in the grain passing through them.

One other point I wish to refer to. Whatever legislation is passed with respect to the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, must, of course, be made to apply to all the transfer elevators between those points and the Atlantic sea-board; that would be necessary in order to preserve the identity of our Canadian grain until it reaches the European market. I do not wish to trouble the House with more quotations, but there is one matter that I do not see how to deal with, and that is the matter of grain transhipped to Buffalo. There is no possibility, so far as I know, of preserving the identity of our grain transhipped at Buffalo, of which there is a large quantity. Legislation passed by us must refer only to elevators upon our own side of the line. Let me read on that subject a very brief quotation from Mr. F. W. Thompson, whose words on another subject I read a moment ago:

> In regard to the suggestion of government ownership of terminal elevators, this, of course, would involve an expenditure on the part of the government of a great many millions of dollars, and to carry out the object desired by those advocating such a course, it seems to me they would require to go far beyond the terminals at Port Arthur and Fort William. It would be necessary to take over in the same manner all the elevators through which the grain must pass in course of transit to and at the sea-board. Moreover, a considerable proportion of Manitoba grain is shipped through American ports via Buffalo, and, of course, Canada would have no control over it after it had reached that point unless an international arrangement can be arrived at for preserving the identity of Canadian wheat. We have recently been

informed by a Canadian exporting house that a system of mixing Manitoba wheat is being carried on at an American port, the grain being forwarded under another certificate issued at that port. As to whether it has gone any further than this we do not know, but it is plainly evident that if any change is to be made in the present system it has got to go infinitely farther than at present contemplated.

This proves that it is necessary to legislate with respect to the transfer elevators, as well as to the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and also shows the difficulty with respect to grain transhipped at American ports.

Now, in conclusion, let me say that no subject has been more prolific of legislation than the question of handling western grain. A great many beneficial amendments have been made to the Manitoba Grain Act in the last ten years. There was a time in western Canada when the farmer did not even have the right to get a car to ship his grain; the elevator companies and the railway companies were one vast monopoly, controlling all the cars, and no ordinary farmer could get a car to ship his grain at all. That difficulty has been long since removed, with many other difficulties, since the present government came to power. I believe there is no question which received more careful attention from the Department of Trade and Commerce than the handling and marketing of western grain, and I have every confidence that any legislation brought in by this government will be with the sole view of improving conditions at the present time existing in the west in the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. I have much pleasure in moving this resolution.

Mr. LENNOX. Before the hon. gentleman resumes his seat, I have one or two questions to ask him. I notice in the amendment which he introduced a couple of years ago regarding government ownership, he used the term 'undue mixture of grain.' In his resolution of to-day he speaks of the 'improper admixture of grain.' It would help us if the hon. gentleman would briefly tell the House what he means by these terms. For instance, when he speaks of the improper admixture of grain, is there any kind of mixture of grain that would be proper, or should be tolerated?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The improper admixture of grain means mixing different grades of grain. The mixing of the same grades might be proper.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. gentleman really mean that in his resolution? He is surely not dealing with the mixing of the same kind of grain backwards and forwards. But if you take one grade of grain and put it into another grade of grain, is not that improper, and to be prevented?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My hon. friend is quite right.

Mr. LENNOX. There is one other question. I think he has made it quite clear, because he repeated it several times, that as a result of the careful study he has given to this matter, nothing but government ownership and operation, in his opinion, will be effective. Now that being the hon. gentleman's view, would he tell the House whether he would advocate such ownership and operation by a commission appointed by the government, or by a department of the government?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I understand my hon. friend asks whether I would be in favour of the government directly operating these elevators, or by means of a commission. It is a subject that I am not sufficiently familiar with to express an opinion; but offhand, I would say a commission.

Mr. THOS. MACNUTT (Saltcoats). I desire to say a few words on this resolution before it is passed, as the subject affects not only the west but the whole Dominion. It is usually supposed that the farmers in the west are extremely prosperous, and can stand any kind of thing as regards tariff charges and so on. But let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the farmer of the west is up against a good many things. He is, as it were, a partner of nature; he supplies the labour, and nature supplies the soil and climate. But nature is sometimes very unkind to him, and occasionally we have too much rain and sometimes too little. Sometimes we have a devastating hail storm which wipes out all chance of crops that year. At other times, a frost visits the fields before the grain is mature, and ripens it in fact before it is properly filled. This accounts for the different qualities of wheat. Now, I think the farmer is perfectly ready to accept any chances where he cannot control them. But I do not think he is at all willing to accept the extortions of the middlemen and others who are handling his grain, and who are simply watching the farmer to see how much grain he is raising in order that they may see how much they can make out of him when he sells his grain. The farmer is willing to pay all legitimate charges and costs of hauling and handling. But there is a class of men, owners or lessees of the terminal elevators, who, it is well proved, are in the habit of manipulating the farmers' grain to their own pecuniary advantage, and at the expense of the reputation of his wheat. While my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin) was speaking, an hon. member asked him how this kind of thing is done, and my hon. friend replied that not being a farmer, he could not exactly say, but referred his questioner to a farmer. Now I happen to be a farmer, and I may say that I do not know

exactly how this is done; I think the only man that can tell is the grain manipulator himself. He has got the science down pretty fine. But I understand it is something like this. The grain is graded into probably six or seven different qualities. The qualities are established by purity, by colour, and by weight. Now if the grain buyer gets in a number of cars of different qualities of wheat, he will take some small quantity of the best grade and mix it with inferior grades so as to bring them up probably to the weight of an intermediate grade; and consequently he will get a bigger price for that grade. I have seen a great many farmers who have gone to the old country and have interviewed millers there. They have taken to the old country samples of our wheat, and have been informed by the millers there that they rarely ever saw wheat of that quality in the old country, if they did they were willing to pay a good price for it. One of my neighbours took a sample of No. 2 Northern which he had grown himself, and showed it to a miller in the old country, who told him that he rarely saw wheat of that quality, but he would be willing to pay a good price for it if he could get it. He gave my friend a sample of what he bought as No. 2, and when he came back to this country he showed it to the inspector who graded it as No. 4. Now that grain had been mixed in this way, and in this way we are losing the value of our wheat. When a miller looks at a sample of grain he says. This will make so much flour, it may be a No. 2 or No. 3, and we will fix the price at so much according to its milling value. Now if it is an inferior sample, if it is No. 2 or No. 3, yet inferior in milling qualities, the price is fixed lower. So they never really get our wheat in the shape in which it leaves the farmers' loading platform, or the local elevator.

What remedy should there be to prevent this kind of thing? I think it will be acknowledged that it exists. A system of government inspection was inaugurated and I am of opinion that to a certain extent it was successful although a great many are of a different opinion. I base my judgment upon the facts ascertained and the conclusions arrived at which proved conclusively that this manipulating was going on. It took some time to find this out. The government inspectors could tell the quality of the grain going out but they could not tell whether that was due to mixing or whether the grain came originally from the farmers in that shape, and until the stocks in the elevators got low no comparison could be made. When the stocks got low, the balance of the grain was weighed and graded, and then it was found that this manipulation had been going on. Several of those who were guilty of this offence were fined. It has been said that this fine was nothing in comparison to the loss and damage that has accrued to the farmers, but they were not suing for damages, they were proceeding under the Criminal Code and a penalty was imposed, as is usual in these cases, not as heavy as it might be, but probably the fine for the second offence would be very much heavier, and imprisonment would be added. I think that when men find that they are sure to be detected they will not steal.

Like the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin), I am not particularly in love with the idea of the government operating everything in sight. I think the functions of government are something different and that it is the duty and the privilege of private citizens to carry on the commerce and business of the country. But sometimes such government interference is necessary, and this may be such a case. At all events, it would give satisfaction to the farmers of the west, who are very uneasy owing to the existing state of affairs. If the terminal elevators were operated by the government, I think probably it would be the best plan. Under the present system there are a large number of inspectors and they are paid out of the general revenue. If the government purchased or leased these elevators, and the inspectors, who are expert grain men, were turned into operators, the cost of their salaries and rentals and insurance, &c., could be made a charge against the wheat. In that way a great deal of money would be saved and every one who raises any wheat is perfectly willing that all legitimate charges should come out of the wheat. I think also that a man should accompany every vessel loaded with wheat going to Port Colborne or Buffalo, and that he should accompany that wheat until it reaches the sea-going vessel, after which it could not be tampered with.

However, my reason for addressing the House is to point out the absolute necessity for a remedy that will be really effective. It is quite possible, I think it is quite probable, that the only system and the better system is for the government to take over the elevators either by purchase or lease and operate them under a commission. I believe that leasing would be best in the beginning. As a farmer, representing a farming community, I wish to place myself on record as being in great sympathy with this question. I know that these abuses have been going on, I know that very serious losses have occurred all through the west, it does not affect the east, I suppose, in the same way, but it certainly does affect the west as every western man knows. The problem is to provide a remedy, and I re-

iterate my belief that government operation under a commission would be the best. As there are other members who may wish to speak on this subject at length and as under the rules of the House this debate must close at six o'clock and may possibly not be resumed this session, I shall conclude my remarks in order to permit other members to express their views. I simply want to place myself on record as being strongly in favour of an effective system which will prevent the improper admixture of the farmer's grain. He is entitled to the market value of what he grows, less the cost of transportation, &c. Every one will admit that he is not getting that under the present system and therefore it is absolutely necessary that some better system be thought out and applied. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

Mr. A. MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). Mr. Speaker, it would be hard to overestimate the importance of the subject brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin). At the same time if I keep my remarks in due proportion to the meaning that he has chosen to throw into his resolution I shall be able to be very brief indeed. The hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt) who has just taken his seat, has gone so far as to assure the House that on this great question he thinks that probably the proper solution is government ownership and operation. The hon. member has proceeded so far along the line of solving that problem that I venture to think it probable he will actually reach a conclusion by the time the government Bill comes down for consideration by this House. As for the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) I can only say that I can quite understand the resolution he has moved, and with all appreciation for his personal qualities and without perhaps even casting a reflection on the lucidity of his language, I must say that I am unable to understand his speech. So far as I grasped his meaning the hon. gentleman finds that a very great evil and very great abuses exist in the grain trade, as the grain passes through terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur and other transfer elevators. Up to that point we have no quarrel with him; we have only to say that these matters have been brought to the attention of the House by hon. gentlemen on this side for some years back, that this abuse is now recognized on all hands as existing, and that the injustice of it has appealed to all sections of the country. So there was no necessity whatever of further impressing parliament with its importance because the First Minister in this House has already laid it down that there was an abuse that demanded a remedy. To that extent I cannot see that the hon. gentleman has accomplished much. His position in relation to the various remedies suggested, as I understand it, is this: He says he sees no reason why government control should not be successful; he advises, as he did some two years ago, the enforcement of the Grain Act as a solution, if that succeeds. He sees no reason why control by a commission without government ownership or operation should not be successful and he favours that, if that succeeds. And lastly he says that while he is personally adverse to the whole principle of government ownership and operation he believes it is a case for government ownership and operation and he also favours that, if it succeeds. So that, the hon. gentleman's cogitations lasting doubtless over many years has brought him at last to this remarkable point, that in a moment of daring he is willing to assure this House that whatever solution will be a success he is in favour of it. I must commend to the attention of parliament and the country the very great political enterprise of the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin). There was a meeting in a rural school district some years ago and the subject of discussion was what should be done with the school house in the cold winter months. There was a very large attendance and a great many were in favour of closing the school and a great many others were in favour of keeping it open. After wrangling for a very long time an old gentleman at the back of the hall got tired and he rose and made this startling speech: 'Gentlemen, we have been here now for a few hours, we have wrangled and quarrelled together and we are no nearer the point than we were when we started; now, I move that this school house be either kept open or closed up.' And, Sir, that is the attitude of the hon. gentleman for Regina as to a solution of the terminal elevator question. As far as the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt) went in the direction of supporting the principal of government ownership and operation his remarks would be much more in point if he had made them to item No. 8 on the Order Paper which is the resolution introduced this session and for many years by the hon. gentleman for Souris (Mr. Schaffner). But it is not the record of hon. gentlemen opposite to fall in line with a good policy or principle if it comes from this side of the House, and consequently these gentlemen opposite must precede it by this aimless and meaningless circumlocution put on 'Hansard' by the hon. member for Regina. I have no quarrel to make with the motion in so far as there is any virility in it; in so far as there is any meaning to it. I would move an

amendment to it along a line that meant something specific only that such an amendment would be simply anticipating the resolution now on the Order Paper in the name of my hon. friend (Mr. Schaffner). Clearly, the bulk of the discussion well may wait until we come to this masculine and virile resolution which brings the matter before the House in the form in which I submit it should be brought.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt). Mr. Speaker, I am sure I share with every other member on this side of the House, especially the members from west of the Great Lakes, a feeling of very keen disappointment at the remarks which have just been made by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) because I anticipated that when he rose in this House to discuss a question of such vital importance to the people of the west we would have heard from him something better than a criticism of the speeches of the hon. gentlemen who spoke before him. Sir, this question is of too much importance to the people to be made a sort of political football by the hon. member (Mr. Meighen) or anybody else. It is not a question of political expediency at all; it is a question that affects the marketing of the most important product of our western Canadian farmers and for that reason I find fault with the remarks of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) finds fault with the speeches of the hon. member for Saltcoats, and the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) in that they are too indefinite. Possibly my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) is a Solomon who possesses all the wisdom of the world, and knows the solution of every question off-hand, but does my hon. friend undertake to say that he knows a cure-all for all the evils of the grain trade of western Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does my hon. friend ask a question?

Mr. NEELY. Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If he will look in 'Hansard' at the speech I made last year he will see my views on the subject, and had he been here he would have heard them. My views have not changed since. I did not lay them before the House as the words of a Solomon. I laid them before the House as the straightforward view in definite form of an humble member of parliament.

Mr. NEELY. Well, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is a little more modest just now than he was a few moments ago, but even at this moment he does not undertake to say that his views provide the only solution of this question. I believe, Sir, that my hon. friends from Regina and Saltcoats were perfectly right in taking a moderate position on the question because I think a man would have a good deal of hardihood who would stand on the floor of this House and say that he had the only solution of this question that could be found anywhere in the world.

Mr. SPROULE. Did not the Grain Growers' Association which came to Ottawa declare it to be their judgment that the only solution was government ownership and government operation?

Mr. NEELY. They did make that statement, and they also told us that the tariff is the greatest evil that the farmers of Canada suffer from, and does the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) agree with that?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. member had better ask the Prime Minister.

Mr. NEELY. The Grain Growers' Association of western Canada expressed the view that government ownership and operation is so far as they see the best solution of this question.

Mr. SPROULE. Not the best solution but the only solution.

Mr. NEELY. I must point out to my hon. friend that the commission appointed for the purpose of investigating this question some four years ago, came to the conclusion that government ownership and operation were not necessary, and that proper supervision and control were sufficient or ought to be sufficient to bring about the alleviation of the evils from which the farmers were suffering. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) tells us that he has expressed an opinion which is undoubtedly in favour of government ownership and control, but this off-hand method of finding a solution of the question without thorough and painstaking investigation is sometimes likely to produce very disastrous results. Take the case of the political associates of the hon. gentleman in the province of Manitoba. They undertook without investigation, without the appointment of a commission, to remedy the evils of the elevator system, and the grain trade within the limits of their own province, with the result that they placed an Elevator Bill upon the statute-books of the province, and put it into operation. I am not going to discuss that Bill, I am not going to discuss whether it is a good move or a bad one, but I am going to mention this fact: That the commission appointed by the adjoining province of Saskatchewan with Professor McGill at its head, and the other two members being leading members and directors of the Grain Growers' Association of the province of Saskatchewan,

came to the conclusion after weeks and months of investigation, that the system adopted by Manitoba was not such as they would recommend to the government of Saskatchewan. I am not criticising the action of the government of Manitoba, but I am using that as an illustration to show how dangerous it might be to lay down here a principle as the only absolute remedy applicable to a certain situation before we have given the matter, by means of a commission or otherwise, a thorough investigation that will enable us to get all the facts of the case before coming to our decision.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Is the hon. gentleman aware that the report of the commission appointed by the Saskatchewan government was written and handed to the commission before they started out to investigate at all?

Mr. NEELY. I am not aware, neither is my hon. friend aware.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I think I am. It can be proven.

Mr. NEELY. I will not accept the statement of any hon. member of this House impugning the character and the dignity of the Saskatchewan Elevator Commission until the facts are laid before me in some definite form. I think my hon. friend has not strengthened his position in this House by making such an insinuation without delivering the goods. Why does my hon. friend make the statement? I say I am not criticising that commission one way or the other, and I am not criticising the action of the government of Manitoba one way or the other, and surely my hon. friend is not finding fault with what I said.

In reference to the resolution introduced by my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin), I am convinced that the government of this country is just as anxious to settle this question satisfactorily and in the best interests of the people of this country as the most enthusiastic and ardent supporter of western interests can possibly be. I heard the Premier of Canada, during his western tour last summer, make the statement, in answer to deputations of farmers who waited upon him, that as far as the question of terminal elevators was concerned, his government had put their hand to the plough, and they would not turn back until they had remedied the grievances complained of under present conditions. As to the method, he did not say that his government had decided what it should be, but he was prepared to go the length of government ownership and operation, if necessary, if that were the only remedy that could be afforded. We must remember that there are a great many things that may militate against the success of the farmers' operations. Many years ago, as my hon. friend from Regina intimated, the conditions of the grain trade in western Canada were very serious indeed. As a result of those conditions the farmers of the west became organized, and year after year they have come to Ottawa to lay their views before the government of the day in regard to the proper remedies for the evils that existed. The result has been that for many years past there has been an evolution in the grain laws of this country, an evolution, we confidently believe, wholly in the interest of the producer of grain. The establishment of a loading platform, the bringing into existence of the inspection of grain at Winnipeg, the introduction of government supervision and control at the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, have undoubtedly tended very largely to improve the conditions of the grain trade, and in recent years —in the last year, in fact—other changes have been brought about which, to my mind, have been responsible for a very great change in the grain trade of western Canada. I refer to the establishment at Fort William and Port Arthur of a clearing house, which was not in existence when this question was discussed in this House two sessions ago. Perhaps some hon. members will recall that on that occasion I called the attention of the House to one great loss from which the grain trade was suffering, in the fact that vessels which came to the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur to obtain loads required two or three times as long to load at those ports as they did at American ports, because of the absence of a clearing house. During the following summer the Department of Trade and Commerce, in agreement with the terminal interests at Port Arthur, established a clearing house, with the result that to-day, instead of finding great shortages on our Canadian shipping routes and a great loss of time in loading at Fort William and Port Arthur, the conditions are very much more satisfactory at these ports than they are at ports on the other side of the boundary in the same line of business.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Can the hon. gentleman give me the date when that clearing house was established, and can he say that it has anything to do with remedying the evils of which the farmers of the western country complain?

Mr. NEELY. It was established some time in the summer of 1909. It appears to me to be a very plain proposition that anything that causes loss or waste in the grain trade must affect the price to the farmer, and anything that stops the leaks from the time the grain leaves the farmer to the time it reaches its market must increase the price of the grain. The differences in the figures with regard to the shortages at the ports

across the line, and at our own terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, and on the lakes, are very remarkable indeed. The average shortage at Chicago during the last season was 22 pounds of wheat to the 1,000 bushels; at Milwaukee it was 22 pounds. The smallest loss from any American port was 11 pounds per 1,000 bushels. At Fort William and Port Arthur there was actually a surplus of 2 pounds per 1,000 bushels shipped, and that is undoubtedly due to the establishment of the clearing house, which enables the government officials at these ports to fix any shortage at its proper place, and thus bring about a remedy.

I say that there is, in connection with this clearing house, a registration bureau at Fort William and Port Arthur, and this has been a very great step in advance as far as the remedying of the evils of the grain trade is concerned. With regard to this registration bureau, there may be those not familiar with the grain trade who may not understand its objects and effects, and I may point out that although there was a prosecution of a terminal elevator company for having made false returns during the season of 1909, or for having mixed grain, I have not heard of any serious complaints with regard to this season's operation from the purchasers of grain, especially from Fort William or Port Arthur. I have not heard of any complaints regarding the handling of grain at these points, and I think that one of the chief reasons for this improvement is the establishing of a registration bureau at Fort William. The object of this bureau is this, and it has this purpose and effect, that just as soon as an elevator gets a car load of No. 1 Northern wheat, the shipper comes to this registration official, who is called the registrar, who acts partly as a government official and also in the interests of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and whose interests, so far as the terminal elevators are concerned, are identical with those of the western farmer. This registrar gives a receipt for the amount of No. 1 or No. 2 Northern, as the case may be, which the elevator man has received in car lots and has put into his elevator. This must correspond with the grade of wheat certificate furnished by the government weighmaster and inspector. When the elevator man wishes to ship out a certain quantity of No. 1 or No. 2 Northern, he must go to the registrar, and the registrar cancels his receipts to the extent of the amount shipped. When the elevator man is compelled to register with the registration bureau the amount of each particular grade of grain which he takes into his elevator and when that must correspond with the grade of wheat certificate of the government inspector and weighmaster, and when before he can ship out of his elevator any amount of any grade of grain, he must cancel the certificates or receipts with the registrar to the extent of the amount he ships out, can any one tell me how, at the end of the season, it is possible for that man to get away with mixing the grain at those terminals. What would be the benefit? If, for instance, he gets in 10,000 bushels of No. 1 Northern at the end of the season he has cancelled receipts or certificates to that effect, and the inspector goes into his bins and finds 100,000 more bushels No. 1 Northern in them—why it seems absurd a man should undertake operations that lay him immediately open to the clutches of the law. My hon. friends may ask how has it been done before. As a matter of fact this bureau was only established the past season, and since its establishment I have not heard of any serious complaint along the lines of those made in past years.

But there are dozens of other ways in which harm may come to the grain trade, apart from that which came in former years through the operations of these terminals at Port Arthur and Fort William. Take a case of this kind. A short time ago, in conversation with a wholesale baker who purchased flour which he supposed to have been made from wheat of a certain grade, he gave me this information. He was purchasing his flour from a certain miller in Ontario, supposing it to have been made from No. 2 Northern wheat. He found however, that the flour was very bad and not at all what it ought to be. So one day he took a trip to the mill and discovered that the miller was grinding out wheat that averaged No. 4 instead of No. 2 and was selling the flour as No. 2. He went to the miller and charged him with dishonesty, but the miller said that is the wheat I got for No. 2. Now I am absolutely convinced that it was not what that miller got for No. 2. Here is the situation. We have an inspection at Port Arthur and Fort William, but the man who is shipping the grain from those points to any point in Ontario, for instance, says to the seller: I do not want you to put the grade of that grain on your bill of lading. The wheat then comes down to Ontario without any grade marked on the bill of lading, and the miller, in the instance I have cited, may possibly have done this. He may have taken an old grade certificate, a No. 2 grade certificate, and have held that certificate instead of destroying it, and he may have shown that to the baker and have said to him: Here is the grade certificate for the wheat I am grinding into flour for you, when that wheat probably came to him without any grade certificate at all. There you find a side light on this question which shows us that after all the serious trouble in the grain situation, which in years past was at Fort William and Port Arthur, extends today to every point throughout Canada

where there is a transfer elevator. We must also remember that a considerable quantity of our wheat goes through the United States. The wheat that goes by the United States we have absolutely no control over from the moment it reaches an American port. The United States refuse to bond our wheat by the grade, they merely bond the quantity, so that in the case of wheat shipped to Buffalo or any other American port, all the shipper is responsible for is the quantity and not the quality, so that wheat of ours may reach the Liverpool market in a demoralized condition as the result of mixture that goes on across the line. I point this out simply to show that all the trouble is not centred, as some hon. members would suggest, at Fort William and Port Arthur, but that the whole grain trade of Canada is in such a position that the operator in grain who wishes to destroy the quality and grade of our grain as these grades are passed through the inspectors' hands at Winnipeg and Fort William has abundant field in any part of Canada. I call attention to these points to show that the question, after all, is not so simple as it might at first appear, and also to call the attention of the government to the fact that any schemes they may introduce—and as I said before, I am satisfied it is their intention to bring in something that will be satisfactory, that will touch the heart of the question—should have cognizance of the grain from the time it leaves the market at the farmers' door until it reaches Liverpool and other world market points.

My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie, (Mr. Meighen), has suggested that there is one remedy for the evils of the grain trade, and that is government ownership and operation. I believe that, before we can have successful government ownership and operation, if that be the necessary solution, we must have men trained to the operating of the terminal and transfer elevators. Thus, in my opinion, the very first step in the solution of this difficult question is the appointment of a commission as suggested by my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin). That hon. gentleman was asked as to the sort of commission he would favour, and I may very well be asked the same question. My answer would be that I would favour a commission with the very widest powers possible, so far as the handling of the grain trade is concerned. I would favour a commission that would hold the same relation toward the grain trade as the Board of Railway Commissioners holds toward the railways. Such legislation would not be entirely new, for such a commission already exists in the State of Minnesota, where, I believe, the conditions of the grain trade are probably more satisfactory than in any other part of North America. They have what they call a warehouse and grain commission which has powers and relations to the grain trade much the same as those held by the Canadian Board of Railway Commissioners in relation to the railways of Canada. The members of this proposed new commission should be men thoroughly versed in the grain situation. And they should be given wide powers; for, if they are the right stamp of men, they can be trusted with such powers. And they should have a length of appointment that would ensure them freedom from any political or partisan influence for a considerable number of years. They should not be subject in any way to corporation influence or control. Get such a commission, give them the powers I have indicated, and it would be in their province to make regulations governing the grain trade, not merely at the terminals, but in every part of Canada, including the Atlantic and Pacific seaports and also our future port on Hudson bay. I would go even further and give them power to send agents abroad to learn of the condition in which Canadian grain is reaching the markets of the world. I have already shown that our grain going through American channels is subject to being tampered with. That is a state of affairs that we could not directly remedy; but, if we had such a commission as I speak of, though they could not control that situation, at least they could notify the purchasers, or would-be purchasers of Canadian grain, that if they wished to secure Canadian grain pure and intact, as it left the inspection department at Winnipeg or at Fort William, they must specify that that grain must pass by all-Canadian routes. That also would be a very important matter that would tend very largely to raise the standard of our grain in the markets of the world. If such a commission were inaugurated, it would be one of their main objects, after having thoroughly familiarized themselves with the conditions as they exist, to come to a conclusion as to the best method of handling the terminal and transfer elevators. The views of this commission would be invaluable as to the necessity or otherwise of government ownership and operation.

Now, I am not prepared to advocate views simply because they are the views of somebody else; and, while all my sympathy goes out to the farmer, not only the farmer of the west, but all the farmers who in the past, have been subject to loss through manipulation of their grain, I must first be convinced that government ownership and operation is essentially and vitally necessary to remedy the evil. It is a very simple proposition, some hon. members would suggest, or may think, to take the step, to go into government ownership. Yes, but if it does not work well, it will be very hard to get out of it. Hon.

members must remember that the grain trade of Canada is only in its infancy. We talk of the large quantities of grain that have been shipped from western Canada within the last couple of years. Why, we are only on the fringe of things in the great west. So, if we take such a step to-day, no matter how sincere we may be, no matter how much we may think it in the interests of the grain producer, if what we do militates in the end against the grain trade, the evil resulting will grow with the years. Therefore, I say, it behooves us to go carefully. Insistent—as I am aware—as are the demands of the farmers of the west for the speedy remedy, and loud as some of them declaim that the only remedy is government ownership and operation, I am free to say that my advice to the government on this occasion would be to consider with the greatest care every step that they take on this question. If they make a mistake now, if they start out on a certain line of policy and that proves not to be what they expected, the harmful results in years to come would be inestimable.

Now, I want to call the attention of my hon. friends who are so strongly in favour of government ownership to one or two features of the government ownership and operation of terminal elevators, and other utilities of this kind. The large financial responsibility involved in the expropriation or purchase of the terminal and transfer elevators of this country is not a thing to be waived lightly aside. We must remember, as I have already remarked, that while at the present moment this would involve an enormous outlay of money, in the days to come when new seaports are established in Canada, and our grain trade increases, this will involve an ever increasing expenditure on the part of the government. I am not saying that the country is not rich enough to do this. I am simply reminding the House that we must not consider as a question of no moment the taking over of these elevators. There is another feature in this question. We might possibly have some difficulty in getting hold of these elevators, it might ultimately mean expropriation. I want to ask my hon. friends who are in favour of this principle if they consider that drastic measures of that kind at the present stage of Canada's development, form the best method we can adopt to induce foreign capital to come into this country for its development. The other day we heard a member of this House speak very strongly in favour of bringing our railways to account by reason of their excessive rates. These excessive rates probably exist to some extent, how far we do not know. But there is this to remember. The people of western Canada are so anxious to get railroads at the present time, no matter whose capital builds them, that I am quite certain the majority of the people would prefer to pay even excessive rates rather than have no railway transportation at all. So I say that we must be a little cautious how we proceed lest we discourage the investment of foreign capital in the enterprises that are necessary to develop this great country.

Another thing I would refer to the consideration of those who believe that government ownership and operation is the only principle to adopt. Any system that is adopted must be a flexible system. By that I mean that there must be no obstacle put in the way of the natural and easy flow of grain in the channels of trade as they now exist in Canada. I have already pointed out that it is essential that so far as possible we retain our Canadian trade in Canadian channels ; that is to say, we must encourage the shippers and buyers to ship grain by all Canadian routes if they wish the identity of that grain to be preserved until it reaches the markets of the world. Now, let this government undertake to impose conditions at the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur that will make the burden of shipping via those points onerous on the grain dealers, what will be the natural result? The natural result will be that trade will follow the lines of least resistance, and instead of the bulk of our grain going by Canadian ports as it does at present, we will find it directed towards American ports ; the grain will lose its identity, and we will lose the benefit of having it go by an all Canadian route. Take for instance, our customs and our post office administrations. We understand that there must be rules laid down for any government institution, and that it must be operated strictly according to those rules. You cannot leave everything at the discretion of the official who is operating. So conditions might arise under government ownership and operation that might be onerous to the man who is dealing in grain, and if that occurs once or twice in the experience of a grain dealer, the result will be that he will transfer the field of his operations to some place where conditions are not so onerous. Now, I am not suggesting that we should make the grain trade so flexible that the grain dealer can do what he likes with his grain ; that is not the point at all. I am referring simply to the problem of transportation, of getting the grain from the farmer's home to the markets of the world with as little friction and trouble as possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, in solution of this question, a method that will preserve the quality of the grain intact from the time it leaves the government

inspector at Winnipeg and Fort William until it reaches the markets of the world. I say again that government ownership and operation of the terminals and transfer elevators further east alone will not prove a solution of this difficulty, if, indeed, it be necessary at all to a solution of the question. This commission I suggest should have very large powers; they should be able, like the Railway Commission, to deal with every feature and phase of the grain trade from the initial elevator right through so far as our Canadian jurisdiction extends. There is no manner of doubt that to-day our law is too lenient. The men who in the past have been manipulating grain, making an improper admixture, under regulations less severe than we have to-day, have undoubtedly got off too light. The laws of the state of Minnesota are much more severe than are ours in regard to the penalties imposed. The question has been asked: What penalties should be fixed by a commission for elevator operators who break the laws? Unfortunately, many of the owners of our terminal elevators are not citizens of Canada; they reside in the United States, outside the jurisdiction of our law. The only remedy I can think of for that condition is that every elevator company operating at terminal points in Canada should be compelled to name and bond some prominent Canadian citizen, some business man on this side of the line, who would personally be responsible for the operation of their elevators. It would not be sufficient that the man who operates the elevator at a salary of, perhaps, $3,000 or $4,000 a year should suffer a penalty of 5 or 10 years' imprisonment for infractions of the law, there should be some substantial individual named as the representative of the company operating the elevator, and that person should be made responsible for any infraction of the law to the extent of any fine that may be imposed, as well as to imprisonment for that infraction. There is even a further penalty that may be imposed, cancellation of the license for a year or two years.

Mr. McKENZIE. Are the elevator companies incorporated?

Mr. NEELY. They are, and must have a license.

Mr. McKENZIE. Then they are subject to indictment and fine as corporations?

Mr. NEELY. But the penalties imposed under the present Grain Act are not sufficiently severe. I think that while this matter is under consideration the penalty should be made so severe and the power of the commission to exact these penalties be made so absolute that there would be no inducement to the terminal elevator operator to do anything but the right and proper thing. I have endeavoured to place before the House the different aspects of this question and to impress the necessity, before any definite principle is laid down by this House for the advice and direction of this government, that we should understand that the evils of the grain trade are of far greater extent than the manipulation of grain at Fort William and Port Arthur, that this mixing process may go on in any part of Canada outside of these ports and that whatever provision is made must be great enough and wide enough to protect our grain from the time it leaves the farmer's home market until it reaches not only the sea-board but the markets of the world.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). I do not intend to address the House at any great length on this question. I may say at once, on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread, that I will certainly support the motion presented by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) to-day; but in saying that I am thoroughly convinced that an operation will have to be performed on that resolution in order to squeeze out half a loaf. My friend from Regina referred to some very interesting figures of the amount of wheat grown in Saskatchewan. I only wish there were ten times as much grown there, and there no doubt will be at some future time. He made a comparison of the amount of wheat grown in Saskatchewan with the amount grown in Manitoba, saying it was about three times as much. I have not verified these figures but I have verified the figures that they have a province, given by this government, nearly four times as big as our little country of Manitoba, and I would like to know whose fault it is that our province is so small to-day? It is due to what I may call the ungenerous way in which the Prime Minister and his government have used that province of Manitoba.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SCHAFFNER I said I was not going to occupy the time of the House because I intend to bring forward at the very first opportunity a resolution which I believe will be definite, which is on the Order Paper and about the next in order. One of the hon. gentlemen said that we on this side of the House felt ourselves in a very delicate position. I have only to speak for myself, and if I may judge from the arguments put forward and the tremendous effort that has been made by hon. gentlemen opposite to speak on this question, it will not be difficult for a reading public to understand who are the gentlemen who are in a delicate position. So far as I am personally concerned, I am in no delicate postion, my position is

definite, is decided, and I shall, when the proper time comes, speak to that motion and support it, believing that it is right. A number of questions have been referred to to-day but I shall defer discussing them until my resolution comes up. One of these question relates to the government operation of so-called line elevators throughout Manitoba and the other provinces. I shall content myself to-day with repeating that I hope we shall reach the conclusion of this debate this afternoon in time to enable us to place ourselves on record as to how we feel in connection with the government ownership and operation of these important elevators throughout this country, the terminal elevators.

Mr. JAMES CONMEE (Thunder Bay and Rainy River). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to some of the hon. members who have been discussing this question that the trouble is not altogether with the terminal elevators. It is the general representation that there is a good deal of manipulation going on in these elevators. I happened to be in the House when the delegation of western farmers was here and I heard their arguments. The difficulty arises very largely long before the grain reaches the terminal elevators and it is a defect in part in the legislation. I believe that when the grain reaches Winnipeg, and it may be there purchased by A, B and C and transferred to the local elevators. I do not know what the practice may be to-day as there may have been some recent change within the last few months. It is not inspected into these elevators although samples are taken, but it is inspected when it comes out of the elevators and it is reinspected at the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. That leaves the door open for any amount of manipulation, it permits the operator to mix it as much as he pleases, to buy a low grade and to mix with it a certain amount of a higher grade and bring it out so it will all pass out as a higher grade. That cannot take place at the terminal elevator for the reason that the grain is inspected into the elevator and out of the elevator. According to the regulations the elevator company cannot give out a greater quantity of any particular grade than their records will show they have taken in. There ought to be no great difficulty in protecting the grain at the terminal elevator or elsewhere if the regulations go far enough. Under our banking system, there is no trouble to turn up the records at any time and find how a man's bank account stands, his deposits and audits, and so with the grain trade there could not be this manipulation if the regulations are enforced and proper records kept. I am not prepared to say that the regulations may not be improved, I am assuming they are sufficient if they are enforced. The only possible manipulation that could possibly take place at the terminal elevator is, that the inspector might say: This grain should be cleaned to a certain extent. It is graded No. 1 or No. 2 Northern provided a certain amount of small grain and waste material is eliminated, and if that full quantity is not taken from it then the grain will measure out more bushels than the certificate will show and to that extent there might be manipulation to the value of these few extra bushels of grain. I believe that has been frequently done, but it is an evil that could readily be prevented. I have not had an opportunity of reading the hon. gentleman's motion, and I am, therefore, perhaps at a loss in speaking to it, but I may say that the remedy would not be applied within a reasonable time by the taking over of the elevators under government control. The object of that is to remove temptation by having the staff in these elevators disinterested so that there would be no motive for the manipulation which now takes place. Well, Sir, I cannot see wherein there would be better protection for the public in that respect than there is to-day under the system of examination if the regulations are made properly workable, and if they are properly enforced. In that respect I fancy I agree more or less with the last speaker. Now, there is a good deal more than the terminal elevators to be considered. Grain is not inspected through all the country elevators; the grain buyers put their grain into the elevators in the country; they need not route it to Winnipeg; they may route it through to the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William, and in that case I admit there is very little if any opportunity for manipulation after the grain is shipped. But they may mix the grain previous to shipping it; they may say: Here, I can buy this at No. 1 Northern and this at No. 2, and this at No. 3. In my opinion these grains ought to be graded out No. 1, and they may be mixed, and if the buyer is a good judge he may get the No. 1 grade for the whole bulk of the grain he has purchased, and that does frequently happen. Then, as to our milling companies; the milling companies at Winnipeg, and Kenora, and Fort William, and all other points have their own elevators and they buy the grain without any restriction whatever as the regulations do not relate to them at all. They can mix it as much as they like, and they can grind the inferior grade or the better grades just as they please. The question is a very wide one, and if it is to be dealt with at all it seems to me there ought to be some system of dealing with it all along the line.

Now, there is another question in connection with this matter; there are certain elevators at different points in the country

that do not deal with custom grain at all; they are built by certain men for the purpose of handling their own grain. I am aware that there is a question of some dispute just now as to whether an individual or a company should be allowed to carry on that business. I am not going to discuss that question because it is considerably involved and there is perhaps a good deal to be said on both sides, but at first blush it does seem to me that it is rather an extreme measure to say to any company or person: you shall not put machinery into a building to clean the grain that you may purchase. I believe the whole question of the protection of the farmer who produces grain can be worked out by proper regulations, if these regulations are wide enough and broad enough and extend not to one, but to all points, and are enforced. If the door is left open at one point for a continuance of the evil it is sought to remedy, then the door will be left open for manipulation all along the line, and I do not believe that a remedy can be applied in that way.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). It is so near six o'clock that I do not propose to speak at any length on this resolution. Another reason why I shall not discuss the resolution at length is that it is very indefinite in its character, and a third reason is that just two items down on the Order Paper there is a resolution standing in the name of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) which proposes to apply a remedy in concrete form for the grievances which exist and upon which the House can express a definite opinion. In order to show the aimless character of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) I shall read it:

That in the opinion of this House, in view of the investigations recently made by the government into the conditions existing in the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and in view of the disclosures as a result of such investigations, it is in the interests of the western grain producers and of Canada generally that such measures be adopted by the government as will more effectually prevent the improper admixture of grain delivered to the several terminal and transfer elevators through which the grain of the western provinces may pass.

Now, that is a most indefinite and vague resolution, so indefinite indeed, that no one could offer any objection to it. It suggests no remedy and it leaves the hon. gentleman who moved it (as no doubt his object was) open to vote for any legislation that the government of which he is a follower may introduce into this parliament. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) approved of the legislation introduced into this House in 1908, and he expressed his approbation of it in a speech delivered here in 1909. He tells us that slowly and by degrees he has become a convert to government ownership, although it was rather difficult for us to ascertain what the hon. gentleman did pin himself down to, so contradictory were his statements. First he was opposed to government ownership, and then he was in favour of it; first he was in favour of operating these elevators under a commission, without government ownership, and when he sat down he left us altogether in the dark as to what were his particular views on the whole matter.

Now, this resolution in regard to the measures that should be adopted evidently did not meet with the approbation of his colleague from Humboldt (Mr. Neely), because that hon. gentleman's argument, if it meant anything, meant opposition to government ownership and operation of terminal elevators; otherwise, why did he point out to the government the disadvantages of such a policy? Why did he point out the expense of it, and say that it would necessitate expropriation and possibly drive capital out of the country? In fact, we do not need to read between the lines, because it was patent that the hon. gentleman was opposed to the measure suggested by the farmers of the west.

The hon. member for Regina paid a well-deserved tribute to the farmers who congregated in Ottawa in such large numbers prior to the holidays. In that tribute I can heartily join. The careful manner in which they prepared their case and presented it must convince us all that those gentlemen had made a careful study of the various questions dealt with, especially the question now under discussion, and on this question they came to the conclusion which, in my opinion at any rate, offers the only solution that would be satisfactory to the grain trade. The hon. member for Regina stated that he approved of their suggestions with reference to the tariff, because they advocated a lower tariff. He also approved of their suggestion regarding the Hudson Bay railway. Why did he not go a little further and say that he approved, also, of the remedy they suggested for the terminal elevator problem? If there is anything on which the judgment of the farmers should guide this House, it is the question under discussion. On the question of the tariff each of us is just as able, and possibly better able, than the average farmer to form our conclusions, whereas on this question, in which they are vitally interested, which they have been studying year after year in their various local associations and farmers' parliaments, they are in a much better position to express a competent opinion than on possibly any other question dealt with in their memorial to this House.

In the session of 1907-8 delegates visited

this government and parliament on this question. The transportation companies, the farmers, the elevator companies and the bankers were all represented, and, indeed, almost every other interest connected with the shipping of grain, and they had an interview with the Minister of Trade and Commerce in his room. To that meeting the members of parliament were invited, and we heard the discussions proceeding day after day pro and con. As a result of those discussions the Minister of Trade and Commerce undertook to prepare amendments to the Manitoba Grain Act, and they were subsequently introduced to this House during the same session. Just prior to their introduction, however, a small delegation of farmers came here, consisting of Mr. Langley, a member of the Saskatchewan legislature, and Mr. Mackenzie, the secretary of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, and they were here for some days. We on this side of the House were not honoured with an invitation to the conferences they were having with the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but we learned from some of the government members that they had access to those meetings. Session after session was held with regard to that Bill, but the Conservative members of this House were left entirely in the dark as to what was proceeding. However, when the amendments were brought down, they were the subject of criticism, not by hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House, but by hon. gentlemen on the opposition side. We expressed our conviction that the amendments introduced would not accomplish the purpose desired by the farmers, and the result has proved that our contention was correct. I remember, during the election of 1908, meeting a certain senator in my constituency, who, in defending the government's action on this question, took the ground that while they did not go so far as to provide for government ownership and operation of terminal elevators, they had given something just as good—like the proverbial dealer, who, when out of a particular article which is desired, offers something else which he asserts is just as good. The senator also said that the two farmers who were here, Messrs. Mackenzie and Langley, were satisfied with the amendments which had been introduced. I was rather surprised to hear that, for I felt convinced that it could not be so, and the very best evidence of that was that immediately after the election these same two gentlemen joined the farmers of the west in petitioning the government in favour of government ownership and operation of terminal elevators. Whether these two gentlemen had given their consent to those amendments merely until the election was over, for fear of injuring their political friends they themselves know best, but that the farmers of the west were not satisfied with the amendments proved to be correct, and both of these gentlemen have been since down here as delegates to protest against the present Act.

The hon. member for Humboldt has stated that he is in favour of a commission, not to operate the elevators, but something like the Railway Commission, to enjoy the very widest powers to make regulations with regard to the whole grain-growing trade of the country. The Railway Commission does not operate the various railways of the country, therefore I think my deduction is fair when I say that his suggestion was not that a commission should operate the terminal elevators, but should merely supervise the operation carried on under private ownership. This I am satisfied would not be any more satisfactory to the farmers than is the present Act.

Now the hon. member for Regina referred to the fact that the Royal Commission did not recommend government ownership and operation. They merely recommended a way of compelling the cleaning of the grain under government supervision by private owners. That is what the government provided for in the session of 1907-8, which has proved to be entirely unsatisfactory.

At the same time that the farmers were urging on this government to take over the terminal elevators they were also urging on the respective provincial governments in the west to take over the various interior elevators, and to operate them. The hon. member for Humboldt referred to the fact of the Manitoba government having done that, and while he did not condemn it, he left the impression upon the House that they had acted hastily, and he warned this government to take their time and not rush into government ownership and operation. We are not asking the government to do anything hastily. This question has been before this House for years. It has engaged the attention of this parliament and of previous parliaments, and it has been discussed by the press and by the farmers for years past. It is no new proposition. It is true, the Manitoba government did comply with the request of the farmers in that respect so far as the province of Manitoba is concerned. They appointed a commission on which two out of the three members are gentlemen who were suggested by the executive of the farmers' organization, in response to the government's request. These three commissioners are running the interior elevators to-day entirely independent of the government, except that the government is responsible to the people for the expenditure of the money. And still this does not satisfy some gentlemen in the province of Mani-

toba of the political faith of hon. gentlemen opposite.

But, in order to have the interior elevators working to the best advantage, the farmers of the west feel convinced, it is absolutely necessary for this government to act in concert with them, and take over and operate the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur as well as the transfer elevators on this side of the lakes. And, while it is felt that provincial ownership of the interior elevators will redound to the benefit of the farmers, it is believed that it will not be a full success unless the terminal elevators are operated by the Dominion government. That does not necessarily mean the purchase at extravagant prices of existing elevators. As has been suggested by hon. members in this House to-day, and on previous occasions, those elevators could be leased. In fact, in conversation, I have heard some of the owners of those elevators express themselves as willing to lease the elevators to the government, thus making unnecessary the expense that would be entailed upon the country of initiating this policy by purchase. A lease might be made for a term of years for operation by the government, for, personally, I have no faith in the public operation of elevators that are privately owned, even under a government appointed commission.

I shall have an opportunity on the resolution of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) to express further my opinion on the question of public ownership, so I need not trespass longer on the attention of the House.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). There is no doubt that the question under discussion is one of the big questions as far as the west is concerned. As was pointed out by one of the speakers on this side, a couple of years ago, some 80,000,000 of bushels of wheat passed through Fort William and Port Arthur. This is practically another way of saying that eighty million gold dollars passed through the elevators there. If there is anything wrong in the handling of this wheat by the men in charge of the terminal elevators, it is, beyond doubt, the duty of the government to find a remedy for that wrong. And, to my mind, this government, during all the time it has been in power, has shown every desire to deal in the best way with this question. During the past three or four years they have done much to better the conditions of the wheat trade throughout the western country and at the terminal elevators. I well remember that when the matter was under discussion two or three years ago, and when it was suggested that the government should take over and control the terminal elevators, it was felt by a great many who took part in the discussion that the same results could be secured by taking control of the elevators as would be gained by government purchase and operation. I am free to admit that I was one of the members representing the farmers of the west who took that view. I thought, and thought honestly, that if we had men in charge of the different elevators, we would be able so to regulate and control the wheat passing through these elevators and that such wrong-doing as had been complained of could be put a stop to. I expressed myself then, as I express myself now, as emphatically opposed to government ownership and government operation of anything in which these things can possibly be avoided. My experience of the government—not of this government alone, but of all governments, that we have had in Canada—in the operation of public utilities they have now in hand, does not induce me to support the taking over and operation by the government of any more public utilities. But I will go so far as to say that, if no other method can be adopted by which these 80,000,000 bushels of wheat, which in a few years will be 200,000,000 bushels of wheat, equal to two hundred million gold dollars, can be properly controlled,—if any combination of American wheat scalpers can get control of these elevators and practically pick out one dollar out of every hundred that goes through, then I say I am willing to go the length of government ownership and operation in this particular question. But I am not sure that all other expedients have been tried. I am satisfied now that the present system of operation by government control is not satisfactory. And I will tell you why it is not satisfactory. You may put a man in charge of an elevator, and he may be able to direct the men in the elevator where and how they are to handle the wheat. But he cannot be at a dozen places at once; and, in spite of everything he can do, and no matter how good a man you may select, if the elevator is owned by men owning also the interior elevators, whose object it is to make money by manipulating the farmers' wheat, that man cannot prevent that manipulation. Certainly, you cannot stop it by means of fines. Why, I look upon that fine of $5,000 that was inflicted upon one of them some time ago as practically a license to go on and do business. What is $5,000 to a terminal elevator? They could make double that in one day's mixing if allowed a free hand. If, as suggested by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), the law were amended and it were provided that if any elevator company were found guilty of fraudulent returns to the government or of mixing grades, their license would at once be cancelled and the guilty

parties would be imprisoned for one year for the first offence and three years for a second offence, I think probably you would get over that difficulty. We have some of the same men operating in the elevators in Fort William to-day, who were chased out of Minnesota—some of the same gang. They have a law in Minnesota, as I understand it, something on the line suggested by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), on several occasions. They have a commission there to operate the elevators, composed of men who are not in the grain trade and who have never, at any time in their lives, been connected with the grain trade.

I do not know sufficiently about the system in Minnesota to say whether it is an absolutely good one; but I know that in the states of Minnesota and Dakota they had years ago the same difficulties in dealing with the question that we had some years past in the west—exactly the same only a good deal worse. But they have largely overcome them and, as I understand from grain men, millers and exporters, the present system applied in the terminal elevators at Minnesota is giving satisfaction. So that, while I am not at all sure about it in my own mind, if something in that line can be effected here which will give the same satisfaction as government ownership and operation, that would suit my ideas a good deal better.

Mr. ROCHE. Was the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) correct in his surmise that they allow mixing in Minnesota at present?

Mr. TURRIFF. I am not sufficiently familiar with their system to be able to speak definitely. All I can say is that I have spoken with a number of men who have looked carefully into the subject, and they have expressed the opinion that the Minnesota system of handling their terminal elevators by an independent commission, who have never been connected with the grain trade, was working very satisfactorily, so satisfactorily that these men who are now scalping wheat in Fort William and Port Arthur were driven out of business in Minnesota because they could not do business along the lines they wanted to and consequently drifted into our country.

Mr. CONMEE. They are still in business in Minneapolis, St. Paul and Duluth as well.

Mr. TURRIFF. They may be, but they are doing business on a different basis from the way they are doing it in Fort William and Port Arthur. The trouble is that the terminal elevators have got out of the hands of the railways. As long as they were in the hands of the railways there was no great dissatisfaction. The Canadian Pacific railway always handled their elevators well. In Fort William and Port Arthur, that company always gave very good satisfaction. There used to be some objection to the charges made for the handling of wheat, but there was never any charge that the terminal elevators, owned and operated by the Canadian Pacific railway, ever tried to do the farmers up for the benefit of the dealers. There was no object in their doing so. Later on, however, when the Canadian Northern railway built its elevators in Port Arthur, it leased the operation to Americans, who have subsidiary companies all through the west and own hundreds of elevators in all parts of the three prairie provinces. There is where the difficulty originated. The trouble has been that they use their opportunities to the great disadvantage of the farmers. There is no doubt in my mind that some of the regulations made during the past year by the Department of Trade and Commerce are a long step in the right direction. It has been pointed out to me by men in the grain trade this winter that now it is most difficult for any of these terminal elevators—no matter how anxious they may be to do wrong—to do so without being caught. But here I want to say that I do not believe you can watch them successfully. They will find some way of getting around the law. What we want in the west, what the western farmer and the Ontario millers, and the exporters want, is to be able to buy 100 cars of No. 3 Northern wheat and be sure of getting that grade. And mind you there is a spread of 4 cents between No. 2 and No. 3 Northern, those 100 cars will average about half way up between No. 2 and No. 3 Northern, so that the wheat will be worth 1¾ cents per bushel higher than the price of No. 3 Northern, and will average that. What we want to accomplish is that when a farmer sells his wheat, the man who buys will be able to get that same quality and not a grade that is skinned right down so that it will barely scale say to No. 3 Northern. The question is how best we can accomplish that. This is not a political matter in any sense, and any one who tries to bring politics into it is very foolish and will not succeed in gaining anything.

Every one in the west, and I think also in the east, wants to have something done that will enable the farmer to get a fair price for his wheat. I have heard it often said that the grain dealers do not make more than a fair profit. There is a good deal in that, but I will tell you why. A grain dealer will make $50,000 a year up from the business but he will then go and speculate on margin in the Chicago market, and lose $45,000 of his $50,000. Then he will say that he has worked a whole year and invested a lot of money and only made $5,000.

There is not only difficulty in the way of grading, but there has been a certain

amount of difficulty in connection with the weighing of wheat. When I was in the west some two or three months ago, I went into the matter somewhat fully, and it was made clear to me that a good deal of the difficulty which occurs from the weighing of wheat in Fort William and Port Arthur elevators comes from the fact that a lot of those elevators are old, and not from any desire to do wrong or injustice. They were built many years ago and their weighing machinery is obsolete, and when you have a thousand cars coming in in a day, as often happens in the rush in the fall, it is very difficult to give the same attention to each individual carload as should be given to it. I was asked by one man who was very much interested in having the weights correct whether something could not be done to have those elevators supplied with proper weighing machinery. Either the government should take them over or see that they were equipped with up to date machinery, or those who are running them should be compelled to put in such machinery so as to do away with the possibilities of making mistakes and causing dissatisfaction to the shippers.

Another difficulty is in connection with the cleaning of the wheat. For instance a farmer ships a carload to his commission agent in Winnipeg and the inspector grades it No. 2 Northern with a dockage of 5 per cent. That goes down to one of these terminal elevators, owned by a private company; and supposing they only take three per cent cleanage out of it, they can put it in and ship it out with the grade, and they just make that much in the weight. Something, therefore, ought to be done.

Something must be done. Either we must have a commission to take charge of those elevators and run them—and I cannot conceive how the commission could run them if they were owned by private individuals. If they were owned by railway companies, then it could be done, because railway companies have no object in doing anything but what is absolutely fair as between seller and buyer. But if the elevators are still to be owned by private companies who are working through the west, I do not see how you can obviate the evils that are said to exist, and that no doubt do exist at present.

Mr. LANCASTER. Has the hon. gentleman any suggestion to make other than government operation? Does he think government operation would cure these evils better than anything else?

Mr. TURRIFF. I am free to admit that I am not sufficiently familiar with the merits or demerits of the Minnesota system to say whether it would overcome the evils we have complained of. Under the Minnesota system, I do not know whether the elevators are owned by warehouse people or by interior elevator companies. I cannot say that at present I have any proposition in my mind that I feel would be satisfactory, outside government ownership and operation. But I want to say that if any other system can be found that promises to be equally effective, then, on the general principle of being opposed to government ownership, I would rather see that tried. But I think the commission system is at least the best adapted to government ownership and operation, and would result in the fewest difficulties. The western farmer is a reasonable man, he has never objected to paying for inspection, or weighing, or for freight charges. He is quite prepared to pay all the charges on every bushel of wheat he ships. So the government could take hold of these elevators and run very little risk of making any losses, because it is a much simpler matter to deal with than most other public utilities. But I want to point out that there are some serious objections to the government taking over these elevators. You may go ahead at present and build a new elevator with reinforced concrete, or brick, or of some fire-proof material; but you can operate that elevator so much more cheaply than the old elevators built ten, fifteen or twenty years ago, at Port Arthur and Fort William, that if the owners of those old elevators were to hand them over to the government as a present, the government could not run them any cheaper than they could build up-to-date new elevators, and make the other charges.

Mr. LANCASTER. What would be the objection to doing that?

Mr. TURRIFF. Obsolete machinery in the old elevators, and another objection is the matter of insurance. In an up-to-date elevator, if it is absolutely fire-proof, you do not have to insure, because nothing in it can burn. But the old elevator is a wooden construction which has to be insured, along with perhaps a million bushels of wheat worth a million dollars; and although the rate is reasonably low, still it runs up. It was explained to me in Winnipeg three or four months ago that the cost of operating one of those old elevators to-day, if you got it for nothing, would be higher than the interest on a new up-to-date elevator.

Mr. LANCASTER. Assuming it were wise for the government to operate them, what would be the objection to building new and properly equipped elevators upon the same sites as the old elevators?

Mr. TURRIFF. This objection, that these people put their money into a legiti-

mate business years ago, built the elevators, according to the best method that was known at that time, and it would be unfair to pass legislation to put them out of business, and give them nothing at all for their property. So the government, in buying and running these elevators, will have to pay a great deal more than they are worth. That is one objection, but it is not an insurmountable objection. It would be better to do that even, if you could thereby stop the manipulation, and, mixing, and deterioration that goes on to-day. I claim it would be better for the government to take them over, even if we paid for them more than they were worth, and I scarcely ever yet knew of any government buying a thing without paying for it more than it was worth.

Mr. LANCASTER. Could not that be remedied by proper arbitration?

Mr. TURRIFF. I have seen a good many arbitrations between the government and individuals, and the government nearly always have to pay more than the private individual could get for it if he sold it to any one else. That is one difficulty, but it can be overcome. Now, with reference to the general question of public ownership, I was very sorry to hear my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe), who is usually a very mild and reasonable gentleman, make such an insinuation as he did on the members of the Saskatchewan commission. That commission was composed of a noted professor, I think from the lower provinces, who was chairman; one of the other members was president of the Grain Growers' Association of the province of Saskatchewan, and the third man was one of the executive of the Grain Growers' Association of Saskatchewan, and a member of the local legislature. To make the statement that this commission had their report written out and put into their hands before they ever started out to take evidence was, to my mind, an insinuation and a slur against the honour of these gentlemen that was altogether uncalled for, unless the hon. member was prepared to lay on the table of the House the absolute proof of that statement. I know Mr. Green, and I know Mr. Langley. I do not know Prof. McGill, but I am satisfied money would not hire either of these gentlemen to do such a thing. I think my hon. friend from Lisgar, when he comes to think it over, will feel it his duty to rise in this House and withdraw that statement. It is not a statement that should be allowed to go out into the country without contradiction. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) felt a little warm over Manitoba being small. It is true Manitoba is not as large as some of the other provinces, but I might ask who formed the province of Manitoba? I remember the occasion, and it was done by the government of Sir John A. Macdonald. A little later on, the Manitoba government thought the province was not large enough, and asked to have it enlarged, and the government of Sir John Macdonald, who had some very good points about it, gave them all they asked for, every acre. Then my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) starts in to abuse this government because the government of which he was a supporter many years ago, on two different occasions, in dealing with this subject, gave the people of Manitoba all they asked for. Now they try to put the blame on this government. I remember some years ago, when the present premier of Manitoba came to my part of the country, then the district of Assiniboia, and had the nerve to propose that we in Assiniboia, then part of the Northwest Territories, should agree to the extending of the western boundary of Manitoba up to about Moosejaw. That would have been all right, perhaps, for the present premier of Manitoba, but it did not suit us at all, and the province of Manitoba can never be extended on the west. But there is a great tract of country there to the north, which can be included in the province of Manitoba, and in reference to which this government has made reasonable offers to the people and the government of Manitoba, so although the province of Manitoba has not yet been enlarged, the blame does not lie with this government, but lies at the door of the present government of Manitoba. Thus I do not think any point can be made against this government in that respect.

Mr. ROCHE. Is it a fact that the legislature of Saskatchewan, at its last session, unanimously passed a resolution in favour of the Dominion government taking over the terminal elevators?

Mr. TURRIFF. I could not tell the hon. gentleman if they did or not. I am not aware. I regret that it is six o'clock, as there is a great deal more I would like to say on the subject.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is expected that to-morrow Mr. Fielding will make a statement to the House, and then we will take up Bills, probably the Bill in regard to the waterways.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 26, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

BANKING AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, if this is the proper time, I would ask leave to bring up the motion I made yesterday, which the hon. member for North Toronto suggested should be left over for consideration until to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the committee from which the report is made has between 70 and 80 members. That is a pretty large committee, and it seems as if we shall scarcely get from that committee such an authoritative revision and recommendation on matters concerning banking and commerce, as shall have force in this House, if we now reduce its quorum to 15. This would make it possible to get measures through the committee by drumming up a very few members, whose recommendation might not be at all representative of the majority of the committee and would hardly be called authoritative for this House. I would be very sorry to see the quorum of the committee reduced to 15. Possibly this talk and warning may have the effect of advertising members of that committee that they should be a little more careful in attending to their duties. I shall take that as a warning and advertisement to myself. The whole trouble arises, as I have said before, and as the Prime Minister has agreed, from having too large committees, so that when three or four are meeting on the same day, it is impossible for the members to attend properly to their duties on any one of them. Maybe this little discussion, and this statement of what seems to be coming if that committee does not attend to a greater extent to its duties, will be sufficient to bring about the desired end, namely, that it shall be a working committee. Nobody desires that it should be made any smaller than is absolutely necessary to gain the ends of revision and recommendation to this House.

Mr. MILLER. I think the hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that the membership of the committee is from 70 to 80. However, when only 15 members of the committee are in attendance, it does not necessarily mean that 55 or 65 are neglecting their duties.

Mr. FOSTER. I will set the hon. gentleman and myself right by saying that the clerk informs me that there are 134 members of that committee. This reduces the idea of making 15 a quorum for such a committee pretty well to an absurdity.

Mr. MILLER. It does not necessarily mean that all the members who are not present are neglecting their duties, because, as a matter of fact, every member of the Banking and Commerce Committee is also a member of at least one other committee, and many of them members of two or three other committees. Several of these committees meet at the same time. Yesterday there were meetings of the Committees on Agriculture, Banking and Commerce, Public Accounts, and Printing, and many of the 130 members of the Banking and Commerce Committee were actually in attendance on these other committees. It would be very desirable if we could get every member of the Banking and Commerce Committee to attend and take an interest in the business of that committee. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said just now that he would take this discussion as a warning to himself that he ought to be more constant in attendance on this committee. If so, that would bring about a very good result because the hon. gentleman is a member of this committee, and not very constant in his attendance. In saying this I am not implying that he is in any way neglecting his duties because no doubt, when not present at the meetings of this committee, he is doing possibly better work in connection with his public duties elsewhere. But that is also the position of many other members of the committee. The whole matter was carefully discussed in the committee on Wednesday morning, and both sides were unanimous in the opinion that the quorum ought to be reduced. Under present conditions, and that no doubt applies to many other committees, if business is to be proceeded with at all the chairman has to see a quorum when really there is none. Rather than have the committee do business in that irregular way, it would be better to have the quorum reduced.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I went to the trouble this afternoon to secure a copy of the printed list of committees in order to ascertain whether I was a member of this Banking and Commerce Committee, and I did so because I have never yet this session received a notice to attend any of its meetings, and it is quite possible there may be other members who have likewise not been notified.

An hon. MEMBER. Here is one.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I take great care to note my committees in my diary. The night before last I had only two and yesterday two, and was quite surprised to read in the evening papers that there was a meeting of this Banking and Commerce Committee. Before any action be taken, we should have this matter referred back to

the committee, and have a full meeting. What is the use of holding hole and corner meetings, at which only some of the members are present, and then passing resolutions. No doubt it is very easy not to have a quorum if the secretary neglects to notify the members of a committee to attend the meeting, and the fact that all the members of this committee were not notified to attend ought to induce the hon. member to withdraw his resolution for the present.

Mr. SPROULE. During the discussion which was held at the last meeting of this committee, it was quite apparent that there was great difficulty in getting a quorum. No doubt that is partly due to all the members not being notified, but I think the chief trouble is the number of committees which hold meetings on the same day. Greater care should be taken not to have so many committees meet on the same day. When the meeting of the Banking and Commerce Committee took place, there were three other committees being held and members could not attend them all, so that necessarily there would be a slim attendance at some of these. But because of the length of time taken in waiting to get a quorum, the suggestion was made to reduce the quorum. I think, in the first place, that the committee is entirely too large. The quorum would seem to be a small one compared with the size of the committee, but it is a reduction from 21 to 15, and it seems to me that if we reduce the quorum at all 15 is a fair number. My experience of late years is that the business is done by a few members, perhaps from 10 to 25. There may be a quorum at the start, but members leave and even if there be then no quorum, the business still goes on. One of two things ought to be done. Either an arrangement should be made not to have so many committees called for the same day or the size of each committee should be reduced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Everybody will agree that the evil is that the committees are altogether too large. That matter was discussed by my hon. friend opposite and myself when we were forming the committees this year, but we did not think it advisable to make any alteration in the number during the present parliament, but to wait until the new parliament and then endeavour to reduce the committees to a practical number.

Mr. HENDERSON. I believe that to a certain extent I am responsible for the motion to reduce the number from 21 to 15. The reason for this motion was that if the number was reduced we could do business legally and regularly and not do, as at present, the work with a lesser number than is required by the rules of the House. I may say it is no unusual thing to find a small meeting of the Banking and Commerce Committee. I do not understand that every member who is on the list is expected to be present, but the idea of putting a large number on the committee is to give an opportunity of attending to any member who has any special interest in any matter that comes before it, and if there is nothing before the committe in which he is specially interested he is not called upon to attend. There is a good deal in what the chairman says, that the business of that committee from year to year is conducted by a few members, and I am not aware that the business is not just as well done as if a hundred were present. I remember on one occasion—I have not mentioned it before, and I mention it now to show how difficult it is to get business through that committee—on one occasion a good many years ago only two members of the committee turned up, the chairman even was absent, and a matter of some importance, at least requiring immediate attention, was to come up. I was moved to the chair by the other member, the other member made the motion, I put it, the clerk drew up the report, the report was adopted and presented, and I never heard that what was done on that occasion by two members was not just as well done as if it had been done by the whole quorum. However, I promised to myself that I would never repeat that. Perhaps it was not the proper thing to do, and I have no desire to repeat it. But I do not think the members of that committee are all expected to attend a meeting, when there are three or four committees sitting, but it gives the members of the House an opportunity, when there is anything special before the committee, of going there and expressing their opinion, and voting on the question. The same thing applies to the Committee on Railways and Canals that has, I think, 160 or 180 members. You never find them all there, perhaps not much more than half of them. Yet we have an opportunity, if a special circumstance calls for it, to be present. I do not object to putting the number back to 21 again if the members will only attend the committee. But let us do it in a legal way, instead of doing business without a quorum.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am a member of that committee, and I did not receive a notice of this meeting at which I understand this resolution was passed. I think at a meeting where you are proposing to change the number, we should all have an opportunity of being present and discussing it. This year especially, when the Bank Act is coming up, perhaps one of the most important Acts that has ever

been before that committee, it is hardly fair that the members of that committee should be reduced just at this time. I think the Prime Minister should ask the mover of this resolution to let it stand, in order that we may have an opportunity of discussing it at a fuller meeting of the committee. I do not agree that the numbers should be reduced. We are all interested in everything that is going on in that committee, and in knowing what is going on. I think, therefore, that there should be no hesitation in withdrawing this resolution, or letting it stand until we have another meeting of the committee, where we can thrash the question out, and if a majority agrees that the number should be reduced, I am willing to fall in line.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). As a member of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, I want to remind the chairman that he is in error when he said there are three or four committee meetings at the same time. The Banking and Commerce Committee is generally called, and was called, at 10.30; the other committees meeting on the same day were not called until 11 o'clock, and there was plenty of time for the members of this committee to meet at 10.30, and put in half an hour's work before they went to the other committees. If we cannot get a quorum at 10.30, it is not on account of other committees meeting at the same time. I think the quorum is quite small enough at 21 on an important committee like this.

Mr. NESBITT. Let me point out that the proposition is only to reduce the number of the quorum, because some times we have to wait a long while for a quorum to appear. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said the meeting was called at 10.30 and though we waited till 11, sometimes then we did not have a quorum. That is why the suggestion was made to reduce the quorum. I want to point out that we do not propose to reduce the number of the committee at all, but only to reduce the quorum, so that we can go on with the business instead of sitting there and waiting all the morning for a quorum to turn up.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would suggest that the chairman withdraw the motion and let it come again before the committee.

Mr. MILLER. I have no objection to withdrawing the motion. I may say that I had no idea that every member of the committee had not received a notice. The clerk of that committee is usually very careful. I shall speak about that, and see that every member does get a notice of the future meetings.

Motion withdrawn.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 101) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Sealey.

Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the Imperial Traction Company.—Mr. Rankin.

QUESTIONS.

(The questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

EASTERN DIVISION OF NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—OVERBREAK.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. In those cases in which agreement was come to last autumn between Mr. Kelliher and Mr. Gordon as to overbreak on the eastern division of the Transcontinental railway, what quantities of material, and of what class, and what sums of money were taken from or added to the progress estimates?

2. In the case where measurements had to be made, have they been made, and with what result?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would ask my hon. friend to make a motion for a return. I am endeavouring to get the information as rapidly as possible.

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

EASTERN DIVISION OF NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—TOTAL COST.

* Mr. BORDEN (Halifax):

What was the total cost up to the 31st day of December, 1910, of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. The returns are not all in.

REDUCED RAILWAY RATES FOR CLERGY.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Is the government aware of any statute or railway regulation, now or formerly in force, under which the clergy of Canada, or any of them, are or were entitled to receive transportation from the Canadian railways, or any of them, at less than the regular tariff rates?

2. If so, when was such statute or regulation passed or made, is it now in force, what railway companies does it affect, and what is the extent of its application?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no statute to this effect. But the state owned railways of Canada do now, and have for years, granted half fare to any clergyman of any denomination making a request for it.

DREDGE 'NORTHUMBERLAND.'

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. What is the name, place of residence and occupation on ship, of each member of the crew, officers and men, of the dredge 'Northumberland'?
2. What members of the crew are at present on wages on the dredge?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. U. H. Lyons, Master; E. Nickerson, Mate; J. A. Ledingham, Chief Engineer; W. Curry, Second Engineer; C. Hannon, Operator; G. Jollimore, Assistant Operator; A. McDonald, Assistant Operator; H. McKinnon, Boatswain; U. Rafuse, Cook; W. Abbott, Steward; W. Hopkins, Oiler; W. Oaks, Oiler; E. Marden, Oiler; R. Bone, Fireman; H. Campbell, Fireman; J. Brownrigg, Fireman; D. McCrie, Fireman; B. Abbott, Night Watch; A. Rafuse, Deck Hand; T. Wood, Deck Hand; J. Montague, Deck Hand; G. Little, Deck Hand; H. Mills, Deck Hand; J. Dalton, Deck Hand; J. Hansford, Deck Hand; G. Chambers, Deck Hand.

The department does not keep a record of the changes in residence of the men employed on the dredges, and I am unable to answer that part of the question which asks for the places of residences (which, I assume, means the present places of residence) of the crew, officers and men.

2. Watchmen.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY AND TEMISKAMING AND NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Has the government, or the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, entered into any agreement or working arrangement of any kind with the province of Ontario, or the commission operating the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Company, regarding the securing of running rights, or right of way, for the National Transcontinental railway over the lines of the Toronto and Northern Ontario, between Cochrane and North Bay, or Scotia Junction, or any other point? If so, what are the particulars of the transaction?
2. Is it the intention of the government, or the commission operating the National Transcontinental railway, to discontinue the construction of this railway, in whole or in part, either permanently or temporarily, east of Cochrane, being the point of junction between the Toronto and Northern Ontario railway, and the National Transcontinental railway?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.
2. No.

Mr. GRAHAM:

IMMIGRATION BONUSES.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. Did three Swiss girls named Wilhelmina Kuhner, Antoinette Chatelaine and Ida Brant, arrive as immigrants in Canada in August, 1910?
2. If so, were any bonuses paid to any steamship company or to any booking agent for bringing them into Canada as domestics?
3. If so, to whom was the bonus paid and when?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. See answer to 2.

Mr. ROBB:

1. What was the total amount paid in commissions to immigration agents and booking agents for immigrants sent to Canada, during the last fiscal year?
2. Are commissions paid on the approval of report showing the number of tickets issued, statements showing number of immigrants sent to Canada, or is the commission retained until the immigrant has been accepted to the citizenship of Canada?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. $52,261.
2. Commissions are paid on proof of arrival of the immigrants in Canada.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—STE. PERPETUE STATION.

Mr. TURCOTTE (Nicolet):

1. Did the Department of Railways and Canals call for tenders for the construction of a station at Ste. Perpetue in 1896?
2. If so, did Louis Gilbert tender for that work, and what was the amount of his tender?
3. Did the department decide to accept such a tender, or did they decide to do the work by day labour?
4. If they decided to do the work by day labour, what was the cost of such work?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.
2. Yes, $1,397.
3. No. All tenders were considered too high and it was decided to have the work done by day labour.
4. The cost of the work by day labour was $898.94.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. Who are the present members of the Quebec Harbour Commission?
2. When were these last appointments made?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1 and 2.	Appointed.
Jean Baptiste Lalibertè	Oct. 3, 1896
Wm. M. Macpherson	Oct. 3, 1896
Roger Larue	Jan. 19, 1907
J. S. Thom	Aug. 31, 1907
George Tanguay	June 29, 1910
Lorne C. Webster	Aug. 1910
Wm. Molson Dobell	Aug. 1910
Cleophas Auger	Mch. 16, 1909
G. A. Vaudry	Aug. 1, 1910

COLD STORAGE STATIONS.

Mr. PAQUET:

What amount has been paid for cold storage depots during the fiscal years 1907-8, 1908-9 and 1909-10?

Mr. FISHER:

1907- 8	$18,824.27
1908- 9	36,709.74
1909-10	24,085.85

EXHIBITION GRANTS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What exhibitions, local or otherwise, have been subsidized in our country since the 1st January, 1908, to the 1st January, 1911?
2. What was the amount of each of these subsidies?
3. What exhibitions have been subsidized outside of Canada since the 1st January, 1908, to the 1st January, 1911, and what was the amount of each of these subsidies?

Mr. FISHER:

1 and 2. To effect the holding of Dominion exhibitions, the following subsidies have been given: Toronto, Ont., 1903; Winnipeg, Man., 1904; New Westminster, B.C., 1905; Halifax, N.S., 1906; Sherbrooke, Que., 1907; Calgary, Alta., 1908; St. John, N.B., 1910, $50,000 each.

The government has undertaken to make a similar grant of $50,000 to the Regina, Sask., exhibition, 1911.

In addition, a grant of $10,000 was made to the Prince Edward Island exhibition in each of the years 1906 and 1910.

3. No exhibitions outside of Canada have been subsidized. The Dominion has participated in the following foreign exhibitions: London, 1908; Seattle, 1909; Brussels, 1910.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ICE CONTRACTS.

Mr. MONK:

1. Who obtained the contract last year for supplying ice to the Intercolonial at the stations of Rivière du Loup and Ste. Flavie?
2. At how much per ton did the contractor engage to furnish the ice for the two stations in question in the terms of his tender?
3. How much a ton was he paid during the season in question for the ice at the two stations above mentioned?
4. Who was the lowest tenderer in each case?
5. Did Mr. Polycarpe Ouellet, of Rivière du Loup, tender for the ice at each of these stations, and what was his price per ton of ice in each case?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Polycarpe Ouellet, of Rivière du Loup, obtained the contract for the ice required at Rivière du Loup and Ste. Flavie during 1910.
2. (a) Rivière du Loup, at 74 cents per ton, packed in ice house. (b) Ste. Flavie, at 75½ cents per ton, packed in ice house; the railway transporting the ice and men free of charge from Rivière du Loup to Ste. Flavie.
3. 74 cents for that supplied for Rivière du Loup, and 75½ cents for Ste. Flavie.
4. Polycarpe Ouellet.
5. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

STEAMER 'ALVA.'

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Was the price paid Philip & Son, Limited, for steamer 'Alva,' viz., $22,630 for said steamer delivered at Halifax?
2. If not, what did it cost the government to bring said steamer from England to Halifax?
3. What would be the customs duties on said steamer?
4. Have any expenses or charges been paid on said steamer since arrival at Halifax?

Mr. FISHER:

1. Yes. The contract price included delivery at Halifax.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. No duties.
4. No, but the sum of $600 on account of the purchase price has been paid since the arrival of the steamer at Halifax.

TESTIMONIALS TO MINISTERS.

Mr. BOYCE. Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to state my position with regard to a motion to adjourn the House in order to discuss an important public matter, of which I gave notice on Monday afternoon. At the personal request of the Prime Minister, and in view of the very important statement by the Minister of Finance, for which the House is waiting to-day, I would postpone the discussion of this motion if the Prime Minister will now undertake to move the House into Committee of Supply at an early hour on Tuesday for the purpose of enabling this matter, of which I have given notice, to be discussed; otherwise I will proceed now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We had intended to move the House into Committee of Supply on Tuesday next, but I understand there are some friends of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) who wish to move amendments. Perhaps he could agree with his friends to be allowed to have precedence. The House will go into Committee of Supply on Tuesday.

Mr. BOYCE. The right hon. gentleman, of course, understands the position of matters. I gave notice on Monday that at the opening of the House to-day I would move to adjourn the House, and in view of the absence of the Minister of Finance then, who I thought it was desirable should be present, I stated I would make that motion on the first occasion on which the Finance Minister would be in his seat. That is the way the matter stands at present. I am quite willing to give place to the discussion set for this afternoon if the Prime Minister accepts my suggestion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. member has given notice that he will move the adjournment of the House, and he can do that any day. If my hon. friend prefers to make his motion now instead of as an amendment to go into Committee of Supply, there is no objection at all so far as we on this side of the House are concerned.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. FOSTER. On the 7th of December, 1910, the House ordered a return calling for all petitions, memorials, resolutions, from individuals, boards of trade and other bodies and corporations favouring or asking for a treaty of reciprocity with the United States; also of all similar documents protesting against or unfavourable to the same, and a copy of all correspondence had with the government or any member thereof concerning reciprocity with the United States since January 1st, 1910. This return was brought down on the 9th of January last, but as I pointed out then, and once or twice since, it only deals with one branch of the order. There is nothing in the return brought down except a number of resolutions and documents asking for reciprocity; there is no correspondence at all between any member of the government and any body outside, and there are none of the resolutions or documents which favoured reciprocity. The return has not been supplemented, and we are perhaps just now on the eve of a debate, and the information is not before the House, as it ought to be.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know what correspondence my hon. friend can allude to. I was under the impression that the whole of the correspondence had been brought down. If there has been any exchange of correspondence between some members of the government and other persons, so far as I am concerned, I will ask that it be prepared and brought down.

RECIPROCITY WITH AUSTRALIA.

Mr. AMES. Now that the Minister of Customs is in his place, I would like to ask him to facilitate the speedy bringing down of the return asked for regarding reciprocal trade arrangements with Australia. I want to discuss that matter in the near future.

Mr. PATERSON. I will be pleased to do so.

RECIPROCITY TREATY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means. He said: Mr. Speaker, the action of this government in consenting to reopen negotiations with the government of the United States with a view to bringing about if possible a satisfactory reciprocal trade arrangement, has been very severely criticised in many quarters. From that fact we may properly infer that there must be some people in this Dominion of Canada who hold the opinion that the commercial policy of the 92,000,000 people who live to the south of us is of no concern to the inhabitants of this Dominion. No other conviction could justify the action of those who have objected to the opening of negotiations. One may easily understand, Sir, that there would be room for difference of opinion as to the merits of any arrangements into which it might be proposed to enter, but that there should be opposition to the reopening of negotiations in response to the friendly approach of the United States government seems to us, in the light of history, to be very strange indeed. Sir, for us, for this government, for this parliament, for this Dominion, to set itself against a discussion of the question of the trade relations between our country and the neighbouring republic would be to emphatically reverse the historic policy of the Dominion from the first day of confederation down to the present time, and not only the policy of the Dominion but the pre-confederation policy of every province out of which the Dominion was subsequently formed. Whether we desire it or not, Sir, the conditions of our two countries, lying side

by side, must always make us of much interest one to the other.

The 92,000,000 people to the south are willing to acknowledge that they are interested in the commercial policy of Canada, and we representing 8,000,000 people are not ashamed to confess that we have the deepest concern in the policy which those people may adopt in relation to their commerce with the world at large. It is because we have the feeling that there is a mutual interest, that we have entered upon the negotiations as to which it is my privilege now to address you.

It ought not to be necessary to speak of this historic policy to which I have referred, but in view of the very strong action that has been taken by many gentlemen adverse to reciprocity it will be necessary that I shall for a few moments recall some of the main facts of the history of this matter. I am persuaded, and my colleagues are persuaded, that many of those who have formed a hasty judgment against reciprocity and against reciprocity negotiations have not given their deliberate judgment, and now that the time has come that we are able to disclose the results of our negotiations, we are most hopeful, Sir, that not only will the negotiations themselves be approved but that the result of these negotiations will be approved, not only by the country at large but by a great number of the gentlemen who have hitherto taken up that adverse position. Not to go back any further than a time within the memory of those who are sitting within the sound of my voice, we have to recall the reciprocity treaty of 1854, which was a treaty covering a wide range of natural products. At the time that treaty was arranged for, between the then provinces of British North America and the United States, it naturally received some criticism. No measure of magnitude can at any time be presented to a deliberate assembly or to a great people without some kind of criticism being found. But, I think I am correct in stating that after that treaty had been in operation for some years it was recognized as being in the highest degree beneficial to the provinces of British North America, and as we thought beneficial also to the United States. Be that as it may, when the time came for the abrogation of that treaty in 1866, there was grave anxiety on the part of the people of British North America as to the effect of that abrogation. Our trade interests, it was thought then, were so much dependent upon the American market that the abrogation of the treaty was naturally a cause of much alarm. Every public man in the provinces as they then were, and every public man of responsible position from that day to this in the Dominion of Canada, has realized the necessity of trying to cultivate good trade relations with the United States. From 1854 to 1866 the treaty was in operation. That brought us down to the very eve of confederation. Confederation dates from 1867, and one of the arguments very frequently used in support of the union movement was that in view of the abrogation of the treaty with the United States it was desirable that the provinces should be united in order that they might be stronger in their efforts to bring about a readjustment of our commercial relations and the procuring of a new treaty.

So, from the beginning of confederation this desire for reciprocity became the established policy of the country. It was the established policy, not of one political party, but it was the policy of all political parties that have had to do with the government of Canada. In 1868, in the first year of confederation, there was enacted in the tariff of that year a standing offer of reciprocity to the United States. The men of that day who controlled the government of Canada felt that as one of their first steps they must make this declaration that they desired to renew some reciprocal arrangement with the people of the United States. Accordingly, there was carried into the tariff of 1868, the first tariff after confederation, that standing offer of reciprocity to the United States. In 1869 Sir John Rose, then, if I mistake not, occupying the position which I now have the honour to fill, was sent to the United States as a delegate from the Canadian government to endeavour to bring about reciprocity. In 1870, in the tariff legislation of that time, the standing offer was again inserted. It was changed somewhat in form, but it was renewed in principle and in substance. In 1871 Sir John Macdonald was concerned in the negotiation of what was then called the treaty of Washington, and he endeavoured to bring about commercial reciprocity, as well as settle the other matters that were afterwards dealt with in the treaty, but he was, as his predecessors had been, unsuccessful in establishing better commercial relations. In 1873 a change of government took place, the government of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie came into power, and Mr. Mackenzie again took up the question of reciprocity. So that, in the days of the Liberal government and in the days of the Conservative government this desire for reciprocity has at all times been found. The Mackenzie government dispatched Senator George Brown, of Toronto, to Washington for the purpose of negotiating a treaty, and a treaty was prepared at that time, but the United States failed to ratify it. In 1878, in the early days of what our friends opposite call the National

Policy, one of the strongest arguments which they used in many quarters was that the National Policy should be adopted as a means of forcing the Americans to give us a new reciprocity treaty. In their first tariff, the so-called National Policy, adopted in 1879, a standing offer was made and the terms in which it was made were sufficiently interesting in view of what has now been accomplished to justify me in taking the time of the House for a moment by reading them. In section 6 of the Tariff Act of 1879 there is this standing offer:—

Any or all of the following articles, that is to say: animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour of meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked), and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada.

So you will see, Sir, that our Conservative friends, upon coming back to power in 1878-9, deemed it necessary as one of their first steps that they should proclaim to the world they desire to re-establish reciprocal trade relations with the United States. That principle was continued in their tariff from year to year with some change of form, but not in principle, so that down to the day when the Conservative party retired from office in 1896 this desire to obtain reciprocity with the United States was to be found upon the statute-book, in budget speeches and in everything wherein they proclaimed the commercial policy of Canada.

Now, we turn to the change of administration in 1906. In the Liberal platform of 1893, reciprocity occupied a prominent part and soon after this government came into power—indeed, if my memory is correct, even before parliament assembled—two members of the government were sent to Washington with the view of ascertaining what might be done in the way of reciprocal treaty arrangements. They did not find the situation favourable and they came back to their colleagues and reported that they were not able to accomplish anything. There is one incident in this history that I had forgotten that is of importance, and that is that in the year 1891 the dissolution of parliament was ordered by the Conservative government of the day upon the ground that they regarded the reciprocity question as so important that they required a mandate from the people of the Dominion to enable them to proceed to Washington and deal with that question. The Liberal party of the day also was in favour of reciprocity. Both parties declared for reciprocity at that time and the only question was as to which one could get the largest degree of reciprocity. So, if we follow it from day to day and from year to year, taking the history of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, the early years of confederation, the period in connection with the national policy and the period since the change in administration, down to the joint high commission of 1898-9, we find that throughout all these years, whatever difference there may have been amongst the public men of our country on other subjects, there was no difference of opinion as to the great importance and desirability of re-establishing reciprocal trade relations with the United States of America.

Now, in view of the history which I have so hurriedly presented to you, and with which many hon. gentlemen in the House are more intimately acquainted than I am, would it not have been a strange proceeding, if this government had refused to entertain the friendly approaches of the President of the United States, and to join in a conference to see whether or not something could be brought about in the way of reciprocity? That was the position in which we found ourselves and I confess it was with much surprise that we found the many manifestions of opposition. Again I say I am presuaded that the gentlemen who on the public platform or in the press took such strong ground against our action, did not give us the benefit of their well considered judgment. I am going to appeal to them to revise that judgment, to give a fair consideration to the project we are about to submit to them, and in all sincerity I say I am most hopeful indeed that what we have to propose will not be regarded as a matter of party contest, but as something which if it can be brought about by the joint action of this parliament and the Congress of the United States, will work out for the good of the Dominion and we trust for the good of the United States as well.

These negotiations, Sir, may be said to have commenced nearly a year ago. They took at first the shape of a communication from the Secretary of State of the United States to The Right Hon. Mr. Bryce, His Majesty's ambassador at Washington. The matter being one purely of a Canadian character, Mr. Bryce, like the very sensible ambassador he is, turned it over to the government of Canada for consideration and

from that time down to the present these negotiations have been conducted directly between ministers of the government at Ottawa and the Secretary of State or the officers of the Department of State at Washington. I wish to say in that connection that at every stage of the matter we have been favoured with the cordial sympathy and co-operation of the distinguished ambassador at Washington, and that on many occasions we found his co-operation and sympathy and advice of the utmost value to us. I desire in this public way to acknowledge the service he has rendered to Canada in his capacity as ambassador for His Majesty.

The United States tariff was revised a year or two ago, and the world received what is known as the Payne-Aldrich tariff. That tariff brought out an embarrassing situation between the United States and some countries, particularly between the United States and Canada. The Payne-Aldrich tariff provided that what was called the maximum tariff, a very high tariff, should be imposed on the products of all countries to which that tariff is applied. It was said in the course of the discussions arising out of our action in connection with that matter that Mr. Taft, the president, would never have put the maximum tariff on Canada. That has been very frequently said. Now if the situation had really been as it seemed to be in the minds of the gentlemen who made that criticism, I should have been disposed to agree with them. I will frankly say that I do not think Mr. Taft ever desired to impose the maximum tariff upon the products of Canada. The misfortune was that Congress had imposed the tariff. It was not a question of Mr. Taft doing it. Congress had put that tariff on and declared that on and after a given date the products of all countries not exempted by special action of the president should become subject to the maximum tariff. The maximum tariff existed and was coming into operation in a few days. It was not a question of Mr. Taft putting it on, but of Mr. Taft being induced to take it off, as he had the power to do. The President of the United States, as one evidence of his sincere desire to avoid trouble with Canada on that question, did us the honour of inviting a member of this government to proceed to Albany to meet him and discuss the matter. He came a long way from his capital and not very far from our own and was pleased to discuss the question there with a minister of the Canadian government. My colleagues did me the honour of sending me on that mission. I have said before and repeat that at my first interview with that distinguished statesman, the President of the United States, I became satisfied that he was animated by the warmest desire to make a fair and just and friendly arrangement with Canada. As I have already said, it was not a question of putting on the maximum tariff, it was a question of taking it off, and I found that the President of the United States was willing to take it off if we could give him some decent excuse to do so under the terms of the American tariff law. We made a few changes, a few concessions of no earthly importance, so small and trifling that I am sure hardly any of us in the House could remember to-day what they were. But they served the purpose; they were enough to give Mr. Taft the reason and excuse he desired and accordingly he issued his proclamation that Canada should not be placed under the disadvantage of the maximum tariff, which if applied would undoubtedly have done harm on both sides, most certainly to large business interests in Canada. Out of the negotiations at that time have sprung the larger negotiations of a more recent date. We were invited by the President and the Secretary of State, Mr. Knox, to take up the greater question of a reciprocal trade arrangement. The arrangements we made nearly a year ago, last March, were of such a small and trifling character that nobody could have regarded them as a final adjustment of our tariff question and we readily responded to the suggestion of the President that we should meet him and his cabinet ministers for the consideration of the question along broader lines.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it in any way one of the conditions on which President Taft consented to excuse Canada and lift her out of the rather embarrassing condition, that in addition to the concessions which we gave in a tariff sense, there should be an undertaking, implied or expressed, that that action should be followed by negotiations for a trade treaty ?

Mr. FIELDING. As a matter of condition, no. There was no question, understanding, arrangement, condition or suggestion as between Mr. Taft and the Canadian government that is not set forth in the correspondence which has been in the possession of the House for the last ten months. That correspondence clearly shows that Mr. Taft expressed an earnest desire to have a discussion on broader lines and that on behalf of our colleagues we agreed that that discussion should take place; but it was not a condition of Mr. Taft taking any action at that moment; it was a matter which we jointly desired, which he had suggested, and which we were very happy to agree to.

I have, Sir, referred thus to the earlier stages of these negotiations, and brought the story down to a very recent date. I have pointed out that the desire for reci-

procity was not a party matter, that it was universal, and we felt, as we had a right to feel, that we were bound to take advantage of any opportunity that offered to bring about that more desirable arrangement of trade between the United States and Canada for which this country had been seeking for the last half century. That was the position in which we found ourselves. If we thought the moment was favourable, if in view of that history which I have so briefly referred to, we thought the psychological moment had come when we could deal with the United States in a more favourable manner, if we thought they had repented, if I may use the expression, of the error of their ways, that they had seen they could not afford to treat Canada in the way they had been treating her in bygone years, if they had reached that happy frame of mind, was it our duty to refuse to meet them? Was it not our duty to meet them and say: We are glad, brethern, you think better of the situation, we are willing to sit down and discuss this matter in a fair and generous spirit?

We have, then, proceeded along these lines, and we have conducted negotiations first at Ottawa and afterwards at Washington, covering the whole question of trade relations. We have now been able to come to an understanding, and if we are able to bring about some of the good results which this country has been seeking for many years, I earnestly hope that the action will be one in which all parties in this House and in this country will be able to join and say, that that is for the good of Canada and for the good of the United States as well. Let me proceed to tell you, first in a summary way and afterwards in detail, exactly what the arrangement is.

In the first place, I am glad to be able to tell the House that at a very early stage in our negotiations, several months ago indeed, we informed the representatives of the United States government that while we desired to make a friendly reciprocal arrangement, while we were most anxious to broaden our trade conditions and to establish and continue friendly relations with them, we believed that could be now brought about as well by mutual legislation, as by the more definite form of a treaty; and therefore we informed them that while we were prepared to proceed with the negotiations and to make the arrangement as broad and generous as we could, it must be understood that we preferred the form of concurrent legislation, and that it was not our purpose to bind the Dominion of Canada or the United States in the way of a treaty.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister give about the date at which that information was sent to Washington?

Mr. FIELDING. It was never sent to Washington by any communication. It occurred in the personal communications between the representatives of the government and those of the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. The date of that?

Mr. FIELDING. It occurred in the city of Ottawa, at the time the delegates from the United States were here. I cannot give my hon. friend the exact date. Intimation was given that while we were anxious to have an arrangement, we preferred that there should be no treaty, and we thought we could show that the arrangement could be made useful and effective without the formal binding of a treaty. It will, therefore, be found, in the document which I shall read presently, that we have made no binding arrangement—that if this arrangement which I shall present to you, commends itself to your judgment, is found to be advantageous, it will continue, but if on reasonable trial, it is found in any way to be unfavourable to the Dominion of Canada, the government and the parliament of the day, are absolutely free at any time to change the arrangement, and nobody will have any right to complain.

The next point is that we have arranged that there shall be a large free list. We have agreed upon a schedule containing a large number of articles which are to be reciprocally free. These are chiefly what are called natural products, though there are some things in them which would hardly be classified in that way. Some of these things are already free in Canada, but have been subject to duty in the United States. We have been able to arrange that the United States shall take off the duty, and, therefore, instead of having what some of our hon. friends have sometimes called a lop-sided free trade, there will be real free trade in this matter, and the thing that is free in Canada shall also be free in the United States.

In another schedule we have provided a rather numerous list of items on which there shall be a common rate of duty in both countries. A very common criticism on the part of gentlemen who have not viewed this matter as favourably as we would have wished, has been: If the United States want to make a tariff arrangement with you, let them come down to your rates of duty. It seemed to be taken for granted that that was what the United States would not do. But that is exactly what we asked them to do, and what they have agreed to do, respecting a large num-

ber of articles. They have not only come down to our rates, but in some cases they have come below them, and in those cases, in order to reach that common rate, we have had to make reductions. But as our tariff is a moderate one, while theirs, in the main, is a high tariff, the result has been that, in order to arrive at a common rate, we have had to make only moderate reductions, while they, in many cases, have had to make quite large reductions. There are a few exceptions to this general rule. We found a few cases with which we desired to deal, but with respect to which we were not able to agree upon a common rate. In some instances it was not so much the rate itself as the classification and the phraseology. Dealing with these cases as exceptions, we have provided one schedule of articles on which the United States impose the rates of duties therein mentioned on the products of Canada, and another schedule of articles on which Canada imposes the rates of duties therein mentioned on the products of the United States. The idea of reciprocity is in the arrangement, but it does not require both countries to adopt the same rate or the same classification. These two schedules, however, will be found to contain not many items.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If there is nothing in the nature of a treaty, how is this arrangement to be carried out?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will see as I proceed. It is not a binding treaty in any shape or form. The arrangement rests on mutual faith, mutual good-will, mutual conviction that the thing is for the benefit of the two countries.

Before dealing with the schedules in detail, I want to give an illustration of how we have been able to reach a common ground. For example, take the article of wheat. At present wheat is dutiable in the United States at 25 cents a bushel and in Canada at 12 cents a bushel. We make wheat free in both countries. The reduction in Canada is 12 cents a bushel, whereas the United States reduction is 25 cents a bushel. I give that as an illustration of the fact that the tariff of the United States being much higher than ours, in order to meet a common rate they have had to make very much larger reductions than we have.

Mr. OWEN. What will be the duty on our wheat going into the United States?

Mr. FIELDING. The duty on our wheat going into the United States will be nothing. As another illustration, take the article of barley. It was a large crop in Ontario some years ago, and when the American tariff increased the duty on barley it was regarded by Canadian farmers as a rather severe piece of legislation. Barley is now made free. Canada's reduction is 15 cents per bushel and the United States reduction is 30 cents per bushel.

Take another illustration, an item of importance to many districts in this country, the item of potatoes. Potatoes are now made free. Canada's reduction is 20 cents per bushel and the United States 25 cents.

Oats are made free. Canada's reduction is 10 cents per bushel, the United States 15 cents per bushel.

Flour is now to be dutiable at the common rate of 50 cents per barrel ; Canada's reduction is 10 cents per barrel ; the United States reduction is about equal to 70 cents per barrel

Rough sawn lumber is made free. It was already free in Canada but in the United States, even under the Payne-Aldrich tariff, there was a duty of $1.25 per 1,000 feet. That duty is removed, and rough sawn lumber may be exported free into the United States by the manufacturers of the Dominion.

In the discussion of tariff items in this House in by-gone years, there were two items which were commonly bracketed together, strange as it may appear. I refer to coal and flour. In the early days of the discussion of the duties on these articles, it was argued with much force that the coal duty was rather a burden on the people of Ontario, and that the flour duty imposed a burden on the people of the lower provinces, and that, on the principle of give and take, the people of the two sections should be willing to have these two duties imposed, each section profiting by that policy. I need not now go into the discussions which took place at that time. We are now proposing to bracket them together. We are making a small reduction in the duty of flour of 10 cents per barrel, and a small reduction in the duty of coal of 8 cents a ton. The present duty on coal is 53 cents, and we propose to make it 45 cents. The duty in the United States to-day is 45 cents, and our duty, under this arrangement will be 45 cents. But that is not fully placing the matter fairly before the House. In the United States the duty is 45 cents on the long ton of 2,240 pounds, whereas, ours is on the short ton, so that while nominally there is a similarity, there is not actually quite an equalization of the rates. However that may be, our coal people, who were alarmed over this reciprocity matter, will have to bear a cut of 8 cents per ton on their duty ; and I hope, as one who has warm sympathy for the coal trade, that they will be able to stand it and continue to do business at the old stand.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Is there any change in the duty on slack coal?

Mr. FIELDING. I am just coming to that. There is no change in the duty on slack coal coming into Canada, but there is a very important change in the duty on slack coal going into the United States. Slack coal is dutiable at 15 cents per ton in the United States. Recently, in the last amendment to the tariff law, words were used in the definition of slack coal which led to considerable trouble. The words used, if I remember correctly, were that all slack coal shall be deemed coal produced in the ordinary way. And the United States authorities ruled that coal which was washed for the purpose of preparing it is not produced in the ordinary way, and therefore, one of our coal concerns, which has large contracts in the United States, and desires to build up a large trade in that country in slack coal, found itself subject to this condition, that what it regarded as slack coal was regarded by the United States as coal screened and held dutiable at the rate of 45 cents per ton. We protested against that and we arrange that the duty of 15 cents per ton on slack coal should apply to slacked coal of all kinds, including washed coal.

Another item is that of coke. Coke is free in Canada, but dutiable in the United States. We asked that it be made free in the United States as well as free in Canada, and our American friends have agreed. I think that hon. gentlemen interested in the coal fields in British Columbia will be very glad to hear that news because coke is an important item, and I have every reason to believe that large quantities of coke will go from British Columbia into the United States under this arrangement.

With regard to some of the items made free, I have said before that they are largely natural products, but we have made some reductions in a moderate list on manufactured articles. I have already indicated that our reductions are not very large while those of the United States are considerable. Our manufacturers are rather alarmed at the competition of the Americans. No doubt, with their magnificent organization and great accumulation of capital, our American friends are in advance of us in most of the lines of manufactures, and I do not suppose that in manufacturing generally we can hope at present to send many things across the line. But I do hope that the reduced rates of duty will open up new facilities to our manufactures and that we shall be able to send more manufactured goods across the border. Our manufacturers, whose products are shut out to-day by prohibitory duties, may be encouraged to send some of their goods into the United States under a moderate tariff.

Take wire rods which are largely made in Canada. They are free in Canada but dutiable in the United States, and there is a bounty on them here which will expire shortly. We have thought it desirable that our manufacturers in that line should have a chance in the American market, and therefore, we claimed that wire rods, which are now free in Canada, should be free in the United States, and I think we will have a fair chance of making wire rods for Uncle Sam and sending them over from our steel plants.

With regard to agricultural implements, the House need not be reminded of the strong desire on the part of our western farmers to have better terms on these articles. They would be glad to have them free of duty, but, anxious as I am to meet their views I must frankly say to them that we do not think that is fair. Like all others they must be prepared to give and take, they must be prepared to bear their share in the burdens of the country, and I believe that when the matter is fairly put to the farmers, they will recognize that principle. We do not propose to make agricultural implements free but to make some reductions, and we trust that, while these may not be all the farmers want, they will be evidence of the desire of the government to meet their views as far as possible without doing any injustice to the industries of Canada. We have made a 15 per cent list on agricultural implements, including mowers, reapers, and harvesters. These were 17½ per cent, and we now propose to reduce them to 15 per cent.

Mr. BRODER. Is there any change to be made in the valuation for duty?

Mr. FIELDING. Our negotiations have not touched the question of valuation; that must be left to the operation of the customs authorities of the two countries. Then there is a list of implements: Cultivators, ploughs, harrows, horse-rakes, seed-drills, threshing machines, including wind-stackers, baggers and weighers; these are reduced from 20 per cent to 15 per cent. Then, hay-loaders, potato-diggers, fodder or feed-cutters, grain-crushers, fanning-mills, hay-tedders, farm or field-rollers—on these the Canadian reduction is from 25 to 20 per cent. These are the reductions which are being made in our tariff. On the other side of the question, the United States tariff on some of these things is 15 per cent. We have provided that parts of machines shall be introduced at the same rate as the machine itself. In the United States, where they had a nominal rate of 15 per cent upon agricultural

implements of a certain class, it was provided that repair parts for these machines should be dutiable at the rate of 45 per cent. We have provided that the machines and the parts shall bear the same rate of duty. Then, portable engines, horse-power and traction engines for farm purposes, hay-loaders, potato-diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain-crushers, fanning-mills, manure-spreaders, windmills, and parts thereof for repairs—these are now dutiable in the United States at from 30 to 45 per cent, and we have arranged that the American duty shall be reduced to 20 per cent.

Before I proceed to take up the schedules in detail, there are one or two interesting features which I am sure the House would wish me to explain at the earliest moment. We have had very interesting discussions from time to time over the question of the duty on paper and pulp of various kinds. Our American friends were anxious for some tariff change in relation to these articles. We ourselves were anxious for some tariff changes. As respects certain grades of pulp and paper, mechanically ground pulp, chemical pulp, common printing paper, known as newsprint, and the common pasteboard and the cheaper articles of paper other than newsprint, or common paper, up to a limited value of four cents per pound, we believed that we could compete with our American friends on these particular articles and that it was desirable we should have free trade in them. As to the paper of a more advanced quality, I doubt if we would be able to compete with them and we did not take that class of paper into our negotiations. But as respects pulp of its various kinds and common newsprint paper and common pasteboard and common paper of all kinds running to the value of four cents per pound, we would have been quite willing to have reciprocity with them. They said: We are quite willing to do that if you provide that the regulations which exist in some of your provinces with regard to the shipment of pulpwood shall be removed. Of course, there could be but one answer to that. We have nothing to do with the provincial regulations. These regulations have been made by the provincial governments in accordance with what they believed to be the best interests of their respective provinces, and whether they are good or bad regulations was not for us to debate with our friends of the United States. And so we had to say to them: If you propose to put any such limitations upon the arrangement we cannot object to your doing for yourselves what you think best respecting the terms and conditions upon which you will admit our paper into your country; you have the right to impose these conditions, and if they do not suit Canada no harm is done; but we on our side will not agree to make paper and pulp and these articles free in Canada until you have made them free into your country from every province and part of the Dominion of Canada. So, the matter stands in this way: that they will put in their tariff, as set forth in their correspondence with us, an item that these various grades of pulp and paper shall be made free if there be no regulations, either in the form of an export duty or in the form of the provincial regulations interfering with the shipments of pulpwood. Whenever that condition arises they will make paper free. We said: All right, but that is no concession to us, and we will not make your paper free in Canada until you remove the restriction.

Now, there was one other question. It has always been a matter of complaint against the United States (and I may say it has sometimes been a matter of complaint against my good friend the Minister of Customs) that the pious intentions of tariff makers are sadly interfered with by the administration which makes the regulations, and so we thought it necessary to bring that question to the notice of our American friends. As these regulations may arise from time to time, it was impossible to deal with them in detail, but what we thought we ought to do was to obtain on both sides a declaration that there should be no interference by means of vexatious regulations with the good intentions of this reciprocal arrangement, and that both parties would sincerely and earnestly endeavour to facilitate trade along the lines contemplated. It is set forth in our correspondence that if any regulation is found to work adversely either party would have the right to make representations concerning it, and each party pledged itself to the other that it would endeavour to remove any regulation as to which there was found just cause of complaint.

There is one other question, before I come to deal with the correspondence and the schedules, namely, the very important branch of our national industry which touches the fish question. Canada has never enjoyed the advantage of free fish into the United States except upon the condition that she should grant the United States not only similar privileges but the right to fish in the national waters of Canada. That was a condition of the old reciprocity treaty, and under that condition very satisfactory progress in our fisheries was made. There are some people in our country to-day who attach so much importance to the item of free fish that

they would be willing, in order to obtain it, to give to our American friends the right to fish in our waters. We do not think that this represents the national sentiment. We said to our American friends that we were willing to meet them in the exchange of commodities, that we wanted to show our good will, but that we could not discuss this question at all of giving them free fishing, and practically at an early stage in the negotiations that feature was eliminated. One thing further we have done: We have secured, I may say unconditionally, for the first time what is regarded as the very substantial advantage of the free admission of our fish of all kinds into the United States markets. In what is commonly called the Chamberlain-Bayard treaty, made between Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Tupper on the one side and Mr. Bayard, of the United States, on the other, in the year 1888, provision was made for free fish being admitted into the United States, and the condition set forth in that treaty was that Canada should give to the fishermen of the United States certain commercial privileges, such as the right to come into our ports and obtain bait, ice, and supplies, and to ship crews, and transfer their fish. These commercial privileges were to be granted free of all charge and cost to the United States in exchange for the privilege of free fish in the United States market.

It was believed at that time that the treaty would probably be ratified; but as there might be some delay in its ratification, and with a view of avoiding the friction which unhappily was existing in relation to our fisheries, there was put into the form of a protocol what was commonly known as the modus vivendi, in which it was declared that for a period of two years, that being the period within which it was thought the treaty would be ratified, the United States would be allowed to enjoy these commercial privileges by a license to be issued to their fishermen at the cost of $1.50 per ton. That arrangement, which was contemplated for two years, has existed down to the present time. The treaty was not ratified, the American government was not able to secure its ratification in the Senate; but inasmuch as the withdrawal of the modus vivendi, it was thought, might lead to some friction and some embarrassment, the Canadian government decided to let it remain in operation, and it has so remained down to the present time. We get a few thousand dollars from the licenses which are so issued to our American friends. We do not value this license system for the sake of the small revenue it yields. The important point is to maintain our national control of the inshore fishery. As we shall, if this arrangement be confirmed, receive the benefit contemplated by the treaty of 1888, which failed of ratification, we propose to give the United States fishing vessels these licenses, not exactly free, as that treaty proposed, but for the nominal fee of $1 per annum.

I think I have called attention to all the special features of this arrangement, and now I propose to present to the House the form in which the arrangement is made. The decision that was reached was that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs and myself——

Mr. BURRELL. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him how the new arrangement affects fruit?

Mr. FIELDING. When I read the schedules, my hon. friend will find that fruit is made reciprocally free.

Mr. SPROULE. What about dairy products?

Mr. FIELDING. Dairy products are free.

Mr. MONK. What about garden produce?

Mr. FIELDING. Vegetables are free. I was saying that the form in which this arrangement was made that my hon. colleague and myself should address to the United States Secretary of State a letter setting forth our understanding of what had been mutually determined, and inviting him to confirm it. I will now read the letter:

Washington, January 21, 1911.

Dear Mr. Secretary,—

1. The negotiations initiated by the President several months ago through your communication to His Excellency the British Ambassador respecting a reciprocal tariff arrangement between the United States and Canada, and since carried on directly between representatives of the governments of the two countries, have now, we are happy to say, reached a stage which gives reasonable assurance of a conclusion satisfactory to both countries.

2. We desire to set forth what we understand to be the contemplated arrangement, and to ask you to confirm it.

3. It is agreed that the desired tariff changes shall not take the formal shape of a treaty, but that the Governments of the two countries will use their utmost efforts to bring about such changes by concurrent legislation at Washington and Ottawa.

4. The Governments of the two countries having made this agreement from the conviction that, if confirmed by the necessary legislative authorities, it will benefit the people on both sides of the border line, we may

reasonably hope and expect that the arrangement, if so confirmed, will remain in operation for a considerable period. Only this expectation on the part of both Governments would justify the time and labour that have been employed in the maturing of the proposed measures. Nevertheless, it is distinctly understood that we do not attempt to bind for the future the action of the United States Congress or the Parliament of Canada, but that each of these authorities shall be absolutely free to make any change of tariff policy or of any other matter covered by the present arrangement that may be deemed expedient. We look for the continuance of the arrangement, not because either party is bound to it, but because of our conviction that the more liberal trade policy thus to be established will be viewed by the people of the United States and Canada as one which will strengthen the friendly relations now happily prevailing and promote the commerical interests of both countries.

5. As respects a considerable list of articles produced in both countries, we have been able to agree that they shall be reciprocally free. A list of the articles to be admitted free of duty into the United States when imported from Canada, and into Canada when imported from the United States, is set forth in Schedule A.

6. As respects another group of articles, we have been able to agree upon common rates of duty to be applied to such articles when imported into the United States from Canada or into Canada from the United States. A list of these articles, with the rates of duty, is set forth in Schedule B.

7. In a few instances it has been found that the adoption of a common rate will be inconvenient and therefore exceptions have to be made.

8. Schedule C specifies articles upon which the United States will levy the rates therein set forth when such articles are imported from Canada.

9. Schedule D specifies articles upon which Canada will levy the rates therein set forth when such articles are imported from the United States.

10. With respect to the discussions that have taken place concerning the duties upon the several grades of pulp, printing paper, &c.—mechanically ground wood pulp, chemical wood pulp, bleached and unbleached, news printing paper and other printing paper, and board made from wood pulp, of the value not exceeding four cents per pound at the place of shipment—we note that you desire to provide that such articles from Canada shall be made free of duty in the United States only upon certain conditions respecting the shipment of pulp wood from Canada. It is necessary that we should point out that this is a matter in which we are not in a position to make any agreement. The restrictions at present existing in Canada are of a Provincial character. They have been adopted by several of the Provinces with regard to what are believed to be Provincial interests. We have neither the right nor the desire to interfere with the Provincial authorities in the free exercise of their constitutional powers in the administration of their public lands. The provisions you are proposing to make respecting the conditions upon which these classes of pulp and paper may be imported into the United States free of duty must necessarily be for the present inoperative. Whether the Provincial Governments will desire to in any way modify their regulations with a view to securing the free admission of pulp and paper from their Provinces into the market of the United States must be a question for the Provincial authorities to decide. In the meantime, the present duties on pulp and paper imported from the United States into Canada will remain. Whenever pulp and paper of the classes already mentioned are admitted into the United States free of duty from all parts of Canada, then similar articles, when imported from the United States shall be admitted into Canada free of duty.

11. The tariff changes proposed might not alone be sufficient to fully bring about the more favourable conditions which both parties desire. It is conceivable that Customs regulations which are deemed essential in some cases might operate unfavourably upon the trade between the United States and Canada, and that such regulations, if made without due regard to the special conditions of the two countries, might to some extent defeat the good purpose of the present arrangement. It is agreed that the utmost care shall be taken by both Governments to see that only such Customs regulations are adopted as are reasonably necessary for the protection of the Treasury against fraud; that no regulation shall be made or maintained which unreasonably hampers the more liberal exchange of commodities now proposed; that representations on either side as to the unfavourable operation of any regulation will receive from the other all due consideration, with the earnest purpose of removing any just cause of complaint; and that, if any further legislation is found necessary to enable either Government to carry out the purposes of this provision, such legislation will be sought from Congress or Parliament as the case may be.

12. The Government of Canada agree that, until otherwise determined by them, the licenses hitherto issued to United States fishing vessels under the provisions of section 3 of chapter 47 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, granting to such vessels certain privileges on the Atlantic coast of Canada, shall continue to be issued and that the fee to be paid to the Government of Canada for such license by the owner or commander of any such United States vessel shall hereafter be one dollar per annum.

13. It is understood that upon a day and hour to be agreed upon between the two Governments, the President of the United States will communicate to Congress the conclusions now reached and recommend the adoption of such legislation as may be necessary on the part of the United States to give effect to the proposed arrangement.

14. It is understood that simultaneously with the sending of such communication to the United States Congress by the President, the Canadian Government will communicate to the Parliament of Canada the conclusions now reached, and will thereupon take the necessary steps to procure such legislation as

is required to give effect to the proposed arrangement.

15. Such legislation on the part of the United States may contain a provision that it shall not come into operation until the United States Government are assured that corresponding legislation has been or will be passed by the Parliament of Canada; and in like manner the legislation on the part of Canada may contain a provision that it shall not come into operation until the Government of Canada are assured that corresponding legislation has been passed or will be passed by the Congress of the United States.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) W. S. FIELDING.
WM. PATERSON.

The Honourable P. C. Knox,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Does that mean that all or none must be accepted on behalf of each government?

Mr. FIELDING. Practically, I would say, yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it an indivisible agreement?

Mr. FIELDING. I would think so, because if we should attempt to make changes our American friends would be equally ready to make changes, and I am afraid that there would be danger of our not making any agreement at all. In that sense. I would say, yes; it would be all or none, although parliament, of course, would have the absolute right to make any changes it saw fit.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). It will be subject to modification or the reopening of negotiations?

Mr. FIELDING. It might be possible, but I am bound to say that I think the time is exceedingly favourable for the accomplishment of this purpose, if we agree that it is desirable, and any attempt made to delay it by further negotiations, I am afraid, would put in peril the whole arrangement. However, parliament is absolutely free to treat the matter as it deems best. Let me now read the reply of the Secretary of State, the Hon. P. C. Knox:—

Department of State, Washington,
January 21, 1911.

The Honourable W. S. Fielding, and
The Honourable William Paterson,
Washington.

Gentlemen,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of this date in relation to the negotiations initiated by the President several months ago for a reciprocal trade arrangement between the United States and Canada, in which you set forth and ask me to confirm your understanding of the results of our recent conferences in continuation of these negotiations.

I take great pleasure in replying that your statement of the proposed arrangement is entirely in accord with my understanding of it.

It is a matter of some regret on our part that we have been unable to adjust our differences on the subject of wood pulp, pulp wood and print paper. We recognize the difficulties to which you refer growing out of the nature of the relations between the Dominion and Provincial Governments, and for the present we must be content with the conditional arrangement which has been proposed in Schedule A attached to your letter.

I fully appreciate the importance, to which you call attention, of not permitting a too rigid customs administration to interfere with the successful operation of our agreement, if it is approved by the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada, and I desire to confirm your statement of our understanding on this point. I am satisfied that the spirit evinced on both sides gives assurance that every effort will be made to secure the full measure of benefit which is contemplated in entering into this arrangement.

The assurance that you give that the Dominion Government proposes to require only a nominal fee from the fishing vessels of the United States for the privileges in Canadian waters for which heretofore a charge of $1.50 per ton for each vessel has been required is most gratifying.

I heartily concur in your statement of the purposes inspiring the negotiations and in the views expressed by you as to the mutual benefits to be derived by both countries in the event our work is confirmed, and I take this opportunity to assure you, on behalf of the President, of his appreciation of the cordial spirit in which you have met us in these negotiations.

I have the honour to be, gentlemen.
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) P. C. KNOX.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). In case the Congress of the United States or the parliament of this country should alter in any way the tariff as fixed by this negotiation, what would happen? Would it be, as you were, in regard to everything?

Mr. FIELDING. Each party is absolutely free to make its tariff in accordance with whatever it believes to be the interest of the United States on the one side or the interest of Canada on the other.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). What would happen then? Would everything then go back to the old condition?

Mr. FIELDING. If the United States should change one item in its tariff in a way to prejudice the trade in that particular article, the parliament of Canada might change its tariff on a particular item in such a way as to prejudice the trade in

that particular article, and if, by and by, one item after another were changed and all the advantages of the arrangement were wiped away, I suppose we would come back to our old condition, and it would be a case of, as you were.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I would like to ask the minister if any articles have been signed, or is this just simply a convention, and not a treaty ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is neither a treaty nor a convention in the technical sense. The agreement is to be found in the letter addressed by my colleague and myself to Mr. P. C. Knox, Secretary of State for the United States, and in Mr. Knox's reply, the two documents being those which I have just read. These are the only documents that express the arrangement in any shape or form.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Then I understand this is not a treaty at all ?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is quite correct.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask whether the proposed arrangement covers any articles which are imported to any extent from Britain or any of the British possessions, and if so, whether the lowering of duties which has been granted to the United States, is to be extended to Great Britain and the British possessions ?

Mr. FIELDING. Of course, as a general principle, whether Great Britain is to be interested or not, any duty that may be lowered to any foreign country, according to our well established policy, would be at the same time lowered to Great Britain, and a clause will be inserted in the resolutions which I shall have the honour to propose, providing that where in any case the duties are lowered the benefit shall be extended to Great Britain. As a matter of fact, they are only lower on a few items of food stuffs than the preferential rate and they are articles which Great Britain does not send us at all. Notwithstanding I think that if this arrangement be confirmed, it would probably lead to some readjustment of our tariff here and there, in order that we may maintain, as we fully intend to do, the principle of the British preference and that the concessions under the tariff now existing may be maintained under the condition of affairs when this arrangement is made.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand from those who are more familiar with such matters from personal experience than I am, that the necessity of obtaining consular certificates for goods exported from Canada to the United States has been found sometimes a little oppressive. Has any arrangement been made in regard to that matter ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was mentioned and it is covered by the general clause in our agreement that all customs arrangements—and that will include consular certificates —shall be liberally interpreted whatever they may be. We did not think it was possible to go into things in detail because if we attempted to deal with any particular regulation and failed to deal with some others, we would have been embarrassed and we thought our best position would be to deal with the general principle. Therefore, we determined that no regulation should be allowed to hamper this trade unless the regulation were found to be necessary for the protection of the revenue against fraud.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not quite understand my hon. friend's answer to the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden). As I understood the Finance Minister if in the case of articles imported from the United States and from Great Britain a lower duty is made to the United States, a lowering will also be made to Great Britain. Great Britain now has a preferential rate on certain articles, that preference giving her such and such an advantage, and the lowering of rates on similar articles from the United States, unless the British preference is by that amount increased, diminishes the British preference. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that in all cases of that kind the British preference would be kept intact in its degree?

Mr. FIELDING. Not by the operation of this regulation in itself. I understand my hon. friend's question is whether in the event of any rates being lower on the products of the United States than on the products of Great Britain there would be at the same time a lowering to Great Britain. To that I answer, yes. But I also said, that if this arrangement be confirmed, it would probably necessitate some readjustment of the rates in our tariff laws generally with a view to the maintenance of the preference at whatever rate we may see fit to make.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister be willing to say whether that has simply to do with the principle of preference or with maintaining the degree of preference?

Mr. FIELDING. A large number of the articles covered by this are free; we cannot make them more than free to Great

Britain, my hon. friend does not imply that. I think it will be found that most of the rates—I do not wish to speak too generally, for fear in some cases I should make exceptions—most of the rates we are giving, for example on manufactured goods, are the rates now laid down in the intermediate tariff, of which Great Britain and the world have had notice for several years. There are a few cases in which the rates are lower than the intermediate and even lower than the preference. That is in the case of food products, and as these do not come from Great Britain at all they are of practically no importance in relation to the preference. This instrument deals with duties on goods from the United States, but we would have to look over our tariff and see how it affected the British preference at any given point, and if we see fit to grant Great Britain a larger preference than would remain it is absolutely within the right of this parliament of Canada to fix that preference at whatever we think is a proper rate. That would be a matter for careful examination in detail and I do not think it arises at this moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose that to-day Great Britain on any set of articles enjoys a preference of 33⅓ per cent. Suppose that by this instrument the United States is given, in that competing line of goods, a lower duty than it now has to pay, will the Finance Minister say that the British preference shall be kept intact as to degree?

Mr. FIELDING. We do not deal with that in this instrument——

Mr. FOSTER. I know you cannot.

Mr. FIELDING. But what we will do in regard to any particular item of our tariff in future Acts or resolutions, is a question which I find it impossible to answer at this moment, but I will say that we remain absolutely free to make the rates of the British preferential tariff as low as we like. If the effect of any given item is what my hon. friend says, to diminish to some extent the British preference, that is diminishing the proportion although not changing the rate, then if we want to give Great Britain a greater preference all we have to do is to reduce the British preferential rate. That is all.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister has declared that one prime consideration kept in view in these negotiations was that whatever happened the British preference would not be interfered with. The Finance Minister will not say they will keep the British preference intact but he says, as everybody knows, that this parliament can do just what it likes about that when it is legislating on that article. But if there was anything made fairly certain it was that whatever was done in this matter between the United States and us the British preference should not be diminished, that is that the degree of the preference should be kept intact. The Finance Minister, I believe, does not go so far as to say that shall be done, he simply throws it on the House and upon our power to do as we like.

Mr. FIELDING. We are dealing to-day with negotiations with the United States. We are giving to the House the result of our negotiations with the United States. It is not necessary for me to say to my hon. friend that the British preference never entered into these negotiations, and that we never discussed with our American brethren what the British preference should be. The preference is a great and important question. We have dealt with it in the past, we shall deal with it again. I do not want to import into this discussion anything of party colour, but I ask my hon. friend if he does not think that the British preference may safely be trusted in the hands of the men who created it?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not particularly interested now as to who created it or procreated it.

Mr. FIELDING. We are.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a document put before me, a set of negotiations, and as one member of parliament and representing my people I am asked whether I will assent to that or not. As one condition of my assent I want a straight answer to a straight question, that is whether in any degree my acceptance of this will diminish the British preference as it at present exists, either actually or relatively. I have been led to believe by the assertion of the Prime Minister that it would not. Will the Finance Minister allay my fears?

Mr. FIELDING. Unfortunately being possessed of somewhat orderly minds, we like to do one thing at a time. This is a tariff negotiation with the United States. We will have to deal with the items in the tariff generally, we will have to consider the British preference and to see how far it would be affected by this if we made any change. But that is an entirely distinct question which we will have to deal with at the proper time, and I do hope we will be able to deal with it in a spirit of greater sympathy with the principle of the British preference than my hon. friend manifested

when the British preference was brought down.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Would it be considered a breach of faith or a breach of the agreement which has just been entered into if you should keep the corresponding duty on goods coming from Great Britain to Canada 33 per cent lower than the duty on similar goods from the United States?

Mr. FIELDING. No, Sir, we can do as we like with the duties on goods from Great Britain.

This agreement deals with the rates of duty on Canadian products going into the United States, with the rates of duty on American products coming into Canada, only that and nothing more. If my hon. friends will permit me, I will now read the schedules:

Articles the growth, product or manufacture of the United States to be admitted into Canada free of duty when imported from the United States, and reciprocally articles the growth, product or manufacture of Canada to be admitted into the United States free of duty when imported from Canada:

Live animals, viz.:—Cattle, horses and mules, swine, sheep, lambs, and all other live animals.

Poultry, dead or alive.

Wheat, rye, oats, barley, and buckwheat; dried pease and beans, edible.

Corn, sweet corn, or maize (except into Canada for distillation).

We can impose a duty on corn for distillation. In the United States they do not. We maintain our duty for the purpose of distillation, but the corn is free otherwise.

Hay, straw, and cow pease.

Fresh vegetables, viz.:—Potatoes, sweet potatoes, yams, turnips, onions, cabbages, and all other vegetables in their natural state.

Fresh fruits, viz.:—Apples, pears, peaches, grapes, berries and all other edible fruits in their natural state.

Dried fruits, viz.:—Apples, peaches, pears and apricots, dried desiccated or evaporated.

Dairy products, viz.:—Butter, cheese, and fresh milk and cream. Provided that cans actually used in the transportation of milk or cream may be passed back and forth between the two countries free of duty, under such regulations as the respective Governments may prescribe.

Eggs of barnyard fowl, in the shell.

Honey.

Cotton-seed oil.

Seeds, viz.:—Flaxseed or linseed, cotton-seed and other oil seeds; grass seed, including timothy and clover seed; garden, field, and other seed not herein otherwise provided for, when in packages weighing over one pound each (not including flower seeds).

Fish of all kinds, fresh, frozen, packed in ice, salted or preserved in any form, except sardines and other fish preserved in oil; and shell fish of all kinds, including oysters, lobsters and clams in any state, fresh or packed, and coverings of the foregoing.

Seal, herring, whale, and other fish oil, including sod oil.

Salt.

Mineral waters, natural, not in bottles or jugs.

Timber, hewn, sided or squared otherwise than by sawing, and round timber used for spars or in building wharfs.

Sawed boards, planks, deals and other lumber, not further manufactured than sawed.

Paving posts, railroad ties, and telephone, trolley, electric light and telegraph poles of cedar or other woods.

Wooden staves of all kinds, not further manufactured than listed or jointed, and stave bolts.

Pickets and palings.

Plaster rock or gypsum, crude, not ground.

Mica, manufactured or rough trimmed only, and mica ground or bolted.

Feldspar, crude, powdered or ground.

Asbestos not further manufactured than ground.

Fluorspar, crude, not ground.

Glycerine, crude, not purified.

Talc, ground, bolted or precipitated, naturally or artificially, not for toilet use.

Sulphate of soda, or salt cake; and soda ash.

Extracts of hemlock bark.

Carbon electrodes.

Brass in bars and rods, in coil or otherwise, not less than six feet in length, or brass in strips, sheets or plates, not polished, planished or coated.

Cream separators of every description, and parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing.

Rolled iron or steel sheets, or plates, number fourteen gauge or thinner, galvanized or coated with zinc, tin or other metal, or not.

Crucible cast steel wire, valued at not less than six cents per pound.

Galvanized iron or steel wire, curved or not, numbers nine, twelve, and thirteen wire gauge.

Typecasting and typesetting machines and parts therof, adapted for use in printing offices.

Barbed fencing wire of iron or steel, galvanized or not.

Coke.

Round rolled wire rods in the coil, of iron or steel, not over three-eighths of an inch in diameter, and not smaller than number six wire gauge.

Pulp wood mechanically ground; pulp of wood, chemical, bleached or unbleached; news print paper, and other paper, and paper board, manufactured from mechanical wood pulp or from chemical wood pulp, or of which such pulp is the component material of chief value, coloured in the pulp, or not coloured, and valued at not more than four cents per pound, not including printed or decorated wall paper.

Provided that such paper and board, valued at four cents per pound or less, and wood pulp, being the products of Canada when imported therefrom directly into the United States shall be admitted free of duty, on the condition precedent that no export duty, export license fee, or other export charge of any

kind whatsoever (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee or otherwise) or any prohibition or restriction in any way of the exportation (whether by law, order, regulation, contractual relation, or otherwise, directly or indirectly) shall have been imposed upon such paper, board or wood pulp, or the wood used in the manufacture of such paper, board or wood pulp, or the wood pulp used in the manufacture of such paper or board:

Provided also that such wood pulp, paper or board, being the products of the United States, shall only be admitted free of duty into Canada from the United States when such wood pulp, paper or board, being the products of Canada, are admitted from all parts of Canada free of duty into the United States.

Note.—It is understood that fresh fruits to be admitted free of duty into the United States from Canada do not include lemons, oranges, limes, grape fruit, shaddocks, pomelos, or pineapples.

These things are largely free in Canada. In the United States they do not want to make them free, so they are not included in the fruits that are made free.

It is also understood that fish oil, whale oil, seal oil and fish of all kinds, being the product of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of the United States shall be admitted into Canada as the product of the United States, and similarly that fish oil, whale oil, seal oil and fish of all kinds, being the product of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of Canada, shall be admitted into the United States as the product of Canada.

That refers to fish taken beyond the three-mile limit, which would not be strictly a Canadian or a United States product; but if it is taken by Canadian fishermen it assumes the character of a Canadian product, and if it is taken by United States fishermen it assumes the character of a United States product, and is treated accordingly.

SCHEDULE B.

Articles the growth, product or manufacture of the United States to be admitted into Canada at the undermentioned rates of duty when imported from the United States; and reciprocally the same articles the growth, product or manufacture of Canada to be admitted in the United States at identical rates of duty when imported from Canada:—

Articles.	Rates of Duties.
Fresh meats, viz.:—beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats excepting game	One and one-quarter cents per pound.
Bacon and hams, not in tins or jars	One and one-quarter cents per pound.
Meats of all kinds, dried, smoked, salted, in brine, or prepared or preserved in any manner, not otherwise herein provided for	One and one-quarter cents per pound.
Canned meats and canned poultry	Twenty per cent ad valorem.
Extract of meat, fluid or not	Twenty per cent ad valorem.
Lard, and compounds thereof, cottonlene and cotton stearine, and animal stearine	One and one-quarter cents per pound.
Tallow	Forty cents per 100 lbs.
Egg yolk, egg albumen and blood albumen	Seven and one-half per cent ad valorem.
Fish (except shell fish) by whatever name known, packed in oil, in tin boxes or cans, including the weight of the package:—	
(a) when weighing over twenty ounces and not over thirty-six ounces each	Five cents per package.
(b) when weighing over twelve ounces and not over twenty ounces each	Four cents per package.
(c) when weighing twelve ounces each or less	Two cents per package.
(d) when weighing thirty-six ounces each or more, or when packed in oil, in bottles, jars or kegs	Thirty per cent ad valorem.
Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn, in cans or other air-tight packages, and including the weight of the package	One and one-quarter cents per pound.
Wheat flour and semolina; and rye flour	Fifty cents per barrel of 196 pounds.
Oatmeal and rolled oats, including the weight of paper covering	Fifty cents per 100 pounds.
Corn meal	Twelve and one-half cents per 100 pounds

SCHEDULE B—*Continued.*

Articles.	Rates of Duties.
Barley malt	Forty-five cents per 100 pounds.
Barley, pot, pearled and patent	One-half cent per pound.
Buckwheat flour or meal	One-half cent per pound.
Split pease, dried	Seven and one-half cents per bushel of 60 lbs.
Prepared cereal foods, not otherwise provided for herein	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Bran, middlings and other offals of grain used for animal food	Twelve and one-half cents per 100 pounds.
Macaroni and vermicelli	One cent per pound.
Biscuits, wafers and cakes, when sweetened with sugar, honey, molasses or other material	Twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
Biscuits, wafers, cakes and other baked articles composed in whole or in part of eggs or any kind of flour or meal when combined with chocolate, nuts, fruits or confectionery; also candied peel, candied pop-corn, candied nuts, candied fruits, sugar candy and confectionery of all kinds	Thirty-two and one-half per cent ad valorem.
Maple sugar and maple syrup	One cent per pound.
Pickles, including pickled nuts; sauces of all kinds, and fish paste or sauce	Thirty-two and one-half per cent ad valorem.
Cherry juice and prune juice, or prune wine, and other fruit juices, and fruit syrup, non-alcoholic	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Mineral waters and imitations of natural mineral waters, in bottles or jugs	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Essential oils	Seven and a half per cent ad valorem.
Grape vines; gooseberry, raspberry and currant bushes	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Farm wagons, and finished parts thereof	Twenty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Ploughs, tooth and disc harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-rakes, cultivators; threshing machines, including windstackers, baggers, weighers, and self-feeders therefor; and finished parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing	Fifteen per cent ad valorem.
Portable engines with boilers, in combination, horse-powers and traction engines, for farm purposes; hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm or field rollers, manure spreaders, weeders and windmills; and finished parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing, except shafting	Twenty per cent ad valorem.
Grindstones of sandstone, not mounted, finished or not	Five cents per 100 pounds.
Freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone, and all other monumental or building stone, except marble, brechia, and onyx, unmanufactured, or not dressed, hewn or polished	Twelve and a half per cent ad valorem.
Roofing slates	Fifty-five cents per 100 square feet.
Vitrified paving blocks, not ornamented or decorated in any manner, and paving blocks of stone	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Oxide of iron, as a colour	Twenty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Asbestos further manufactured than ground; manufactures of asbestos, or articles of which asbestos is the component material of chief value, including woven fabrics wholly or in chief value of asbestos	Twenty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Printing ink	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Cutlery, plated or not, viz.:—pocket knives, pen knives, scissors and shears, knives and forks for household purposes, and table steels	Twenty-seven and a half per cent ad valorem.

SCHEDULE B.—*Concluded.*

Articles.	Rates of Duties.
Bells and gongs; brass corners and rules for printers..	Twenty-seven and a half per cent ad valorem.
Basins, urinals and other plumbing fixtures for bath rooms and lavatories; bath tubs, sinks and laundry tubs, of earthenware, stone, cement or clay, or of other material..	Thirty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Brass band instruments..	Twenty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Clocks, watches, time recorders, clock and watch keys, clock cases, and clock movements..	Twenty-seven and a half per cent ad valorem.
Printers' wooden cases and cabinets for holding type..	Twenty-seven and a half per cent ad valorem.
Wood flour..	Twenty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Canoes and small boats of wood, not power boats..	Twenty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Feathers, crude, not dressed, coloured or otherwise manufactured..	Twelve and a half per cent ad valorem.
Antiseptic surgical dressings, such as absorbent cotton, cotton wool, lint, lamb's wool, tow, jute, gauzes and oakum, prepared for use as surgical dressings, plain or medicated; surgical trusses, pessaries and suspensory bandages of all kinds..	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Plate glass, not bevelled, in sheets or panes exceeding seven square feet each, and not exceeding twenty-five square feet each.. ..	Twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
Motor vehicles other than for railways and tramways, and automobiles, and parts thereof, not including rubber tires..	Thirty per cent ad valorem.
Iron or steel digesters for the manufacture of wood pulp..	Twenty-seven and a half per cent ad valorem.
Musical instrument cases, fancy cases or boxes, portfolios, satchels, reticules, card cases, purses, pocket books, fly books for artificial flies, all the foregoing composed wholly or in chief value of leather..	Thirty per cent ad valorem.

SCHEDULE C.—Articles the growth, product or manufacture of Canada to be admitted into the United States at the undermentioned special rates of duty when imported from Canada:—

Articles.	Rates of Duties.
Aluminum in crude form..	Five cents per pound.
Aluminum in plates, sheets, bars and rods..	Eight cents per pound.
Laths..	Ten cents per 1,000 pieces.
Shingles..	Thirty cents per thousand.
Sawed boards, planks, deals and other lumber, planed or finished on one side..	Fifty cents per M. feet B.M.
Planed or finished on one side and tongued and grooved, or planed or finished on two sides..	Seventy-five cents per M. feet B.M.
Planed or finished on three sides, or planed and finished on two sides and tongued and grooved..	One dollar and twelve and a half cents per M. feet B.M.
Planed and finished on four sides..	One dollar and fifty cents per M. feet B.M.
In estimating board measure under this schedule no reduction shall be made on board measure on account of planning, tonguing and grooving.	
Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, and the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites..	Ten cents per ton of 2,240 pounds.
Coal slack or culm of all kinds, such as will pass through a half-inch screen..	Fifteen cents per ton of 2,240 lbs.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). What about anthracite coal?

Mr. FIELDING. That is at present free on both sides. We do not produce it in Canada.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). What about the standard for anthracite?

Mr. FIELDING. There is nothing in our regulations touching anthracite at all. We have a few articles on the other side, and this sets forth the terms and conditions upon which these are to be admitted into Canada from the United States, being the items with respect to which we did not find it convenient to have a common rate.

SCHEDULE D.—Articles the growth, product or manufacture of the United States to be admitted into Canada at the undermentioned special rates of duty when imported from the United States:—

Articles.	Rates of Duties.
Cement, Portland, and hydraulic or water lime, in barrels, bags, or casks, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty..	Eleven cents per 100 pounds.
Trees, viz.:—Apple, cherry, peach, pear, plum, and quince, of all kinds, and small peach trees known as June buds..	Two and a half cents each.
Condensed milk, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty..	Two cents per pound.
Biscuits without added sweetening..	Twenty per cent ad valorem.
Fruits in air-tight cans or other air-tight packages, the weight of the cans or other packages to be included in the weight for duty..	Two cents per pound.
Peanuts, shelled..	One cent per pound.
Peanuts, unshelled..	A half cent per pound.
Coal, bituminous, round and run of mine, including bituminous coal such as will not pass through a three-quarter-inch screen..	Forty-five cents per ton.

This completes the schedules which, I am sorry to say, have occupied the attention of the House longer than I thought they would.

Mr. EMMERSON. Would the hon. minister, before he leaves these schedules, state the changes made in the tariff with respect to building and grinding stones?

Mr. FIELDING. I am going to include in the schedule a comparison showing the effect of the changes in each article—showing the American rate, our rate, and the new rate, and the reductions on each side. With the permission of the House I shall hand it into 'Hansard' without reading it.

Mr. BRODER. Is there any understanding about the packages in which free goods are shipped?

Mr. FIELDING. In some cases we have mentioned it. For instance, in the case of cream we have provided that the cans containing it, which may pass to and fro, shall be free of duty.

Mr. BRODER. They put a heavy duty on the packages.

Mr. FIELDING. We have thought of that, and my hon. friend will find that the wording of the item is entirely satisfactory. These reductions will apply to British goods as well, if they should be found in any case to affect them. But these cases will be found to be very few. They will apply, however, not only to the United States but they will apply to every country with which we have what is called the favoured nation treaty. It is well understood that by virtue of these old treaties (many of them made years ago at a time when Canada had hardly reached its present mature status, and when the colonies were not so consulted as they are now in regard to these arrangements), these old treaties still outstanding and binding the whole empire oblige us to give whatever is given to one country to all other countries possessing these treaties. We have had that question repeatedly up here, and hon. gentlemen no doubt understand it. And so, these reductions will have to be given in each case to the various countries which have what is called the favoured nation treaties.

It is too soon to make any very close examination into the financial results, but

I thought we ought to make an approximate estimate and that it would interest the House to know what that estimate is. As far as we can see on a hurried examination, on the basis of last year's business—assuming that for the first year under the operation of this arrangement the volume of trade to be the same as last year,— it would result in a reduction of taxation amounting to $2,260,000. Therefore, even from the point of view of the reduction of the burden on the taxpayer the matter is well worthy of attention.

We have been impressed, Mr. Speaker, from the beginning—my hon. colleague the Minister of Customs and myself, who have been charged with these negotiations—with the great importance of the matter. I need hardly say we have given to the work our best consideration and attention. We have fortunately had the benefit of the assistance of two capable and able officers of our public service. I refer to Mr. John McDougald, the Commissioner of Customs, or Deputy Minister of Customs as he really is, and Mr. James A. Russell, for many years in the Customs department, but now assigned to the tariff branch of the Finance Department. In the preparation of the information necessary for an intelligent study of this question, and later on in the working out of the details of the arrangement, we have received from these gentlemen a service of the utmost value, and I desire in this public way, to express how deeply we are indebted to them.

It would be too much to expect that an arrangement of this character should be adopted without careful criticism and perhaps it is too much to expect that it should be passed without adverse opinion. The common experience is that all grave and important movements are calculated sometimes to alarm people and that we are amazed afterwards as the years roll on to find how our anticipations have not been realized. I trust it will be found by those who have been somewhat anxious, perhaps nervous, possibly alarmed for the outcome of these negotiations; I trust as they look into the matter carefully, they will find, as I believe they will find, that their anxiety, while very natural, was hardly necessary. In this arrangement, they will find that every interest in the Dominion of Canada has received our careful consideration. We hope indeed to broaden the trade between our neighbours and ourselves; we have desired to find larger markets for our products. We are doing that all the time; we are sending our commercial agents to the uttermost ends of the earth to seek for business; why not seek it from the 92,000,000 people who live side by side with us?

We present this arrangement as one which we feel we can sincerely commend to the judgment of this House and of the people of Canada. We do not present it to the House as something in which we have won a victory over our American friends. That, Sir, would be a small return for the good spirit in which they have met us. I desire to say that throughout these negotiations the President of the United States has given us abundant reason to appreciate his sincere desire to carry out a friendly arrangement. He will carry into the completion of this transaction the authority of his great office and his great talents; he will carry into it, Sir, all the energy and ability he possesses to bring it to a successful issue, and I know he will make it a labour of love.

And, no less commendable has been the line of conduct of the distinguished Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. P. C Knox. As this is an international matter, it came under the direction of the Secretary of State. Mr. Knox gave it close personal attention for many days, day after day, and I know he is not less anxious than the President of the United States to bring about a friendly arrangement. From these two distinguished gentlemen, from every officer of the State department and Treasury department, and from all with whom we were brought in contact we found abundant evidence of an honest and sincere desire to make a friendly arrangement with us.

We present the arrangement to you to day, Sir, not as a triumph of one country over the other, but as the result of an effort to do justice to both; we commend this arrangement, Sir, to the judgment of this parliament as the President of the United States will commend it to the judgment of the Congress. The one fear I have is that there may be people who will say that we have made so good a bargain that the Congress should not approve of it. In times past friendly arrangements have been made with the United States government which have failed to receive the approval of the Congress, but we think the time is more favourable now. We think we have found the psychological moment for dealing with this question; we think we are within reach of some of the commercial advantages for which our people have struggled now for half a century. We commit this matter to the care of the Canadian parliament with the firm conviction that it is going to be a good thing for Canada, a good thing for the United States, and that we will continue to have it and maintain it not because there is any binding obligation to do so, but because the intelligence of the people of the two countries will decide that it is a good thing for the promotion of friendly relations and for the development of commerce of the two countries.

Resolution to be moved in Committee of Ways and Means.

That it is expedient to amend the Customs Tariff, 1907, and to provide as follows:—

1. That the articles, the growth, product or manufacture of the United States, specified in schedule A shall be admitted into Canada free of duty when imported from the United States.

2. That the articles, the growth, product or manufacture of the United States, specified in schedules B and D shall be admitted into Canada upon payment of the rates of duty specified in the said schedules when imported from the United States.

That the advantages hereby granted to the United States shall extend to any and every other foreign power which may be entitled thereto under the provisions of any treaty or convention with His Majesty.

That the advantages hereby granted to the United States shall extend to the United Kingdom and the several British colonies and possessions with respect to their commerce with Canada. Provided however, that nothing herein contained shall be held to increase any rate of duty now provided for in the British preferential tariff.

That it is expedient to provide that the Act proposed to be founded on the foregoing resolutions shall not come into operation until a date to be named by the Governor in Council in a proclamation to be published in the 'Canada Gazette' and that such proclamation may be issued whenever it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that the United States Congress has enacted or will forthwith enact such legislation as will grant to Canada the reciprocal advantages provided for in certain correspondence dated Washington, January 21, 1911, between the Honourable P. C. Knox, Secretary of State for the United States, and the Honourable W. S. Fielding, Minister of Finance of Canada, and the Honourable William Paterson, Minister of Customs of Canada.

STATEMENT No. 1.—RECIPROCAL TARIFF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

Statement of Articles and Duties Specified in SCHEDULES A and B.

Articles.	Canadian Tariff.			United States Tariff.	Rates now proposed for both United States and Canada.	Reduction by United States.	Reduction by Canada.
	Preferential.	Intermediate.	General.				
Cattle	15 per cent.	22½ per cent.	25 per cent		Free		25 per cent.
Less than one year old				$2 per head	"	$2 per head	
Valued at not more than $14 per head				$3.75 "	"	$3.75 "	
Valued at more than $14 per head				27½ per cent	"	27½ per cent	
Horses and mules					"		
Horses over one year old, valued at $50 or less	$10	$12.50	$12.50		"		$12.50.
Horses, N.O.P.	15 per cent.	22½ per cent	25 per cent		"		25 per cent.
Valued at $150 or less per head				$30 per head	"	$30	
Valued at over $150				25 per cent.	"	25 per cent	
Swine	1c. per lb.	1½c. per lb	1½c. per lb.	$1.50 each	"	$1.50 each	1½c. per lb.
Sheep and lambs	15 per cent.	22½ per cent	25 per cent		"		25 per cent.
Less than one year old				75c. per head	"	75c. each	
One year old or over				$1.50 "	"	$1.50 "	
Other live animals	15 per cent.	22½ per cent	25 per cent	20 per cent	"	20 per cent	25 per cent.
Poultry, dead and alive					"		
Alive	15 "	22½ "	25 per cent	3c. per lb.	"	3c. per lb.	25 "
Dead	12½ "	17½ "	20 "	5c. "	"	5c. "	20 "
Wheat, per bushel	8 cents	10 cents	12 cents	25 cents	"	25 cents	12 cents.
Rye "	7 "	9 "	10 "	10 "	"	10 "	10 "
Oats "	7 "	9 "	10 "	15 "	"	15 "	10 "
Barley "	10 "	12½ "	15 "	30 "	"	30 "	15 "
Buckwheat "	10 "	12 "	15 "	15 "	"	15 "	15 "
Beans, edible, dried, per bushel	15 "	22½ "	25 "	45 "	"	45 "	25 "
Pease, dried, per bushel	10 "	12½ "	15 "	25 " (seed pease 40c)	"	25 " 40 "	15 "
Potatoes, per bushel	12½ "	17½ "	20 "	25 cents	"	25 "	20 "
Corn (except into Canada for distillation)	Free	Free	Free	15c. p. bushel	"	15c. p. bushel	
Sweet potatoes, per bushel	7 cents	9 cents	10 cents	25 cents	"	25 cents	10 "
Yams	15 per cent.	27½ per cent.	30 per cent.	25 per cent.	"	25 per cent.	30 per cent.
Turnips	15 "	27½ "	30 "	25 "	"	25 "	30 "
Onions	15 "	27½ "	30 "	40c. p. bushel	"	40c. p. bushel	30 "
Cabbages	15 "	27½ "	30 "	2c. each	"	2c. each	30 "
All other vegetables in their natural state	15 "	27½ "	30 "	25 per cent.	"	25 per cent.	30 "

Fresh fruits, viz.—							
Apples	25c. per bbl.	35c. per bbl.	40c. per bbl.	25c. p. bushel.	Free	25c. p. bushel.	40c. per bbl.
Pears	per 100 lbs. 35 cents	45 cents	50 cents	25c. "	"	25c. "	25 cents bush.
Peaches	67c. p. 100 lbs.	90c. p. 100 lbs.	$1 per 100 lbs.	25c. "	"	25c. "	$1 per 100 lbs.
Grapes	1½c per lb.	1¾c. per lb.	2c. per lb.	25c. p. cub. ft. cap. of bbls. or packages.	"	25c. p. cub. ft. cap. package.	2c. per lb.
Wild blueberries, wild strawberries and wild raspberries	Free.	Free.	Free.	1c. per quart.	"	1c. per quart.	
Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries and strawberries, n.o.p.	1½c. per lb.	1¾c. per lb.	2c. per lb.	1c. "	"	1c. "	2c. "
All other edible fruits in their natural state, N.O.P.	17½ per cent.	22½ per cent.	25 per cent.	Free or 25 p.c.	"	Free or 25 p.c.	25 per cent.
Dried apples	17½ "	22½ "	25 "	2c. per lb.	"	2c. per lb.	25 "
Dried peaches, pears and apricots	17½ "	22½ "	25 "	2c. "	"	2c. "	25 "
Butter	3c. per lb.	4c. per lb.	4c. per lb.	6c. "	"	6c. "	4c. per lb.
Cheese	2c. "	3c. "	3c. "	6c. "	"	6c. "	3c. "
Fresh milk	15 per cent.	17½ per cent.	17½ per cent.	2c. per gal.	"	2c. per gal.	17½ per cent.
Fresh cream	15 "	17½ "	17½ "	5c. "	"	5c. "	17½ "
Eggs	2c. per doz.	2½c. per doz.	3c. per doz.	5c. per doz.	"	5c. per doz.	3c. per doz.
Honey	2c. per lb.	2½c. per lb.	3c. per lb.	20c. per gal.	"	20c. per gal.	3c. per lb.
Garden, field and other seeds not herein otherwise provided for, when in packages weighing over one pound each, not including flower seeds	5 per cent.	10 per cent.	10 per cent.	from 15c. per bush. to 20c. per lb.	"	15c. per bush. to 20c. per lb.	10 per cent.
Grass seed, including timothy and clover seed	5 "	10 "	10 "	Free	"		10 "
Flaxseed or linseed	per bush 7½c.	10c	10c	25c.	"		10c.
Cotton seed and other oil seeds	5 per cent.	10 per cent.	10 per cent.	Free	"		10 per cent.
Hay	per ton $1.65	$1.75	$2	$4 (2,240 lbs.),	"	$4 (2,240 lbs).	$2.
Straw	" $1.65.	$1.75	$2	$1.50 (2240 lbs)	"	$1.50 "	$2.
Extract of hemlock bark	Free. (for manufacturing purposes.)	Free	Free	½c. per lb.	"	½c. per lb.	
Glycerine, crude, not purified	Free	Free	Free	1c. per lb.	"	1c. "	
Fish—							
Mackerel, fresh, pickled or salted, per pound	½ cent.	¾ cent.	1 cent.	1 cent.	"	1 cent.	1 cent.
Herrings, fresh	½ "	¾ "	1 "	¼ cent.	"	¼ cent.	1 "
Pickled or salted	35 cts. per 100 lbs.	45 cts. per 100 lbs.	50 cts. per 100 lbs.	50 cts. per 100 lbs.	"	50 cts. per 100 lbs.	50 cts. per 100 lbs.
Smoked or kippered, per pound	½ cent.	¾ cent.	1 cent.	½ cent.	"	½ cent.	1 cent.
Halibut and salmon, fresh, pickled or salted, per pound.	½ "	¾ "	1 "	1 cent.	"	1 "	1 "
Cod, haddock, ling, pollock, fresh, salted or pickled, per pound.	½ "	¾ "	1 "	¾ cent.	"	¾ "	1 "
Boneless, per pound	½ "	¾ "	1 "	1¼ cents	"	1¼ cents	1 "
Eels and smelts, fresh or frozen, per pound	½ "	¾ "	1 "	¾ cent.	"	¾ cent.	1 "
All other, fresh, pickled or salted, per pound	½ "	¾ "	1 "	¾ cent.	"	¾ "	1 "
Salmon and all other fish, prepared preserved, n.o.p.	17½ per cent.	27½ per cent.	30 per cent.	30 per cent.	"	30 per cent.	30 per cent.
If in packages containing less than half a barrel, United States (minimum 30 p.c.)				30 per cent.	"	30 per cent.	
Oysters—							
Shelled, in bulk, per gallon	7 cents.	9 cents.	10 cents.	Free	"		10 cents
Shelled, in cans not over one pint, including the duty on cans, per can.	2 "	2½ cents	3 "	Free	"		3 "
Shelled, in cans over one pint and not over one quart, including the duty on cans, per can.	3 "	4½ cents	5 "	Free.	"		5 "

RECIPROCAL TARIFF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA—*Continued.*

STATEMENT of Articles and Duties Specified in Schedules A and B—*Continued.*

ARTICLES.	CANADIAN TARIFF.			United States Tariff.	Rates now proposed for both United States and Canada.	Reduction by United States.	Reduction by Canada.
	Preferential.	Intermediate.	General.				
Oysters—*Con.*							
Shelled, in cans exceeding one quart in capacity, including the duty on cans, per quart.	3 cents	4½ cents	5 cents	Free	Free		5 cents.
Lobsters, fresh	15 per cent	20 per cent	25 per cent	Free	Free		25 per cent.
" canned	17½ "	27½ "	30 "	"	"		30 "
Fresh water fish	½ cent	¾ cent	1 cent	½ cent	"	½ cent	1 cent.
All other fish the produce of the fisheries	15 per cent	20 per cent	25 per cent	Shell fish—free, otherfish ¾ c. per lb.	"	Free or ¾ c. per lb.	25 per cent.
Fish oil:—							
Cod liver oil	12½ per cent	20 "	22½ "	15 c. per gallon	"	15 c. per gallon	22½ "
Seal, herring, whale and other fish oil	12½ "	20 "	22½ "	8 "	"	8 "	22½ "
Feldspar, crude, powdered or ground	Free	Free	Free	20 p.c.(ground)	"	20 per cent	
Fluorspar	"	"	"	$3 per ton	"	$3 per ton	
Mica, unmanufactured and rough trimmed, and mica, ground or bolted	15 per cent	17½ per cent	17½ per cent	20 per cent	"	20 per cent	17½ per cent.
Talc, ground, bolted, or precipitated, naturally or artificially, not for toilet use.	Free	Free	Free	1 c. per pound.	"	1 c. per lb	
Plaster rock or gypsum, crude, not ground	"	"	"	30 c. per ton	"	30 c. per ton	
Salt, in bulk	"	4 c. per 100 lbs.	5 c. per 100 lbs.	7 c. per 100 lbs.	"	7 c. per 100 lbs.	5 c. per 100 lbs.
Salt, in bags, barrels and other coverings	"	6½ c. " "	7½ " "	11 c. " "	"	11 c. " "	7½ " "
Asbestos, not further manufactured than ground—							
Crude	15 p.c.	17½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	Free.	z		17½ p.c.
Ground	15 p.c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.	25 p.c.	"	25 p.c.	25 p.c.
Barbed fencing wire of iron or steel	Free.	Free.	Free.	¾ c. per lb.	"	¾ c. per lb.	
Brass in bars and rods, in coil or otherwise, not less than six feet in length, and brass in strips, sheets or plates, not polished, planished or coated. (For use in Canadian manufactures)	Free.	Free.	Free.				
Bars				Free.	"		
Balance of item				45 p. c.		45 p.c.	
Carbon electrodes	Free.	Free.	Free.	30 p.c.	"	30 p.c.	
Cream separators and parts for repairs	Free.	Free.	Free.	45 p.c.	"	45 p.c.	
Rolled round wire rods in the coil, of iron or steel, not over three-eighths of an inch in diameter	Free.	Free.	Free.	3/10 c. per lb.	"	3/10 c. per lb.	

Rolled iron or steel sheets, or plates, number fourteen gauge or thinner, galvanized or coated with zinc, tin or other metal, or not	Free.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.	½c. lb. to 1-$\frac{2}{10}$c. per lb.	Free.	½ c. per lb. to 1-$\frac{2}{10}$ c. per lb.	5 p.c.
Wire, crucible cast steel, valued at not less than six cents per pound	Free.	5 p.c.	5 p.c.	not less than 35 p.c.	"	not less than 35 p.c.	5 p.c.
Galvanized iron or steel wire, curved or not, numbers nine, twelve and thirteen gauge	Free.	Free.	Free.	not less than 35 p.c.	"	not less than 35 p.c.	
Type-casting and type-setting machines and parts thereof, adapted for use in printing offices	12½ p.c.	17½ p.c.	20 p.c.	30 p.c.	"	30 p.c.	20 p.c.
Coke	Free.	Free.	Free.	20 per cent.	"	20 per cent.	
Cotton seed oil	15 per cent.	17½ per cent.	17½ per cent.	Free.	"		17½ per cent.
Mineral waters, natural, not in bottles or jugs	Free.	Free.	Free.	8c. per gal.	"	8c. per gal.	
Soda ash	"	"	"	¼c. per lb.	"	¼c. per lb.	
Salt cake	"	"	"	$1 per ton	"	$1 per ton	
Timber, hewn, sided or squared otherwise than by sawing, and round timber used for spars or in building wharfs	"	"	"	½c. per cu. ft.	"	½c. per cu. ft.	
Sawed boards, planks, deals and other lumber, not further manufactured than sawed	"	"	"	$1.25 per 1,000 ft. B.M.	"	$1.25 per 1,000 ft. B.M.	
Paving posts, railroad ties, and telephone, trolley, electric light and telegraph poles of cedar and other woods	"	"	"	10 per cent.	"	10 per cent.	
Wooden staves of all kinds, not further manufactured than listed or jointed, and stave bolts	Free and 15 p.c.	Free & 17½ p.c.	Free and 20 p.c.	10 "	"	10 "	Free and 20 p.c.
Pickets and palings	Free.	Free.	Free.	10 "	"	10 "	
Meats, fresh or refrigerated, per pound	2 cents.	2½ cents.	3 cents.	1½ cents.	¼ cent	1¾ cents.	
Bacon and hams, per pound	1½ "	1⅞ "	2 "	4 "	1¼ "	2¾ cents	⅞ "
Beef, salted in barrels, per pound	1½ "	1⅞ "	2 "	25 p.c.	1¼ "	* 2 p.c.	* 15 p.c.
Pork, barrelled in brine, per pound	1½ "	1⅞ "	2 "	25 "	1¼ "	*13 "	* 7 "
Meats, other salted	1½ "	1⅞ "	2 "	25 "	1¼ "	*14½ "	* 6 "
Canned meats and canned poultry	17½ p.c.	25 p.c.	27½ p.c.	25 "	20 p.c.	5 "	7½ "
Extract of meat, fluid or not	17½ "	25 "	27½ "				7½ "
fluid				15c. per lb.	20 "	* 1½ p.c.	
not fluid				35c. "		* 2 2-10 p.c.	
Tallow	15 "	17½ "	20 p.c.	½c. "	40c. per 100 lb.	* 4½ p.c.	15 p.c.
Lard, and compounds thereof, cottolene, cotton stearine and animal searine, per pound	1½ cents.	1¾ cents.	2 cents.	1½ cents.	1¼ cents.	¼ cent.	¾ cent.
Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn and baked beans, in cans or other air-tight packages, including the weight of the package, per pound	1 cent	1¼ "	1½ "	2½cts. to 40 p.c.	1¼ "	1¼ cts. to 2 cts.	¼ "
Wheat flour, semolina and rye flour, per barrel of 196 lbs. {	40 "	50 cents.	60 "	25 p.c.	50 "	13 p.c. or 70c. per bbl.	2 p.c. or 10c. per bbl.
	33 "	45 "	50 "				
Oatmeal and rolled oats, per 100 lbs	40 "	50 "	60 "	$1	50 "	50 cents.	10 cents.
Barley, pot, pearled and patent	20 p.c.	27½ p.c.	30 p.c.	2c. per lb.	½c. per lb.	* 48 p.c.	* 14 p.c.
Barley malt	45 c. per 100 lb.	45c. per 100 lbs	45c. per 100 lbs	45c. per 34 lbs	45c. per 100 lbs	87c. per 100 lbs	
Buckwheat flour or meal	35c. per 100 lb.	45c. per 100 lbs	50c. per 100 lbs	25 p.c.	½c. per lb.	10 p.c.	
Corn meal	20c. per bbl.	22½c. per bbl.	25c. per bbl.	40c. per 100 lb.	12½c. per 100 lb	27½c. per 100 lb	
Split pease, dried	10c. per bushel	12½c. per bush.	15c. per bush.	45c. per bush.	7½c. per bush.	37½c. per bush.	7½c. per bushel
Prepared cereal foods	17½ p. c.	22½ p.c.	25 p.c.	20 p.c.	17½ p.c.		7½ p.c.
" "	15 "	17½ "	20 "	20 p.c.	17½ "	2½ p.c.	2½ p.c.
Bran, middlings and other offals of grain, used for animal food.	15 per cent.	17½ per cent.	17½ per cent.	20 per cent.	12½ cents per 100 lbs.	7½ p.c.	5 per cent.

RECIPROCAL TARIFF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA—*Continued.*

STATEMENT of Articles and Duties Specified in Schedules A and B—*Continued.*

ARTICLES.	CANADIAN TARIFF.			United States Tariff.	Rates now proposed for both United States and Canada.	Reduction by United States.	Reduction by Canada.
	Preferential.	Intermediate.	General.				
Macaroni and vermicelli..... per 100 lbs.	75 cents	$1	$1.25	$1.50	1 cent per lb.	½ cent	¼ cent.
Biscuits, wafers and cakes, having added sweetening only..	17½ per cent.	25 per cent.	27½ per cent.	3 cents per lb. and 15 p.c. or 50 p.c.	25 per cent.	25 p.c.	2½ per cent.
Biscuits, wafers, cakes and other baked articles composed in whole or in part of eggs or any kind of flour or meal when combined with chocolate, nuts, fruits or confectionery, also candied peel, candied popcorn, candied nuts, candied fruits, sugar candy and confectionery of all kinds.	22½ "	32½ "	35 "	3 cents per lb. and 15 p.c., or 50 p.c.; or 1 cent per lb. and 35 p.c.; or 2 cents a lb. or 4 cents a lb.	32½ "	*17½ p.c.	2½ "
Maple sugar and maple syrup	15 "	17½ "	20 "	4 cents a lb.	1 cent a lb	3 cents a lb.	1 cent per lb.*
Canned fruits, including the weight of the package..per lb.	1½ cents	2 cents	2¼ cents	2 cents	2 cents		¼ cent.
Pickles, sauces and catsups	25 per cent.	32½ per cent.	35 per cent.	40 per cent.	32½ per cent.	7½ p.c.	2½ per cent.
Egg yoke, egg albumen and blood albumen	5 "	7½ "	10 "	25 p.c. or 3c. per lb. or 1½ cents per lb.	7½ "	9 p.c.	2½ "
Cherry juice and prune juice, or prune wine, and other fruit juices, and fruit syrup, non-alcoholic.	15 "	17½ "	20 "	70c. per gall.	17½ "	49 cts per gall.	3 cts per gal.*
Sardines, packed in oil in tin boxes, the weight of the tin box to be included in the weight for duty;							
(a) When weighing over twenty ounces and not over thirty-six ounces each.....per box	3½ cents	5 cents	6 cents	over 21 cu. in., 5c.	5 cents		1 cent.
(b) When weighing over twelve ounces and not over twenty ounces each.....per box	2½ "	4 "	4½ "	" " 5c.	4 "	1 cent	½ cent.
(c) When weighing over eight ounces and not over twelve ounces each.....per box	2 "	3 "	3½ "	over 7½ cu. in. and under 21 cu. in., 2½c.	2 "	½ "	1½ cents.
(d) When weighing eight ounces each or less.....per box	1¼ "	2 "	2½ "	" " 2½c.	2 "	½ "	½ cent.
Sardines, prepared in oil in boxes weighing over thirty-six ounces each.	20 per cent.	30 per cent.	35 per cent.	over 33 cu. in. 10c. per box to 30 p.c.	30 per cent.		5 per cent.
Farm wagons, and complete parts thereof	17½ per cent.	22½ per cent.	25 per cent.	45 per cent.	22½ per cent.	22½ per cent.	2½ per cent
Ploughs	12½ "	17½ "	20 "	15 "	15 "		5 "

Tooth and disc harrows	12½ per cent.	17½ per cent.	20 per cent.	15 per cent.	15 per cent.		5 per cent.
Harvesters and reapers	12½ "	17½ "	17½ "	15 "	15 "		2½ "
Agricultural drills and planters	12½ "	17½ "	20 "	15 "	15 "		5 "
Mowers	12½ "	17½ "	17½ "	15 "	15 "		2½ "
Horse rakes	12½ "	17½ "	20 "	15 "	15 "		5 "
Cultivators	12½ "	17½ "	20 "	15 "	15 "		5 "
Threshing Machines	15 "	17½ "	20 "	15 "	15 "		5 "
Windstackers, baggers, weighers, and self-feeders therefor and finished parts of the foregoing for repairs	15 "	17½ "	20 "	According to material 35 per cent to 45 p. c.	15 "	20 p. c. to 30 per cent.	5 "
Portable engines with boilers, in combination, with horse powers and traction engines, for farm purposes	15 per cent.	17½ "	20 "	Steam engines, —30 per cent. Gasoline engines, —45 p. c. Horse powers, —45 per cent.	20 "	From 10 per cent to 25 p. c.	
Hay loaders	15 per cent.	22½ "	25 "	According to material 35 per cent to 45 p. c.	20 "	From 15 per cent to 25 p. c.	5 "
Potato diggers	15 "	22½ "	25 "	45 per cent.	20 "	25 per cent.	5 "
Fodder or feed cutters	15 "	22½ "	25 "	45 "	20 "	25 "	5 "
Grain crushers	15 "	22½ "	25 "	45 "	20 "	25 "	5 "
Fanning mills	15 "	22½ "	25 "	According to material Wood —35 per p. c.	20 "	15 "	5 "
Hay tedders	15 "	22½ "	25 "	According to material. 35 to 45 per c.	20 "	15 to 25 per c.	5 "
Farm or field rollers	15 "	22½ "	25 "	45 per cent.	20 "	25 per cent.	5 "
Manure spreaders	12½ "	17½ "	20 "	According to material. 35 to 45 per c.	20 "	15 to 25 per c. 25 per cent (?).	
Weeders	12½ "	17½ "	20 "	45 per cent (?).	20 "		
Windmills—and finished parts of the foregoing, for repairs, except shafting.	12½ "	17½ "	20 "	45 per cent.	20 "	25 per cent.	
Cutlery, plated or not, viz., penknives, pocketknives, knives for household and other purposes and table steels.	20 "	27½ "	30 "	40 to 90 per c.	27½ "	12½ to 62½ p.c.	2½ per cent.
Bells and gongs ; brass corners and rules for printers	20 "	27½ "	30 "	45 per cent.	27½ "	17½ per cent.	2½ "
Basins, urinals and other plumbing fixtures of earthenware for bathrooms and lavatories ; baths, bath-tubs, sinks and laundry tubs of earthenware, stone, cement or clay, or of other material.	20 "	30 "	35 "	According to material. 35 to 45 per c.	32½ "	2½ to 12½ per c.	2½ "
Brass band instruments	15 "	22½ "	25 "	45 per cent.	22½ "	22½ per cent.	2½ per cent.
Grindstones of sandstone, not mounted, finished or not	10 "	12½ "	15 "	$1.75 per ton.	5 c. per 100 lb.	75 cts. per ton.	50 cts. per ton.
Building or monumental stone of freestone, granite, sandstone or limestone unmanufactured, or not dressed, hewn or polished.	10 "	12½ "	15 "	10 cts per cu f.	12½ per cent.	7½ per cent.	2½ per cent.
Roofing slate per squares of 100 sq. ft.	50 cents.	70 cents.	75 cents.	20 per cent.	55 cents.	*5 "	*¼ "
Vitrified paving blocks not ornamented or decorated in any manner.	12½ per cent.	20 per cent.	22½ per cent.	35 "	17½ per cent.	17½ "	*5 "
Paving blocks of stone	15 "	17½ "	20 "	Dressed, 50 p.c.	17½ "	32½ "	2½

RECIPROCAL TARIFF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA—*Continued.*

STATEMENT of Articles and Duties Specified in Schedules A and B—*Continued.*

ARTICLES.	CANADIAN TARIFF.			United States Tariff.	Rates now proposed for both United States and Canada.	Reduction by United States.	Reduction by Canada.
	Preferential.	Intermediate.	General.				
Clocks, watches, time recorders clock and watch keys, clock cases, and clock movements.	20 per cent.	27½ per cent.	30 per cent.	40 per cent.	27½ per cent.	12½ per cent.	2½ per cent.
Feathers in their natural state	10 "	12½ "	15 "	20 "	12½ "	7½ "	2½ "
Printers' wooden cases and cabinets for holding type	20 "	27½ "	30 "	35 "	27½ "	7½ "	2½ "
Antiseptic surgical dressing, such as absorbent cotton, cotton wool, lint, lamb's wool, tow, jute, gauzes and oakum, prepared for use as surgical dressings, plain or medicated; surgical trusses, pessaries and suspensory bandages of all kinds.	12½ "	17½ "	20 "	45 "	17½ "	27½ "	2½ "
Printing ink	12½ "	17½ "	20 "	25 "	17½ "	7½ "	2½ "
Essential oils	5 "	7½ "	10 "	25 "	7½ "	17½ "	2½ "
Plate glass, not bevelled, in sheets or panes exceeding seven square feet each, and not exceeding twenty-five square feet each.	15 "	25 "	27½ "	22½ c. per sq. ft.	25 "	45·26* per cent	2½ "
Oxide of iron as a colour	15 "	20 "	22½ "	30 per cent.	22½ "	7½ per cent.	
Motor vehicles, other than railway and tramway, and automobiles and parts thereof, not including rubber tires.	22½ "	30 "	35 "	45 "	30 "	15 "	5 "
Asbestos, manufactures of or of which asbestos is the component of chief value.	15 "	22½ "	25 "	25 or 40 per cent	22½ "	2½ or 17½ p. c.	2½ "
Canoes and small boats of wood, not power boats	17½ "	22½ "	25 "	35 per cent.	22½ "	12½ per cent.	2½ "
Wood flour	17½ "	22½ "	25 "	35 "	22½ "	12½ "	2½ "
Digesters of iron or steel for the manufacture of wood pulp.	20 "	27½ "	30 "	45 "	27½ "	17½ "	2½ "
Grape vines, gooseberry, raspberry and current bushes	12½ "	17½ "	20 "	25 "	17½ "	7½ "	2½ "
Mineral and aerated waters, in bottles or jugs	15 "	17½ "	17½ "	Containing not over 1 pint, 20c. per doz.; containing over 1 pint, not over one quart, 30c. doz; containing over 1 quart, 24c. per gallon. Equivalent, 33½ per cent.	17½ "	16 "	

Musical instrument cases, fancy cases or boxes, portfolios, satchels, reticules, card cases, purses, pocket books, fly books for artificial flies, all the foregoing composed wholly or in chief value of leather.	22½ " ..	30 " ..	35 " ..	40, 45 and 50 per cent.	32½ " ..	7½, 12½ and 17½ per cent.	2½

SCHEDULE C.

Articles.	Canadian Tariff.			United States Tariff.	Rates now proposed for U. S.	Reduction by United States.	Reduction by Canada.
	Preferential.	Intermediate.	General.				
Aluminum in crude form	Free	Free	Free	7 c. per lb	5 c. per lb	2 c. per lb	
Aluminum in plates, sheets, bars and rods	"	"	"	11 " "	8 " "	3 " "	
Laths	"	"	"	20 c. per M.	10 c. per M.	10 c. per M.	
Shingles	"	"	"	50 " "	30 " "	20 " "	
Sawed boards, planks, deals and other lumber, planed or finished on one side per 1000 feet board measure	"	"	"	$1.75 per M ft.	50 c. per M. ft.	$1.25 per M. ft.	
planed or finished on one side and tongued and grooved, or planed or finished on two sides	17½ per cent.	22½ per cent.	25 per cent	$2.00 "	75 c. "	$1.25 "	
planed or finished on three sides, or planed or finished on two sides and tongued and grooved, per 1000 feet board measure	17½ "	22½ "	25 "	$2.37½ "	$1.12½ "	$1.25 "	
planed and finished on four sides, per 1000 feet board measure	17½ "	22½ "	25 "	$2.75	$1.50	$1.25 "	
Iron ore	Free	Free	Free	15 c. per ton	10 c. per ton	5 c. per ton	
Coal slack or culm, of all kinds, such as will pass through a half inch screen	10 c. per ton	12 c. per ton	14 c. per ton	15 c. per ton of 2240 lbs.			
(This change is to admit washed slack into the United States at 15 c. per ton of 2240 pounds.)							

RECIPROCAL TARIFF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA—*Continued.*

SCHEDULE D.

Articles.	Canadian Tariff.			United States Tariff.	Rates now proposed for Canada.	Reduction by United States.	Reduction by Canada.
	Preferential.	Intermediate.	General.				
Cement, Portland ..... per 100 lbs.	8 cents	11 cents	12½ cents ...	8 cents	11 cents	.....	1½ cents.
Trees, viz.: Apple, cherry, peach, pear, plum, and quinces, of all kinds and small peach trees known as June buds, each.	2 "	2½ "	3 "	$2 per m. to 25 per cent.	2½ "	....	½ cent.
Condensed milk, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.	2c. per lb.....	3c. per lb.....	3¼c. per lb....	2c. per lb.....	2c. per lb.....	....	1¼c. per lb.
Biscuits without added sweeting.....	15 per cent....	22½ per cent..	25 per cent ...	20 per cent ...	20 per cent ...	.....	5 per cent.
Fruits in air tight cans or other air-tight packages, weight of cans or other packages to be included in weight for duty.	1½c. per lb....	2c. per lb.	2¼c. per lb....	2c. per lb.....	2c. per lb.....	.....	¼c. per lb.
Peanuts, shelled.....	1¾c. per lb....	2c. per lb.	2c. per lb.....	1c. per lb.. ..	1c. per lb.....	....	1c. per lb.
Peanuts, unshelled.....	1¾c. "	2c. "	2c. " ...	½c. "	½c. "	.....	1½ "
Coal, bituminous, round and run of mine, including bituminous coal such as will not pass through a three-quarter inch screen.	35c. per ton...	45c. per ton..	53c. per ton..	45c. per ton (of 2,240 lbs).	45c. per ton (of 2,000 lb).	.....	8c. per ton.

*Indicates "estimated."

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I shall not, of course, at the present moment attempt to follow the Minister of Finance in a detailed examination of the proposals which he has presented to parliament. The first thing that strikes one in connection with these proposals is that they are of a very far-reaching and comprehensive character and that they amount in many respects to a proposal to parliament to enact an entirely new tariff. What their effect may be upon many industries in Canada and especially on many of the smaller industries scattered all over the country I would not attempt to-day to suggest. Looking at them as the Minister of Finance presented them to the House, I was inclined to think that the conditions of trade as they are in Canada at the present time will be subject to very serious interference and dislocation from these proposals. Probably there is no man in this House of Commons to-day, not even the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs, who can foresee with any reasonable degree of accuracy just what the effect upon our trade conditions may be in the future as resulting from these changes.

One or two observations, however, of a general character I would like to make. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has referred to the history of reciprocal relations with the United States of America. He has said very truly that we in this country must always have regard to the fiscal policy of a great nation numbering nearly one hundred millions of people, whose boundaries adjoin ours for nearly 4,000 miles. I entirely agree with that. And I would like to suggest to my hon. friend that we ought, also, to have earnest and serious regard to our relations with the three hundred millions of people who are under the British flag with ourselves. But when the Minister of Finance spoke of the history of reciprocal relations with the United States in the past he might well have drawn a moral and a lesson which he did not draw in the spirit in which he addressed this House to-day. Let us look for a moment at that treaty of reciprocity which existed between the British North American colonies and the United States between 1854 and 1866. What were the conditions of trade during that period, and what followed the denunciation of that treaty by the United States? Certain lines of trade and of industry were established in this country during the years in which that treaty was in force. When that treaty was denounced my right hon. friend remembers, and most of the members of this House remember, that intense confusion was wrought in all conditions of life in Canada by the fact that that treaty was denounced upon one year's notice. Canada did not realize at that time her strength. Canada, it is true, did not then possess the strength which she possesses to-day. But Canada encountered that situation with a firm and confident spirit, and after many years of progress and development under a policy laid down by the Liberal-Conservative party in 1878, and carried out almost unimpaired by the gentlemen who now sit upon the treasury benches, Canada occupies a position at the present time which does not seem to call for the active interference with our fiscal conditions which has been proposed to this House.

Mr. Speaker, what has been the song, what has been the cry, of the Minister of Finance, of the Minister of Customs, and of the Prime Minister himself, in this parliament? During the past eight or ten years they have been telling us over and over again, in every budget speech to which I have listened, that the conditions of Canada were so absolutely satisfactory that every good and true Canadian ought thoroughly to rejoice therein. Canada found new markets after the denunciation of the reciprocity treaty, she found those markets for the most part within the limits of the British Empire, she found markets which she might confidently believe would be open to us, not only now, but in all the years to come. Well, Sir, what does the Minister of Finance propose to-day? He proposes an arrangement of a very far-reaching and comprehensive character, which will bring about a considerable dislocation in the business interests of this country; there is no doubt at all about that. What does he say as to the duration of that arrangement? He says it is expected that this arrangement will continue for a considerable time. Nothing could be more indefinite. My hon. friend the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) asked the Minister of Finance a question, which was upon my own lips; he asked: Is this an indivisible agreement? Does it mean everything that is contained in these resolutions and these schedules, everything or nothing? The Minister of Finance answered that by saying, in a rather indefinite and hesitating way, that he supposed, so far as he understood the situation, that it meant everything or nothing. Well, I would think that the Minister of Finance should be able to give to parliament, in presenting a statement of this important and far-reaching character, the certain meaning of this treaty in that regard. My hon. friend from South York asked the minister another important question, which had also occurred to me. Suppose the Dominion of Canada, next year, or the year after, or five years from now, interfered with one single item set forth in these schedules, or with half a dozen items contained in them, what would

be the net result upon the understanding which has been arrived at between the two countries? In that respect, also, the answer of the Minister of Finance left it open to every member of this House to draw whatever conclusion he might see fit. The answer was no answer at all, and we do not know at this moment, the Minister of Finance has not seen fit, or is not able to say, what the result would be upon this understanding between the two countries if, in two years from now, the parliament of Canada saw fit to alter or amend the customs duties in respect to half a dozen of these items.

Mr. FIELDING. This parliament will be absolutely free to do what it likes, the United States congress and this parliament are both absolutely free. This is an arrangement to which we are committed because we believe it is for the good of both countries; and if one year hence we make up our minds, one country, or the other, that this arrangement is not mutually beneficial, we will change it, that is all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well I am bound to say that that seems to be an extraordinary arrangement, an arrangement of a most indefinite and unsatisfactory character, an arrangement the duration of which is uncertain, the character of which is uncertain, and the effects of which are uncertain—except that we are assured that they will in the immediate future dislocate the conditions which the government have pronounced for many years past to be absolutely satisfactory to the people of this country.

Now, let us look for a moment at the reasons which have impelled the government to enter into this arrangement. My hon. friend was exceedingly frank; he told the House, and very truly, that the government of this country, almost against their will, had been forced into making this arrangement by the suggestions from the United States that they intended to impose their maximum tariff, whereupon the government of Canada, only a year ago, saw fit to recede from the attitude they had held down to the opening of last session. My hon. friend placed himself and his government in an exceedingly curious position by one remark he made to-day. He said that it would have been the duty of the President of the United States to withhold the minimum tariff from Canada unless the concessions which were made by this parliament last year had been agreed to by Canada, and in the next breath he said that these concessions were of so paltry and trivial a character that the people of Canada need not be concerned with them at all. Now, will any hon. gentleman in this House tell me that the President of the United States would have felt himself constrained to hold the tariff of Canada, without those paltry and trivial concessions, as unjust or discriminatory towards the United States? Why, the mere statement of the case is sufficient to refute the argument of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in that regard, and to show the people of Canada that if the government had stood firm at their post as they promised to do at the commencement of last year they would not have been obliged to make the concessions of last session or to engage in the reciprocity negotiations, the result of which has been brought down by the hon. Minister of Finance to-day. That is the true history of these negotiations, as I understand it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has said that the proposals which he submits to parliament may be roughly divided under three considerations; in the first place, that the arrangements are to be carried out by mutual legislation, and not by treaty, in the second place that there is a large free list which consists chiefly of natural products and, in the third place, that a uniform rate of duty is to be imposed by the two countries upon many articles which are enumerated in one of the schedules. Well, Sir, he has mentioned some articles that are free and he has mentioned some upon which there is to be a uniform duty. In so far as some of the items are concerned, for example, that of agricultural implements, I do not believe that the reduction of the duty upon agricultural implements, which he proposes, will yield the slightest iota of relief to any of the farming population of this country, and I am convinced that the price which will be charged the farmers in the future will not be affected in the slightest degree whatever by the reductions which he proposes to make in that regard. The Minister of Finance has referred to several important articles of agricultural production which are to be admitted duty free into the United States. We will discuss those later on. He has referred to the importation into the United States of fish free of duty and he has said that the government of Canada has declined to extend to the fishermen of the United States access to our fishing grounds. That also will be discussed later on. He says that the government of this country denied the United States free fishing. I would like to tell the Minister of Finance and the government that the fishermen of the United States at the present time enjoy free fishing in many Canadian waters simply for the reason that those waters are not protected as they ought to be.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of Canada in fiscal matters ought to be regulated and directed solely with a view to the interests of the Canadian people as a whole. I understand and I thoroughly appreciate the importance of good relations with the United States of America. The United States of America have fixed their tariff in the past and they will fix it at all times in the future purely from the standpoint of the interests of their own people and the development of their own country. It is our duty in Canada to do precisely the same thing. We have had in this country, since 1878 or 1879, a policy which has sought to protect and develop our own natural resources by the labour of our own people. The object of any government in this country ought to be to accomplish that good and desirable result without imposing any oppressive burdens on the people as a whole, and the Conservative party has stood, and it stands to-day, for a policy of that kind. The Conservative party stands to-day, as it stood in the past, for the policy of reciprocity within this great British Empire. As far as we are concerned we believe that the aim and object of the fiscal legislation of this country ought to be to promote that great end and object, and we believe that, for that purpose, as well as for the purpose of fiscal freedom in every possible respect, we ought to keep ourselves free of all entangling treaties, or alliances, or understandings; that that object and purpose, which I regard as the greatest consideration that could be before the eyes of any Canadian statesman to-day, should be kept constantly before our minds and that everything that would lessen the possibility, probability or imminence of carrying out that great scheme of reciprocity within the empire ought to be banished from our minds and put aside as unworthy of our attention.

Then, there is another consideration, Mr. Speaker, which, I think, ought to be borne in mind. As a natural result of the policy to which I have alluded—the policy of building up our own country, developing our own resources and keeping our people at home—we have had the lines of communication in the past running from east to west and not from north to south. They have run from the Atlantic to the Pacific, they have not stopped at the Atlantic or the Pacific, but they have stretched across both oceans, and I see in the proposals which the government has brought down to-day a purpose and object which seems to me to be absolutely inconsistent with that which has been, as I have understood, the purpose and object of the Canadian people for the last thirty years at least. I do not regard it as a good omen for the future of Canada that the government of the day should seek to alter that condition and to divert those lines of trade and communication, now running from east and west so that they shall run in the future from north to south. We have spent a great deal of money in this country, we have taxed our resources perhaps as the resources of no other people in the world were ever taxed to carry out the policy, the object and purpose to which I have alluded, and if there is any meaning at all in the proposals of the government to-day they mean the almost absolute and complete reversal of that purpose and object.

One would have thought that the present was an especially inopportune time for taking up tariff negotiations with the United States; in the first place, because the tariff of the United States, as is well known, is very much higher than our own in very many important articles indeed; and, for the further very good and important reason that if you can judge at all from the trend of public opinion in the United States, the probability is that the tariff of the United States will be revised and very largely reduced upon many of those articles which are enumerated in the schedules brought down by the Minister of Finance.

The negotiations, in short, are a sequel to the surrender which this government made last year. I am, at the same time, of the opinion that if our government had then stood firm the government of the United States would never have imposed their maximum tariff against Canada.

In conclusion, while not able to apprehend the full meaning and scope of these proposals or the exact results which will ensue from this tariff policy now proposed, I believe it is open to severe and grave criticism by reason not only of the considerations which I have very briefly addressed to the House this afternoon, but by reason of the fact that it does not sufficiently regard the position of this country as an integral and important nation of the British Empire and does not sufficiently regard the purpose, the object and scope of the policy to which Liberals and Conservatives alike, as I understand the records of the past have been committed with respect to the development of Canada and its status as a nation of the British Empire.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier the debate was adjourned.

CHINA-JAPAN STEAMSHIP SUBSIDY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to, on or after the seventh of April, 1911, grant a subsidy for steamship service between a port or ports on the Pacific coast of Canada and China and Japan, for such period or periods of time as may be deemed expedient, not however to exceed in the aggregate ten years, and to pay therefor a subsidy or subsidies, as the case may be, not exceeding the sum of 25,000 pounds sterling per annum for such service as may be deemed expedient from time to time.

He said: The House will understand this resolution when I say it is to renew the subsidy which has been voted for some years past to the Canadian Pacific railway for the service which is now well known between Vancouver and Japan and China.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How long has this arrangement been in force?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The subsidy was put in force shortly after the Canadian Pacific railway was completed and has been continued for some 20 years. It has been renewed once. The subsidy has been contributed by the Canadian and the imperial governments. We are not certain yet whether or not the imperial government will continue their contribution, but we are in communication with them on the subject.

Mr. SPROULE. What boats are engaged in this service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are three boats, the 'Empress of China,' the 'Empress of Japan,' and the 'Empress of India.' The service is about every twentieth day and the speed of the boats fifteen knots.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I saw some reference in the press to the refusal of this government to co-operate with the governments of Australia or New Zealand with respect to some such service.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, it is quite the reverse. My hon. friend refers to the Australian service. There is another line of steamers subsidized from Vancouver to Australia and New Zealand. That service has been in operation now for several years. We are renewing it now. There has been some difference between the governments of Australia and New Zealand. New Zealand is contributing a very large sum but the government of Australia has refused up to the present to again aid this service unless there is direct communication with them, avoiding the port in New Zealand. We thought it would not be advisable to give up the service to New Zealand. We have offered the governments of Australia and New Zealand to renew the service just as it was, simply with an improved service, but up to the present time the government of Australia has not thought fit to join. We are in hopes, however, they may be persuaded to do so. At all events, we have endeavoured to maintain the service even if it be confined to Canada and New Zealand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is a distinct service from this?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Absolutely.

Mr. SPROULE. We should have some information about this service, whatever the expectations in connection with it have been realized, whether the trade with China and Japan has greatly improved, for instance, in wheat and fruit stuffs. We should also know what provision there is for the carriage of perishable products, whether there is cold storage and whether we have any control over the freight rates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no arrangement for cold storage on the boats. The result as to improvement of trade has not been very much. We have some trade with Japan which has been increasing to some extent. Our trade with China has made very little progress, if any. Notwithstanding this, I believe that at the present time it would be very unfortunate if these services were abandoned, when China is developing very rapidly, and when Japan is also developing. The little trade we have with those countries would then go to San Francisco, and I think it is worth the sacrifice we are making to keep that trade in our own hands.

Mr. SPROULE. A few years ago there were trial shipments of flour to China and Japan, and rather bright anticipations were held out about the trade that we ought to develop along that line. It was said that it would be a very valuable trade to the Northwest. We ought to have some information as to whether that trade is being established or not, or whether we are making the proper efforts to get it.

Mr. MONK. There is no doubt a large trade possible with that part of the world; but it seems to me that it is time we attached more stringent conditions to the subsidies we give to the steamship lines. We are missing a very important trade in lumber, because the rates in many cases are prohibitive. When we grant such a large subsidy as £25,000 a year for ten years, we

should have some control over the rates. Then, unless there is a sufficient cold storage installation on these ships, we must necessarily miss a very important trade in perishable products. Therefore it seems to me that before we make this grant we should know something more concerning the details of that trade in the past, and the subsidy should be conditional upon the company providing such cold storage facilities as may be required by the trade. I hope my right hon. friend will take these two points into consideration before he asks the House to grant this subsidy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The suggestion that we should have cold storage on the ships is a very reasonable one. The conditions of the contract between the government and the company have not yet been adopted. We are merely asking here for the authority of parliament to renew the contract. I will report to my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce the suggestion that has been made. I can give to my hon. friend the information that he asked as to the character of the steamers.

DESCRIPTION OF VESSELS EMPLOYED ON THE CANADA, CHINA AND JAPAN SERVICE.

Name	Dimensions.			Tonnage.			Passenger Accommodation.			Refrigerator space.	Knots speed.
	Length.	Breadth	Depth.	Net.	Gross.	Capacity.	1st class.	3rd class.	4th class.		
	Ft.	Ft.	Ft.							Cu.ft.	
Empress of India	455·6	51·2	33·1	3,032	5,934	3,000	200	40	1,000	nil.	15
Empress of China	455·6	51·2	33·1	3,046	5,947	3,000	200	40	1,000	nil.	15
Empress of Japan	455·6	51·2	33·1	3,039	5,940	3,000	200	40	1,000	nil.	15

Mr. SPROULE. It has been stated in the press that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company intend to place larger boats on the Pacific next summer, I presume for this service. This proposal is to renew the contract for at least ten years, which would mean subsidies aggregating $1,250,000. This is a contract which has been in operation for several years, and the wisdom of parliament must be exercised to determine whether it be wise to renew it or not or whether, if it be renewed, different terms should not be insisted on. That can only be judged by the results we have had in the past, and for that purpose I desire to find out whether the trade has been developing from year to year and to what extent and in what lines. Many years ago when we agreed to give subsidies to certain steamship lines, we provided that they should be equipped with cold storage and we had an agreement with them as well regarding the rates. But, if I correctly understand the present position, the government do not seem to be taking any precaution in that line whatever, and thus we may be giving a big subsidy which may practically bring us no profit. If there be little or no trade, our subsidy will be so much money thrown away. To enable us to judge whether it be wise to vote this large amount for the next ten years we should know more about what have been the results under the contract about to terminate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall give all that information at the next stage.

Mr. MONK. I would like to be allowed to insist upon the cold storage provision. Undoubtedly, whatever may have been the results in the past, there is a very large cold storage trade to be done with the east. Large quantities of our perishable products are required in China, and these can only be sent there in steamers provided with cold storage. I think it would be proper, in a contract of this magnitude, to stipulate that cold storage facilities must be provided and further that the rates should be under the control of the government or the Railway Commission. Otherwise this company may charge the same rates to shippers as if they were receiving no subsidy whatever from the government. If they want to do that trade, they will have to equip their vessels with cold storage in any case; and when we give them a subsidy, they should be obliged, not only to provide that cold storage, but to submit their rates to the control of this government. Some time ago I heard a complaint regarding lumber shipments on these steamers. In the eastern ports lighters are used to take the lumber from the steamers to the shore, and it appears that the lighter charges were such as to render the shipment unprofitable, It would, therefore, be necessary to stipulate in the contract that the lighter charges should be moderate and not such as to make the trade unprofitable.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I agree that when the steamers, the 'Empress of Japan' and the 'Empress of China,' were put on the line between Vancouver and the eastern ports, the refrigerator system was not what it is to-day. But the Canadian Pacific railway authorities are contemplating putting new steamers on that service. My

hon. friend from Jacquees Cartier (Mr. Monk) will see, by the last annual report of the Canadian Pacific railway, that its president, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, announced that before long new steamers would be put on that route. In 1891, and the years immediately following, when we gave a subsidy to the Canadian Pacific railway, the company was practically depending on its return cargoes of silk and tea, because practically there was no trade from this country to the east on the outward voyage except the tourist business. Since then, however, the Canadian Pacific railway has recognized that it must put larger steamers on this route equipped with the most modern refrigerator system. So far the company has given good service, but my hon. friend is quite justified in saying that the refrigerator service requires to be improved on account of the increasing trade in perishable products between the far east and Canada.

Mr. MONK. I have noticed that the Canadian Pacific railway contemplate improving that service, but we are now about to make a contract with it, and that contract will be made long before these new steamers are in operation. At any rate the point regarding cold storage should have the attention of the government. If we are going to give this large subsidy, we should reserve control over the freight rates on perishable products, as otherwise our trade will languish, whereas the American trade with the east is in full bloom and vigour. I do not know whether my hon. friend the Postmaster General, during his travels in the east, noticed whether the lumber was taken ashore in lighters.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They invariably use lighters to tranship their freight to the wharfs. As regards perishable products, I notice that the apple trade is growing immensely with Japan and China, and also the cheese trade. I told the ex-member for Perth (Mr. McLaren), that I had seen some of his cheese in Tokio and Yokohoma, but it had been shipped on American boats, just because there were no refrigerators on board our steamers. The point taken, therefore, by my hon. friend was well taken.

Mr. MONK. The complaint I particularly made was with regard to the special rates charged by the lighters, and these rates, in spite of the protests of the shippers, are persisted in by the Canadian Pacific railway. It would be necessary to guard against that by providing that the freight rates would cover the carriage from port to port irrespective of these additional charges. Such subsidies should be made absolutely conditional upon our control of the freight rates.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. SPROULE. Do we pay an additional subsidy to these boats for carrying the mails?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The mail contracts are made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and revised by the Post Office Department, but the subsidy is for the mails.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the subsidy simply for the carriage of the mails and not for the purpose of stimulating trade?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The subsidy is supposed to be not only for the carriage of the mails but to stimulate the development of trade between the two countries, just as in the case of the Atlantic service.

Mr. MONK. These subsidies are not paid only for carrying the mails?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. MONK. The main object of the subsidy is to encourage trade.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. If the subsidy was merely for the carriage of the mail there would be no need to stipulate about cold storage.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And no need of such a large subsidy either.

Mr. BLAIN. This legislation will give the Governor in Council authority to spend $125,000 a year for ten years and the government should be able to tell us what the extent and nature of the trade it is expected will be developed with China and Japan. Usually, when we ask what trade has been developed by the voting of these large subsidies for steamers to different parts of the world the government have to answer that the development of trade was not as large as they expected. Again, I would suggest that although the resolution gives the government power to contract for ten years it would be much better to make the contract for five years so that parliament might have an opportunity to say at the end of the shorter period whether it was wise to continue the subsidy or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is of course merely for the renewal of the subsidy. My own personal view is that in the immediate future I do not expect there will be much development of trade as a result of this subsidy, but I certainly do expect that some years hence we shall have a large and growing trade with the Orient.

Mr. BLAIN. In what class of goods?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I should think in cereals, lumber, fruit, manufactured products, minerals such as lead, and as the Orient, Japan especially, is coming more and more to western civilization, I should think we would have a large trade

in machinery with Japan and possibly with China. I shall remember the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) that possibly it would not be wise to make a contract for ten years. Certainly I would be inclined somewhat to his view that the term should be five years.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Can the Prime Minister say how this would affect Prince Rupert as a Pacific port?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Sufficient for the day is the evil or the good thereof. It is quite possible that when Prince Rupert has come to be the terminus of the new Transcontinental line we may have to adopt the same policy with regard to it that we do with regard to the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. DANIEL. How many trips a year are we now getting for the subsidy?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. About eighteen.

Mr. MONK. This is a very considerable subsidy and I am inclined to believe that even if there was no subsidy it would be impossible for a wealthy and powerful corporation like the Canadian Pacific railway to abandon that part of its round-the-world route, and that it would be necessary for them to maintain that steamship line for the next ten years. However I believe with my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) that ten years is a very long period to contract for. It would be more satisfactory if the contract were laid upon the table of the House for approval before it was finally entered into; so that we may see whether these features in connection with the freight rates and cold storage are carefully safeguarded. What information I have received would lead me to believe that there would be a very much larger movement of lumber from the province of British Columbia towards the east if it had not been that the rates charged were absolutely unreasonable.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The points raised by my hon. friends somewhat commend themselves to my judgment and I think I will be able to answer them at the next stage of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. When the next stage comes we shall have information as to what progress has been made in the quantity of freight taken in and out during the last twenty years and as to what class of goods have been carried. I sympathize with the Prime Minister and the rest of the government in the matter of the small amount of information we have been able to draw from them. It is almost wonderful how little ministers may know when they come to ask parliament for a subsidy of $125,000 a year for ten years, to a company like this. We can see from the blue-book reports what the trade with China and Japan is, but it would be very instructive to know what proportion of that trade comes by these subsidized steamers. If it should turn out to be that but a small proportion is being carried by them it might need investigation as to the cause, and if it shall be found to be due to high freight rates that should be guarded against. The Postmaster General told us that no allowances were paid to these steamers for the mails, and that it was included as one of the duties they were to perform in earning the subsidy. Is it the same in the case of the carriage of the British mails. What arrangement is there now about the mails between Great Britain and China and Japan? Who pays the cost of carriage across from port to port?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is an arrangement by which the imperial government pay £20,000 a year. The contract was renewed two years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the imperial government pay not more than £15,000. We pay more than they do.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not exactly say, but there is a large amount paid by the imperial authorities, and then there is a subsidy by the Trade and Commerce Department, which includes the Canadian mails taken by the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose the minister traces it from London, how does it come?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It comes by our Atlantic steamers, by the Canadian Pacific railway or the Allan steamers, to whom we pay subsidies.

Mr. FOSTER. Are we paying for the British mails?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, not for British mail coming here, but we pay for Canadian mails going out. The British government is paying for British mails coming in. The mails are taken off the steamer by the Intercolonial railway as far as Montreal or Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. For which the Intercolonial railway gets paid?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Intercolonial railway gets a proportion.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does the Intercolonial railway gets its proportion from?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That depends. If all the mails are delivered at the Rimouski wharf, then they are taken to Quebec, where they are delivered to the Canadian Pacific railway, or to Montreal, and then the Intercolonial railway get a proportion for carrying them from Rimouski to that point. Then the mails are taken by the Canadian Pacific railway straight on to Vancouver, where they are delivered on the Canadian Pacific railway boats and carried across.

Mr. FOSTER. Then for a British mail starting from Liverpool or other British port, the British government pays the cost of passage across the Atlantic?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. It then goes on the Intercolonial railway, and is handed to the Canadian Pacific railway at Quebec. Does the British government pay for the cost of their mail, the China and Japan mail, on the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not give the figures to my hon. friend, but there is an arrangement made by the two governments at the end of every fiscal year, and adjustment as regards the proportion.

Mr. FOSTER. The object of the adjustment is that the British government shall pay for its through mails whatever that carriage costs. What I want to get at is whether we are mixed up with their accounts.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, we have a special contract.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me the time has come for us to consider whether we ought not to adopt the same system as they have in England, and I think in the United States, where they pay so much for carrying the mails, irrespective of any trade considerations. Trade subsidies are not given to ships in England nor in the United States. With us the situation is different. I am not opposed in principle to subsidizing steamship lines for trade purposes, but I think that those purposes to be entirely distinct from the carriage of mails. We ought to adopt the system they have in those countries, where they have more experience than we have, and pay for the carriage of mails distinct from all other purposes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I agree with my hon. friend that the time may have arrived when we should revise our mail subsidies between Canada and Great Britain. But my hon. friend knows under what conditions these subsidies were paid, in the infancy of steam navigation, when Sir Hugh Allan organized a service between Canada and Great Britain. The Canadian government at that time decided, and I think very properly, to give special inducements to the enterprise of Sir Hugh Allan. At that time Canada had not a population like that of the United States or of Great Britain. There had been no necessity at all for giving a special subsidy for the encouragement of that line for trade purposes, trade alone was sufficient to induce enterprising merchants to organize such a service. But we did it with a view of getting a mail service between Canada and Great Britain. This steam service has been going on something like sixty years. My hon. friend says we should revise that system, and I do not dispute it. I think the time has well come when we may, perhaps, think of having a mail service between Canada and Great Britain on the rule of paying so much per ton. Now, with regard to our trade with the Orient. Some time after the completion of the Canadian Pacific railway it was thought advisable to give them a special subsidy to help them to put on a service between Vancouver and China and Japan. This subsidy is not given exclusively for the carriage of mails; it is given in excess of what would be a legitimate compensation for carrying the mails. But it was done to encourage trade, and to establish communication between Canada and the Orient. I am bound to say that that trade has not developed to the extent we had expected. But I think no one at this moment would desire to abandon that service. We think it ought to be maintained, even if it has not done all we expected from it; at all events, we think it better to leave it as it is. I may say to my hon. friend that I did not expect to be able to-day to give to the House all the information which he desires. I expected a good many questions would be put to the government for information, and at a later stage we will be in a better position to give that information.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me remind the Prime Minister that when this service was started twenty years ago he was strongly opposed to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know about that.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I had the pleasure myself of bringing down the subsidy, and I had to put forth all my small powers to overcome my hon. friend's objections on that occasion. Does my hon. friend forget that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend does me a great credit and a great honour to say that he had to overcome my poor opposition. I think he will not find that I said a word against that service.

Mr. MONK. I quite recognize that the conditions of sixty years ago are very different to-day. I understand that some of the information we seek to-night can be brought down later. My right hon. friend will admit that we took on habits sixty years ago with regard to steamship subsidies that it is now high time we should abandon. I have no objection to continuing subsidies for trade purposes to steamship companies, but I think there must be a diminution in the first place, and in the second place we should make these subsidies absolutely subject to conditions which will protect shippers, and that is not done at the present time. Line after

line of steamships has been established, and they have all received subsidies, but they fail to provide the accommodation which we should exact from them. I regret I have not the papers connected with trade in the Orient, but my recollection of the information contained there was to the effect that several very important contracts for oriental governments, or for private firms there, were lost on account of the excessive rate of freight over the Canadian Pacific railway lines. When investigation was made it was found that although the apparent freight rate was not excessive, the great expense was brought about by these special rates charged upon the lighter. I think that a complete reconsideration of the terms upon which we subsidize the steamship lines is now advisable.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I did not quite understand the Postmaster General to-day in answering the question with regard to the Atlantic mail service, as to whether the subsidy was granted or not, and who was carrying out the contract.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does my hon. friend refer to the question put this afternoon?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the subsidy had been renewed and if new conditions had been imposed with a view to just this question?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I answered, no, there is a contract which is not yet terminated between the government and the Allans and that contract has not been altered. It is still in existence, and I think it is in existence for one year more. It has not been renewed and no new condition has been attached to the contract.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot help thinking that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has taken a proper position with regard to urging upon the government the necessity of adopting some kind of cold storage system when these subsidies are granted to the large steamship companies, and I hope the government will take that matter into consideration.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I understand that this subsidy is to be granted on the Pacific coast. Any one who knows the conditions of shipping on the Pacific coast knows that the Japanese are subsidizing their lines heavily. Not only do the Japanese subsidize ships that fly the Japanese flag but they also subsidize the building of ships for Japan and in Japan. I think that the subsidies granted on the Pacific coast should be narrowed down to the shipping companies that are owned and controlled in Canada. If we are going to maintain our trade on the Pacific and keep it in our own hands we must fight the enemy with the same weapons that they are fighting us with. They have succeeded in driving the Americans entirely out of trade by their methods on the Pacific. They have driven such a strong power as Jim Hill out of business and they now own his ships. In making this contract, I hope the Prime Minister will endeavour to take the national ground and, if possible, give the mail contracts to those ships owned in Canada at the present time and that he will also make a further condition that in five or six years, or within a limited period, the subsidy may be earned only by ships built as well as owned in Canada. The policy of the government with respect to the navy is intended to promote the shipbuilding industry, and if that shipbuilding industry is to be promoted it must be promoted along commercial lines as well as along naval lines. If there is to be a shipyard on the Pacific coast then, before very many years have passed, those ships that go out from the Canadian ports on that coast should be Canadian-built ships and the subsidies that we grant should be granted on the same basis as the Japanese have granted their subsidies to Japanese ships. That is the policy adopted by Japan and it is the policy adopted by Germany. These nations have, within the last ten or fifteen years emerged from obscurity in maritime matters and have become very important naval and mercantile nations. I do not see anything in this resolution which would narrow it down so as to ensure that the subsidy should only be paid to Canadian-owned ships. There is nothing to prevent it being granted to Japanese-owned ships. The ships of the Canadian Pacific railway line are now owned in this country.

Mr. MONK. But they are not registered here.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The registration is a mere matter of form. It is only a matter of a few dollars. Whether they are registered in Canada or England, they have the same rights in all British ports, but the question is, supposing that the Japanese succeed in driving our present shipping lines out of business on the Pacific coast, will this subsidy revert to the Japanese owners that may take these lines over? The condition that I have spoken of exists in so far as the American lines are concerned. I understand that the American ships are now owned and manned by the Japanese, and we should avoid that if possible. I hope the Prime Minister will take note of that and in

making the contract ensure that the ships shall be Canadian ships, and if possible, before many years pass, that they shall be built on the Pacific coast, where they hope to have a large shipbuilding industry.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I might remind my hon. friend that this subsidy is intended for the Canadian Pacific railway ships, and I am sure that my hon. friend has no doubt at all in his mind that these ships will not go into Japanese hands, but that they will remain in the hands of the Canadian Pacific railway. As to the general tone of my hon. friends' remarks, if he will permit me I will offer them my strong commendation for their wisdom, and I hope they will be heard on the other side of the House especially by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. MONK. I quite approve of what my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has said, but when my hon. friend proposes to place the condition upon the subsidy that they should be Canadian ships does he mean to say that they should also be ships of Canadian register because we have some Canadian ships that are not registered in Canada?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). If I could narrow it down to have them built and owned here I would do so, but you cannot do that in twenty-four hours.

Mr. MONK. I am glad to hear my hon. friend say that. Of course, that condition would be impossible if there is going to be any continuity in the service. But, there is still further impossibility about the other condition mentioned by the hon. member for Simcoe that they should be ships of Canadian register. There are no ocean-going ships on the Pacific ocean of Canadian register capable of carrying out this contract. All steamships of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are registered in England. That my hon. friend should confine the subsidy to British ships and that he should wish to keep it out of the hands of Japanese capitalists is all right, but he could not possibly carry out any contract of this kind with ships registered in Canada because there are none at all on the Pacific or Atlantic capable of fulfilling the conditions of this contract.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from Simcoe will see what an amount of missionary work he has to do on the other side of the House to convince them of the truth of his statements. I am a convert to his policy, and I hope that ships will be built at Collingwood to do service on the Pacific ocean.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe).

Mr. MONK. It is the expression of a very good hope.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, and a fact.

Mr. MONK. But my right hon. friend admits that I am right in my statement of fact, does he not, that these ships intended to be subsidized at the present moment cannot fulfil the conditions pointed out by my hon. friend from Simcoe?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. MONK. With respect to hopes for the future, I have just as many as my hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no, my hon. friend cannot have. This subsidy is intended for ships which are now built. My hon. friend from Simcoe referred to ships to be built afterwards.

Mr. MONK. Oh, no.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). As to the registration, any ship built in England and registered there desiring registration in Canada is registered here on payment of some small fee like $50, so it would not cost the Canadian Pacific railway much to have its ships registered here. Then they would be Canadian owned and Canadian registered.

Mr. MONK. I think my hon. friend is under a misapprehension: ships are registered either in Canada or in England, the object of registering in England being to bring them under the operation of a government contract which renders them liable to serve as cruisers in time of war. If they are built under certain conditions set down by the British government, they possess advantages of a special kind. It is not a matter merely of a few cents or dollars to register ships in Canada that have been registered in England. The Canadian Pacific railway ships, like the Allans and others, are registered in England for a specific purpose, to serve, by arrangement with the British government, as cruisers or as transports in time of war.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is the reason why they have a special system of subsidizing in England and give only what is called poundage in the mail service. My hon. friend must not forget that the British government to-day pays huge subsidies for the Atlantic service between Liverpool and New York the Cunarders. The ships that ply between Southampton and South Africa, receive huge subsidies called mail subsidies, but for the very reason mentioned by the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that in time of war they may be utilized for other purposes.

Mr. MONK. It has nothing to do with trade at all.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I think it is a system of protection.

Mr. CROSBY. I am delighted to hear the Prime Minister give expression to his anxiety to have ships built in Canada. We in Halifax and those interested in Halifax, have been seeking for a subsidy for a number of years. I think it is 10 years since I had the honour on one occasion of coming here with a delegation asking the government to grant a subsidy to assist us in commencing a ship building industry in Halifax. I have no doubt there are other places where they could be built, but we claim that we at least have a reasonable right to ask some assistance. The local government of Nova Scotia, the city of Halifax, and the town of Dartmouth, gave bonuses towards the construction of a ship building plant. If the right hon. gentleman had been as anxious to have ships built in Canada 10 years ago as he seems to be to-night we would no doubt be building ships in Halifax now. I would ask if it would not be possible, even at this late date, to have provision made in the supplementary estimates for such a subsidy. Steel and iron ships have already been built in other parts of the province, but we in Halifax claim that the province and city have been interested in this project and have gone a long way in this matter, and should receive assistance, although we have almost given the matter up because we have not been able to get any encouragement from the present administration to assist us in starting a ship building industry in Halifax. If that had been done 10 or 12 years ago we no doubt would be now constructing ships there suitable for this kind of work. Of course it takes some time for any ship building yard to construct the kind of ship run by the Canadian Pacific railway on the Atlantic and Pacific. But we would be in a position to build commercial ships for transportation on the Atlantic and also on the Pacific. I think it would be well if the Prime Minister would give us that promise, and I am sure the people of the eastern part of Canada and of Canada as a whole would be glad indeed, to hear that we were to get some encouragement in the direction of a subsidy or assistance to the construction of ships in Canada and do away with all this worrying about having them built and registered in Canada, because unless the government could assist us there is not much prospect of our being able to build ships in competition with other countries that have long been engaged in the ship building industry. In the United States they are willing to pay large sums in order to have ships constructed in their own country. It is easy to prove that this government would be doing good missionary work for the Dominion of Canada by giving a good subsidy to encourage ship building here.

Mr. MONK. My right hon. friend has the opportunity of seeing his hopes fulfilled.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In what way?

Mr. MONK. Give a subsidy and we will have ships built in Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give a promise, I am blamed every day by the Conservative press for making promises.

Mr. CROSBY. My right hon. friend had no hesitation in saying to my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that he was anxious to have ship building in Canada, but when it comes to building ships in Canada the right hon. Prime Minister keeps his seat.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not at all, they have a ship yard in Collingwood.

Mr. CROSBY. Ship building in Collingwood, the right hon. gentleman does not worry about it very much. I say it is not fair to intimate these things and when an opportunity offers to do something definite to withhold assistance. If the Prime Minister would promise a subsidy it would be good news to send out to-night to offset some of the bad news for some parts of the country that will be in the papers to-morrow.

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

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 103) relating to steamship subsidies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROHIBITION OF OPIUM AND OTHER DRUGS.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING moved second reading of Bill (No. 97) to prohibit the improper use of opium and other drugs. He said: Mr. Speaker, the House will remember that a year or two ago a Bill was introduced into and passed by this parliament having for its purpose the suppression of the opium traffic in Canada. That Bill came as a result of the inquiry which took place on the Pacific coast shortly after the riots which had occurred, affecting the conditions of the Chinese and Japanese residing in the city of Vancouver. A number of Chinese whose stocks of opium had been somewhat damaged in those riots put in claims for losses which they had suffered in the

manufacture of opium. Those claims came as a surprise to a good many people in this country, who were not aware that the opium traffic was making any headway on this continent, particularly in Canada. Upon the report of the inquiry which I had the privilege of making, a Bill was introduced by the then Minister of Labour, the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, for the purpose of prohibiting the manufacture, sale and importation of opium. So far as the manufacture of opium is concerned that Bill has proved most effective. Where there were seven factories operating in different cities on the Pacific coast three years ago, there are none at the present time ; so that the manufacture of opium in Canada has been completely suppressed by that legislation, and the importation has been very largely suppressed. On the other hand, it has been found that in spite of the regulations, a considerable amount of opium has been smuggled into Canada. The police have found that the present legislation is not drastic enough, or broad enough, to give them the powers of seizure and confiscation which they regard as necessary. One of the objects of the present Bill is to make more drastic the regulations in that regard. Before submitting this Bill to the House I conferred with the chiefs of police in Vancouver and Montreal, two officers who have had a good deal of experience in administering the law, and obtained from them suggestions which are embodied in the Bill.

The legislation of two years ago did not prohibit opium smoking. It was thought, that as parliament was prohibiting the importation of opium, the smoking of opium would itself cease. But this has not proven to be the case, for it is found that the practice of opium smoking is considerable in a good many of the cities of Canada. The present Bill prohibits absolutely the smoking of opium.

I would like to bring to the attention of the House the international aspect of this question. In 1909 an international commission met in Shanghai for the purpose of considering whether it was possible for the different nations of the world to assist the Chinese government in its efforts to suppress the opium traffic in China. As is generally known, it is estimated that something like 20,000,000 people in that empire are victims of the opium habit, and the Chinese government, recognizing the importance of a strong manhood to the nation, has sought to eradicate the evil and has asked other nations to join with it in the effort to suppress the opium traffic. At that international commission some 13 or 14 different countries were represented. It was the first international commission which has ever assembled in the Orient. The British Empire had five representatives including one from this country. After a careful investigation and series of reports from the several delegations the International Commission adopted a series of resolutions which the various delegates were asked to present to their respective governments in the hope that these governments would give effect to them. I shall read those resolutions, inasmuch as we are seeking, by the Bill before the House, to give effect to those resolutions so far as Canada is concerned. The first resolution relates to the efforts which the Chinese government is making to suppress the opium traffic, and is in the following words :

That the International Opium Commission recognizes the unswerving sincerity of the government of China in their efforts to eradicate the production and consumption of opium throughout the empire, the increasing body of public opinion among their own subjects by which these efforts are being supported, and the real, though unequal, progress already made in a task which is one of the greatest magnitude.

The second resolution is:—

That in view of the action taken by the government of China in suppressing the practice of opium smoking, and by other governments to the same end, the International Opium Commission recommends that each delegate concerned move its own government to take measures for the gradual suppression of the practice of opium smoking in its own territories and possessions, with due regard to the varying circumstances of each country concerned.

It may be of interest to the people of this country to know that when that International Commission met in Shanghai it was possible for the example of this country to be cited as one to be followed by other nations. It was pointed out that that example had been followed by the United States, and the commission hoped that it would be followed by other countries. The third resolution is:—

That the International Opium Commission finds that the use of opium in any form otherwise than for medical purposes is held by almost every participating country to be a matter for prohibition or for careful regulation; and that each country in the administration of its system of regulation purports to be aiming, as opportunity offers, at progressively increasing stringency. In recording these conclusions, the International Opium Commission recognize the wide variations prevailing in the different countries, but it would urge on the attention of the governments concerned the desirability of a re-examination of their systems of regulation in the light of experience with other countries dealing with the same problem.

That is what we are doing in considering this measure.

The fourth resolution expresses the need for co-operation between the nations, and is as follows :

That the International Opium Commission finds that each government represented has

strict laws which are aimed directly or indirectly to prevent the smuggling of opium, its alkaloids, derivatives and preparations into their respective territories; in the judgment of the International Opium Commission it is also the duty of all countries to adopt reasonable measures to prevent at ports of departure the shipment of opium, its alkaloids, derivatives and preparations, to any country which prohibits the entry of opium, its alkaloids, derivatives and preparations.

The fifth resolution relates to the other drugs than the particular one referred to as opium and its alkaloids. It was recognized in this gathering, composed of men who had given careful study to the question, that as the opium traffic was suppressed other drugs equally dangerous might take its place, such as morphine and cocaine, and the commission took the ground that it was desirable that every country which sought to suppress the opium habit should also pass effective legislation with respect to other habit-forming drugs. It is found that the morphine and cocaine habits prevail in some of our cities to an extent which, to say the least, is distressing. I mention these two drugs because of the bearing of the fifth resolution of the commission on the proposed legislation, which resolution I will now read :

In the present Bill will be found a clause with this object in view :

That the International Opium Commission finds that the unrestricted manufacture, sale and distribution of morphine already constitutes a grave danger, and that the morphine habit shows signs of spreading. The International Opium Commission therefore desires to urge strongly on all governments that it is highly important that drastic measures should be taken by each government in its own territories and possessions to control the manufacture, sale and distribution of this drug, and also of such other derivatives of opium as may appear on scientific inquiry to be liable to similar abuse and productive of like ill effects.

In this report of the International Opium Commission, which held meetings at Shanghai from February 1, to February 26, 1909, we have the recommendation on the part of the representatives of thirteen different countries that each should pass legislation which would effectively suppress, not merely the habit of opium eating and smoking, but also the habits that are formed in connection with such drugs as morphine and cocaine. The parliament of Canada, by passing the legislation now proposed will, therefore, be assisting not merely to put down the evil in this Dominion, but will be taking part in a world wide movement which has for its object the suppression of this kind of evil in all countries.

Mr. JAMESON. Who represented Canada on that occasion?

Mr. KING. I had that honour. In addition to the report of this commission, it may interest the House to know that the druggists of this country at their last annual meeting in Halifax—the meeting of the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association—passed on September 10, a very strong resolution on this subject. Of course in a matter of this kind the experience of physicians and of those who have to do with the sale of drugs is all important, and I would, therefore, ask permission to quote part of the speech delivered by the president of that association on that occasion. It will be found on page 4 of the report under the subject heading ' Control of the Supplies of Narcotic Poisons.' :

The control of supplies of narcotic poisons, notably cocaine might profitably engage your attention, and your deliberations should quite properly lead to a request to the federal government to consider the advisability of enacting measures to more completely safeguard the public from the harmful consequences of unregulated use of these dangerous drugs. It is futile to attempt to restrict the supply of these drugs in the absence of general and effective measures throughout the domain. The welfare of our public demands that inviolable laws be enacted by the parliament of our country to make it impossible to procure these peculiarly degrading drugs for any but legitimate professional treatment. As to the proper medium of supply, it is clearly evident that the trained and legally qualified pharmacist is the one person indicated for this function and control by conditions established by governmental regulation through co-operation with your association. This logically suggests the need of a Dominion Pharmacy Act, and as this aspect of the question is to come before you in another relationship, nothing further in this regard is necessary for my present purpose. The necessity for closer restrictions on narcotic drugs of less marked character than those usually recognized as dangerous might be dealt with at this section. It must have come within observation of more than one pharmacist that much harm and misery is wrought by uncontrolled use of even so apparently innocent a preparation as paregoric. There is no logical reason why it should not be sold subject to the same condition as other preparations of opium.

In addition to those two reports from specially qualified sources, I might give to the House information which has come to me unsolicited within the last few weeks from different parts of this country. The number is indeed amazing of the communications which have come to the department from all quarters since it became generally known that legislation of this kind was proposed. These communications all go to show the serious character of the evil we are endeavouring to deal with and the urgent need of immediate legislation. I have a letter sent me to-day by the Dominion parole officer, Mr. Archibald, who has had a good deal of experience with criminals as they

leave the prisons, and he says in this letter —which incloses a confidential communication under consideration by another department:

It is only one of many I come in contact with, and I am safe in saying that 12 to 15 per cent of all the young prisoners I come in contact with credit these drugs with the cause of their downfall.

There you have the statement by General Staff Inspector Archibald that from 12 per cent to 15 per cent of the young prisoners he comes in contact with attribute their downfall to drugs. He adds:

I am grateful for humanity's sake that something is contemplated for relief of a system which is taking hold of many of our best young men and bringing in its train the consequent ruin to both the mental and physical life in our Dominion. Had I time and opportunity to make a census of prisons, I would be greatly surprised if the percentage would not reach over 25 per cent of their populations rather than the figures quoted from my actual experience.

When I communicated with the Chief of Police in Vancouver and sent him a copy of the Bill which I proposed with regard to opium, this is what he replied:

November 21, 1910.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your telegram of the 19th inst., having reference to the Dominion Act——

I had previously discussed this subject with Chief Chamberlain, in Vancouver, and communicated with him by wire when about to bring this measure before my colleagues.

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your telegram of the 19th inst., having reference to the Opium Act, and asking for suggestions from me with a view of amending the same, and in reply beg to state that I would strongly recommend the following amendments:—

1st. It should be an offence for any one to be found smoking opium. At the present time it is not an offence.

2nd It should be an offence for any person to be found in possession of opium other than a qualified druggist or doctor.

3rd. The Act should provide for seizures, confiscation and destruction of opium found in an opium joint when searched under warrant and issued under section 641. The new section 642 providing only for the confiscation and destruction of the pipes, chairs, tables, &c., but not for the opium found in these dens.

I may say that opium seems to be coming in here in large quantities, as my officers are frequently capturing men with it in their possession, and I have no doubt for every one that is captured there are as many more escape the vigilance of the officers, and I am strongly of the opinion that there should be a close supervision of the water-front of Vancouver to prevent smuggling generally, as I am satisfied that it is carried on to an enormous extent and that no time should be lost in putting a patrol boat to keep a constant watch along the docks.

Hoping the above suggestions will meet with your approval.

I have the honour to be sir,
Your obedient servant,
R. G. CHAMBERLAIN,
Chief Constable.

Then in reply to a communication I addressed to Mr. O. Campeau, the chief of police in Montreal, I received the following:

Montreal, December 10, 1910.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your communication of recent date asking if I had any suggestions to offer in connection with the Bill which was introduced in the House of Commons to prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale and use of opium, and especially as regards the best means of suppressing the opium traffic and the evils growing out of same.

I took communication of the Bill, and in my opinion its dispositions shall contribute in a great measure to the suppression of that disastrous traffic.

I wish, however, to call your attention to another traffic which, since about six months, spread devastation in this city especially, I mean to say the trade of cocaine.

Since six months the Montreal police have made over one hundred and twenty-five arrests of persons for selling or using that drug.

As you know, the only legislation which applies to the sale of cocaine is the Pharmaceutical Act of this province, and the penalties enacted for its violation are very lenient.

The fact that the violation of this law is growing up so rapidly and with so disastrous effects shows evidently that the present legislation is not effective.

Therefore, without offering specific suggestions concerning the Bill presently before the House of Commons for consideration, I will ask if it would not be possible to include in this Bill the cocaine and other drugs.

According to the medical men the cocaine produces worse effects than opium, and it would be a good occasion to adopt proper legislation to suppress the cocaine traffic and the evils growing out of same.

One of the means whereby information is gathered by the Department of Labour in relation to matters affecting industrial and social conditions is the selection from newspapers of items which are classified and kept for reference. I have here a very large number of such clippings referring to this subject, but I shall only read one or two to indicate the nature of the reports which have recently appeared in the press. In the Montreal 'Witness", of November 23, 1910, under the heading 'Cocaine a Social Plague' there is an account of some convictions that took place before Mr. Recorder Dupuis who is reported to have used the following language:

'This curse of cocaine,' proceeded Mr. Recorder Dupuis, speaking with emphasis, 'has existed for a short time in the city. It is a

real evil. It is a social plague, and it goes on spreading so fearfully that it is time for society to take marked notice. Alcoholism and morphia are nothing to cocaine. It is the agent for the seduction of our daughters and the demoralization of our young men. I should be a doctor if I could tell you all the evil that exists in it. Those who know what cocaine is and what its evils are, are those who can hurt society most. If the chemists themselves do not give us a hand to assist in stopping the habit we can do nothing. There is no remedy. The able lawyer who represents the Pharmaceutical Association has asked for fine to be increased from $25 to $100. This would not help us at all. As it is now, cocaine is sold at $12 the ounce, and the profits made thereby are stupendous. A number of doctors, who know all the evils of cocaine, must be prescribing it right and left. I wish legislation would be passed so that chemists would have to be licensed in the same way that alcohol dealers are, and licenses could then be refused to those who went on selling cocaine. It is a crime against society. I know of my own knowledge a doctor who says that of ten chemists he knows, six sell cocaine, one he is not sure of, and the remaining three do not. Those who sell it are nothing short of conspirators against society. The College of Physicans and Surgeons should take the matter up. It would be a good thing if chemists were not allowed to sell cocaine without taking the names and addresses of buyers, so that it would be easy, if desired, to find out what doctor had given the prescription. As to selling without prescriptions, that should be positively forbidden.

'For the love of a few dollars these men have thrown away the lives and futures of young men and young girls. I said formerly that those who put foreign matter or water into milk were criminals. Well, I find no word adequate for those who poison the very life blood of society. I am giving the alarm. I call upon parliament, upon the legislature and upon our representatives to do all in their power to stamp it out.'

The 'Montreal Star' of November 17, 1910, has an article headed 'Much cocaine is sold here in an illegal way,' and it gives an account of the existence of the traffic in Montreal. The Montreal 'Gazette' of November 26, has a lengthy article containing this statement made by Judge Leet of that city:

I also think it should be made a criminal offence the same as opium is. That is to say, that it is such an offence for any person to open a shop where opium is smoked, and though the comparison may not be the same, it should be just as much a criminal offence for any one to aid another to snuff cocaine. The offence to be subjected to a fine or imprisonment or both, subject to the discretion of the judge. I intend to urge the necessity of making the illegal sale of the drug a criminal offence.

I may say that in the Bill before the House we have endeavoured to take cognizance of the suggestions made by the authorities who have had to deal with this particular question. The Ottawa 'Journal,' of July last, under the heading, 'The cocaine habit has a grip on Ottawa,' gives an account of disclosures made at a meeting of the trades and labour council of this city as to the existence of the cocaine traffic here. 'La Patrie' of Montreal reports a sermon preached on this subject by His Grace Monseigneur Bruchesi, Archbishop of Montreal. In a communication received from Mr. Gibbard the secrétary of the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association, dated September 10, 1910, there is the following paragraph:

It will only be necessary to inform you that at the last meeting of our association held at Halifax in September, a strong resolution was adopted urging the federal parliament to recognize the imperative demand for legislation prohibiting or controlling the sale of all 'habit-forming' drugs and narcotics throughout the Dominion.

In framing such a measure, the wisdom and knowledge acquired through experience by the entire drug trade is at the disposal of the government, and in its subsequent administration loyal support will be accorded. We, however, desire that such an Act should be a government measure, believing it of sufficient moment to command the attention of the cabinet.

I learned through the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) that Mrs. Henderson, of Montreal, the probation officer of the Children's Aid Society had given this subject very careful study during the past year or two, and I wrote Mrs. Henderson asking if she could come to Ottawa and give the government the benefit of her investigations into the existence of the evil. The story told by Mrs. Henderson was a very sad one indeed. She reported that of her own observation she had met as many as fifty or sixty little girls and boys within the same day, in the city of Montreal, all of whom had acquired the cocaine habit to some degree. She spoke of little girls taken out of cocaine dens, and of young boys whose whole futures had been blighted. It is a fact that this cocaine has been distributed amongst school children and that to-day in that city many a parent is having an anxious time for his child because of the contraction of this habit. Not merely has it come to have a hold upon men; but vicious people have sought this means of spreading the curse for reasons of their own, among the young as well as the old and have brought thereby unhappiness to many homes and many lives. I believe that to no person in Canada is so much credit due for the agitation against cocaine as to Mrs. Henderson, of Montreal, who has devoted her time willingly and persistently in an attempt to suppress this great evil. Without attempting to give the House what is contained in the file of correspondence I have here, I would like to indicate its na-

ture, and to show how general is the desire for legislation of this kind. All the letters I have before me have come as I have already said unsolicited. In no case except those mentioned, have I written to any one asking for information. But in the last few days these communications have come to hand from public officials and many other sources.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister seems to be giving himself unnecessary trouble in presenting those communications to us. I have not heard of any one opposed to the Bill. The Minister of Labour will soon be as bad as the Minister of Agriculture in taking up the time of the House.

Mr. KING. It may be true that my hon. friend has not heard of any proposed opposition to the Bill, and I hope that none will develop. But I have found in my limited experience in the House, that it is after the second reading of the Bill that opposition develops. I trust there will be no opposition when I am through. But I desire to read these communications in order to avert any opposition that might otherwise arise. Here is my communication from His Worship the Mayor of Montreal, in which he says:—

In acting energetically in this matter, you will be doing a great good to our citizens and to humanity generally.

The recorder of Montreal emphasizes in strong words the need of this legislation. Several aldermen of the city have also written. Then I have here a telegram received the other evening from His Grace the Archbishop of Montreal, in the following words:—

I have learned that you propose to pass a federal law to combat the disastrous effects of cocaine among the people, and above all among the young people. You have my entire approbation. One is unable to take too severe measures against a plague which is still more terrible perhaps than that of alcohol.

Then His Grace The Right Reverend Dr. Farthing, the Anglican Bishop of Montreal, wires as follows:—

Delighted that you are giving hearty support to Cocaine Bill. Hope you will not rest until this much needed reform is accomplished.

There are several other letters from clergymen of various denominations speaking on behalf of their churches and on behalf of clerical societies and associations. Among these is a communication from the Protestant Ministerial Association of Montreal, one from Professor Welsh, of the Presbyterian College, and president of the Chinese Mission. In this communication Professor Welsh says:—

The use of cocaine is becoming so widespread, among young people as well as seniors, among foreign races (like Chinese, &c.) as well as Canadians, and the effects are so disastrous, that it is becoming a grave social and national peril.

The Rev. Dr. Gordon, of the Baptist Ministerial Association of Montreal, has written, and the following is contained in his letter:—

In view of the sad consequences that follow the use of these drugs, the measure, in our judgment, cannot be too drastic.

The president of the Montreal Congregational Council, Rev. F. J. Day, has also written, and in his communication the following paragraph occurs:—

In view of the frightful havoc which is being wrought in Montreal by the use of this drug, and doubtless in many other places in Canada, your measure is a most opportune one, and I desire, both in my individual and official capacity, to express my great gratification over this move and the hope that the Bill will speedily pass into law.

The Rev. Dr. Young of Douglas Methodist Church, Montreal, writes:—

Unfortunately the use of drugs is not confined to the so-called poorer classes. It obtains amongst the people who should and do know better. Any measure tending to reduce the evil of this habit will be heartily welcomed by every lover of his country. Again I would assure you of the hearty sympathy and support of the church of which I am a pastor, and of the Montreal North District of the Methodist church, of which I have the honour to be chairman.

The Rev. E. I. Hart, of the Dominion Methodist Church, Montreal, states:—

In connection with our personal work among the young men of Dominion Square and in the old brewery mission, I have met with many cocaine fiends. Two young men from our own Sunday School have fallen victims to the habit. Every effort has been made to save these fellows but thus far without results. They seem hopelessly lost—apparently without moral sensibility.... I hope that the House may be convinced of the need of immediate action, for every day in Montreal new victims are being claimed by this monstrous vice.

In a communication from the Rev. Dr. Sparling, of St. James Methodist Church, Montreal, appears the following:—

You cannot do a greater service for the young humanity of our country. The havoc wrought by that evil among the boys and girls especially is awful. I write to express not only pleasure but the hope that no interests arrayed against this Bill will prevent its passage into law.

The Rev. Dr. Johnston, of the American Presbyterian Church, Montreal:—

These evils have already become so widespread in Canada that I am sure you will have the sympathy of all who truly love our country in your endeavours to restrict them.

Then there is a communication from the Rev. G. H. Baker, of the Temple Baptist Church, and president of the Baptist Young People's Union of the province

of Quebec; one from the Clerical Association of Montreal, signed by ten of the leading clergymen; a communication from the Local Council of the Women of London, Ontario. I may mention that the National Council of Women have taken up this subject and have asked parliament to enact a measure similar to the one that is introduced. The Montreal Women's Club, particularly the committee on child labour, has asked for this legislation. I have also a communication from the University Settlement of Montreal. I may say in connection with settlement work, that I regard persons living in these university settlements as exceptionally well qualified to pronounce upon the needs of legislation of this kind. Settlement workers are really sociological students, and are in the best position to express an opinion. The leter from the University Settlement of Montreal reads as follows:—

In this part of Montreal, our workers find themselves always confronted by the problem; some of our older boys have fallen victims, and it is terribly easy for the younger ones to learn the habit; while the danger to girls is even greater. We are very grateful for a proposal which will greatly strengthen all the work for the welfare of the city children.

The Young Men's Christian Association, of Montreal, have urged the legislation. The Dominion Alliance for the total suppression of the liquor traffic has also made representations and from the letter of Mr. John H. Roberts, secretary of the Alliance, I take the following:

Being in the thick of the battle for social and moral reform in this city, I have had many opportunities of realizing the ravages of this drug, and cannot but strongly urge upon you the necessity for drastic dealing with the evil.

Then the Pharmaceutical Association of the province of Quebec has sent in a request for a federal Bill and state in this connection:

This Bill has the entire endorsation of every honest druggist in this province, and it is the hope of this association that the restrictions and penalties shall be made severe. Statistics in the United States show that only ten per cent of the drug imported is used legitimately, and no such condition of affairs is desired in Canada.

A federal Bill should receive the support of every man who is interested in the health and morals of his fellows. The insidious effects of this drug are antagonistic to both, and the ease with which it is used—merely by sniffing—constitutes its use as one of the most pernicious habits.

The Royal College of Dental Surgeons, of Ontario, in their communication, state:

Our profession are heartily in accord with the restrictions.

In addition to that I have had a large number of communications from individuals, and a petition signed by 429 persons of Montreal, including many prominent citizens. I hope the House will not feel that in quoting these documents I have any other purpose in view than to show how many different classes of people feel the necessity for legislation of this kind. In the Bill which is before the House the government has sought to take cognizance of the views expressed by those who have come in contact with actual conditions, by officials who have had to do with the administration of the law, and we have tried to frame a measure which will be effective if put upon the statutes. We have tried to bring down a Bill that will stamp out for good and all, if possible, the use of these habit forming drugs for any other than scientific or medicinal purposes, and when used for these purposes, used in such a way as to safeguard the interests of all. I should like to again emphasize the fact that in this legislation Canada is not merely helping herself, but is helping also in a world-wide movement, because legislation similar to this is being presented to the congress of the United States at the present time, and as I have indicated by a reference to the International Commission which met in Shanghai a year ago, the governments of various countries may be expected to take similar action.

In conclusion let me say that this legislation belongs to the same class as the Bill I had the privilege of introducing the other evening which seeks to suppress the occupational disease known as necrosis. What we are striving for in legislation of this kind is the conservation of human life and of human well-being. A great deal has been said about the conservation of our natural resources; but natural resources are given to man for the use of man, and not for the destruction of human life. The first of all resources to be conserved are the health and life, moral as well as physical of our people, and it is to keep these intact, and to help to build up in Canada a strong, and happy, and a moral people, that the government brings forward this legislation, and does so in the belief that it will pass this House without any opposition.

Mr. DOHERTY. I desire to say that with the object of this measure I have the most hearty sympathy. The minister has expressed a hope that the Bill will meet with no opposition, and I think he will not be disappointed. I do not think that, after all he has so eloquently said, and the powerful testimony he has thought proper to invoke in support of the measure, it is necessary that I should add any words for the purpose of enforcing the desirability of adopting a measure of this kind. I may say as living in Montreal, and being more or less in communication with a great many of the authorities whom the

hon. gentleman has cited, that I have had occasion to learn something of the very frightful and growing evils which, I am sorry to say, have prevailed in that city, as a result more particularly of the use of cocaine. So much so is that the case that when the hon. gentleman introduced his Bill dealing simply with opium, I was requested to take some steps to have added to it a provision respecting the use of this drug, cocaine, and I had even prepared an amendment in that sense when the minister anticipated me by remodelling his Bill. I am glad to express my sympathy with the purpose of his Bill, and, in so far as its principle is concerned, to give it my support. In going over it I have been struck with the possibility that some of the provisions do not precisely express the intention, or possibly go beyond the intention, but I understand that any verbal matter of this kind can more properly be dealt with when the Bill gets into committee than at the present stage.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Clause 3, which is the operating clause, I do not think, carries out the intention or desire that the hon. gentleman has in view. It reads:

> Every person who imports, manufactures, sells, offers for sale, has in his possession, or takes or carries or causes to be taken or carried from any place in Canada to any other place in Canada, any drug for other than scientific or medicinal purposes, shall be liable, upon summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars and costs, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, or to both fine and imprisonment.

That disregards totally the intent of the person doing this; that is to say a man might innocently carry a package of opium —it might not be marked 'opium'—from the station to the drug store or an employee might put it on a railway express train. Any person who touches it at all, quite innocently, would be liable under this Act and the magistrate would have no discretion but to fine and perhaps imprison him. The minister should insert the word 'knowingly' before the word 'imports' to meet that objection. I notice that in section 4 he says:

> Every person who smokes opium, or who, without lawful or reasonabe excuse.

He puts this qualification in, and likewise in the next subsection:

> Any person who, without lawful and reasonable excuse.

There is all the more reason in the operating clause of the Act that he should insert the word 'knowingly'.

Mr. KING. I think we might consider a point of that sort when the Bill gets into committee. That very point was raised by me with the Justice Department when this Bill was submitted for consideration, but I was advised that perhaps it would be just as well to leave out the word knowingly.' It was represented that the judge would use his discretion in a matter of that kind. The trouble in the administration of Acts of this kind is that it is just such words as the one suggested that tend to nullify the real effect. However, I am quite prepared to leave myself in the hands of the Committee, and if members think it is advisable to make the change suggested by the hon. gentleman, to carefully consider it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. How can the judge exercise discretion when the Act says that if you are found with opium in your possession you are guilty of a crime under this very section? If you carry or deal in it as an innocent employee you are liable to the penalties of the Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2: Definitions; (b) 'Opium' means and includes crude opium, powdered opium, and opium prepared for smoking, or in any stage of such preparation.

Mr. SPROULE. The only drugs mentioned in the schedule are cocaine, morphine and opium. Morphine and opium are practically the same thing. Would it mean any other preparations of the same drug? For instance, take 'opium'; will that include opium, tincture of opium, morphine, paragoric and other preparations?

Mr. KING. Section 14 will perhaps show why these other preparations have not been included. Section 14 gives the Governor in Council power to—

> From time to time, add to the schedule of this Act any substance, the addition of which is by him deemed necessary in the public interest.

It was thought advisable, before filling out that list, to confer with different associations and medical men with regard to the drugs that should be included in it. Additions I think, could be more advantageously made in that way, after getting expert advice from associations like the medical and pharmaceutical associations. Then in connection with our Conservation Commission we have an officer whose duty is in part to consider and advise upon questions of this kind. On the advice of such authorities the Governor in Council might add any preparations deemed necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. You specify opium and morphine. These are two preparations of one drug. Would any other preparations of the same drug come under the provision of the law? Different preparations of the same drug in different forms produce prac-

tically the same effect. If you take laudanum it produces the same effect as morphine. If you take opium it also produces the same effect. Would it apply to all preparations of the same drug?

Mr. KING. It is just possible that there are some preparations which it would not be wise to include in that list, but any that medical experts thought it desirable to include the Governor in Council has power to add.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the question I asked at all. Legally, do you come under the next clause of the Act if you are carrying, or using, another preparation of the same drug than that which is mentioned in the schedule?

Mr. BLACK. I would like to ask if the word 'opium' means opium itself, or does it include alkaloids of opium, or the various preparations made from opium and from the alkaloids of opium?

Mr. KING. That is practically the same question as that which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has asked, As the Bill now stands in its reference to oppium in the interpretation clause, 'opium' includes 'crude opium, powdered opium, and opium prepared for smoking, or in any stage of such preparation.' But as respects other drugs the intention has been to leave them for the present until an opportunity has been had to confer with medical experts as to what preparations, what alkaloids and what derivatives shall be included, and they may be added by order in council. There are a great many of them, but I understand it is rather a technical subject. The government can get the advice of well qualified practitioners, and they can add these preparations by order in council as may be necessary from time to time.

Mr. BLACK. I think there are preparations and alkaloids of opium that need legislation to prevent their use by the people more than crude opium itself. In 47 years' experience in the practice of medicine I have found more people in eastern Canada suffering from the use of morphine than any other preparation of opium. I have found it taken by many people hypodermically, as well as by the mouth, and I think if legislation is required, as I am sure it is, to protect the people against the use of opium, it is equally required in the case of the alkaloids. Some persons drink laudanum, which is nothing less than opium and alcohol, but the great majority of people addicted to the opium habit take morphine, which is an alkaloid of opium, codeine, another alkaloid, and I have found individuals who prefer to drink paragoric or any other form of opium. If we are going to legislate we really ought to include some alkaloids of opium.

Mr. KING. In the schedule appended to the Act, the alkaloids including morphine are specifically named and section 14 of the Bill gives the Governor in Council power to add any other alkaloids, from time to time, as occasion may require.

Mr. DOHERTY. This provision, section 2, combined with section 14 to which the minister has referred, seems to me a very dangerous kind of legislation. I have said that I have great sympathy with the purpose of this Act, but it is to be borne in mind that this is a criminal enactment, we are making additions to the criminal law and by these two combined sections we are handing over the power of this parliament to make the criminal law to the Governor in Council, because if this is carried, a mere addition to that schedule made by the Governor in Council will make the having or selling or dealing in or carrying the substance which may be added to that schedule a crime. I think this is undesirable legislation. It is going very far indeed for us to enact that the Governor in Council shall be free to make a crime, the possession of any substance whatsoever which in his judgment he may consider he ought to add. I have no reason to suppose the power would not be fairly and reasonably exercised, but at the same time, as a matter of principle, it does seem to me very undesirable form of legislation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I entirely agree in what my hon. friend for the St. Anne's division of Montreal (Mr. Doherty) has said. I would like to emphasize the point that the entire pharmacopœia might be added by order in council to this schedule, and the possession or sale of any article enumerated therein might be made a crime. We have had a great deal of legislation by order in council, sometimes of necessity or for purposes of convenience, but I think that this is the first time that criminal legislation by order in council has ever been attempted. A certain evil is said to exist. I have no doubt it does, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the purpose of and object of this Bill. I believe there is an evil and we should have a remedy, but the government in this legislation should be able to point out the extent of the evils and so frame the legislation that it will afford an adequate remedy for them. To go further and to have further criminal legislation enacted by order in council is certainly a step beyond anything in my experience. Also it is going outside of the path of wisdom to adopt any such method of legislation. It is not probable that any evil at present unknown will spring up to any considerable or even appreciable extent before another session of parliament.

If by the time we are in session again it should become apparent to the minister that some further article should be added to this schedule, parliament in its wisdom can add that to the schedule, but in the meantime we should confine ourselves to those articles, the sale of which at the present time is injurious to the public interest, according to the evidence which the minister is able to submit to this committee.

Mr. KING. I am rather surprised at the attitude taken by my friend, the hon. the leader of the oppopsition (Mr. Borden). I remember when the House was considering the measure relating to the eight-hour day that hon. gentleman pointed out that all the legislation proposed could be enacted by order in council, and I gathered at that time that he was rather strongly in favour of legislation by order in council. I am not less surprised at the leader of the opposition saying he regards this as a departure from the path of wisdom and an entire innovation, in as much as this parliament in 1908, and I think with his consent, enacted a measure respecting patent and proprietary medicines in which exactly the same power was given.

17. The Governor in Council may make such regulations for giving effect to any of the provisions of this Act or in respect of the sale of any patent or proprietary medicine in stock at the time of the passing of this Act, and declaring the true intent thereof, in any case of doubt, as to him seems meet, and may also add to or remove from the schedule to this Act any poisons or potent drugs, as from time to time he deems expedient, and notice thereof shall be given in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there a criminal offence created?

Mr. KING (reading):

3 Every person who violates the provisions of this section shall, for a first offence, incur a penalty of fifty dollars and costs, and for any subsequent offence a penalty not exceeding five hundred dollars and not less than one hundred dollars and costs, and the certificate of registration shall be cancelled.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As far as the remarks which I made the other day and which have been alluded to are concerned, I should think it would be apparent to the intellect of any person that there is a slight difference between what is purely a matter of administration and the creation of a criminal offence. If the Minister of Labour cannot understand that without argument and without discussion I shall not attempt to make him understand it. I would think it would be apparent to the humblest intellect in this country. The matter referred to the other day was one touching purely the employment of men upon works under the control of the various departments of the government. I said and I repeat that the object attained by the very limited legislation which was eventually passed by the committee could have been carried out by the government without the necessity of coming to parliament at all. It was of exceedingly limited scope. This is an entirely different thing, it is the creation of a criminal offence by order in council. If the minister can point out to me any reason why that should be done by order in council, instead of by legislative enactment, I am ready to consider it, but up to the present time he has not given any reason that I have heard, absolutely no reason at all. If the minister knows of any such substance now, add it to the schedule of this Bill. If he does not, leave the schedule as it is. If any substance of that character creates a detriment to the public interest between the conclusion of this session and the commencement of another, let us deal with that particular evil when we meet again. That seems to me to be reasonable and plain.

Mr. KING. The same reasons that were urged at the time the Act respecting Patent and Proprietary Medicines was before the House, apply to this case. It must be remembered that new preparations from these drugs are being made constantly, and it would seem to be preferable that cases of that kind should be dealt with by order in council rather than that parliament should be troubled with them. Where it is possible to get expert medical advice upon these matters, it would seem to be desirable to give the governor in council power to frame the schedule from time to time, as may be necessary.

Mr. DOHERTY. The effect of that would be that instead of having criminal legislation passed by and with the advice of parliament, we would be having it passed by and with the advice of certain medical experts. I have not read the Act to which the minister refers; but if parliament made one mistake under that Act, I do not think it is a very good reason why we should make a second mistake.

On section 3—importation, manufacture, sale or possession of drugs; penalty.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like to move that the word 'knowingly' be inserted after the word 'who' in the first line of this section. This would render liable to the penalties under this Act a person who commits the offence wilfully and knowingly, and would preserve the rights of innocent persons. Otherwise persons would be liable to the penalty who innocently carried the goods prohibited under this Act. The minister has accepted the idea I suggest by making an exception in the fourth section. A railway company or any person might innocently con-

vey the prohibited goods in a box from one part of Canada to another. Yet it would be liable to a penalty under this section.

Mr. KING. I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that by section 16, section 4 does not come into force until the 1st of July, 1911. That is the section which relates to opium smoking, and the provision of section 16 is for the purpose of giving to people who are addicted to the habit a little more time in which to get rid of it. As to the insertion of the word 'knowingly,' I am informed that this is a favourite word with the legal profession, but its insertion here, I fear, would make it practically impossible to secure a conviction, and would have the effect of nullifying the legislation. My hon. friend would hardly expect a judge to convict a man for simply having carried a box of opium without knowing what was in the box. The intention is plain enough.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. But under this provision, he would be liable to the penalties provided. Of course, a judge, knowing the circumstances, would make the penalty merely a nominal one. But that is not the question. He would still be convicting an innocent man of a crime of which he was not guilty. It is the intent which constitutes the crime, yet a man who carries a box of opium in all innocence, would, under this section, be guilty of this indictable offence.

Mr. DOHERTY. The minister says that he does not suppose a judge would convict a man who was carrying a box of opium across the street and who did not know the contents of the box. Well, if the minister intends that a judge should only convict a man when he does the thing knowingly, there can be no harm in saying so. While I do not want to show any lack of deference to the legal authority which my hon. friend says he has consulted, I quite agree with my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Middlebro) that if you leave that section as it is, a guilty knowledge will not be essential to the offence. Compare this section with the one following. The one following provides that every man who, without lawful or reasonable excuse, has in his possession opium prepared or being prepared for smoking is guilty of an offence. Why not apply the same qualification to both cases?

Mr. KING. I have no objection and would move to insert the words 'without lawful or reasonable excuse.'

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 4,

1. Every person who smokes opium, or who, without lawful or reasonable excuse, has in his possession opium prepared or being prepared for smoking, shall be guilty of an offence against this Act, and shall be liable on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, or to both fine and imprisonment.

2. Any person who, without lawful and reasonable excuse, is found in any house, room or place to which persons resort for the purpose of smoking or inhaling opium, shall be liable upon summary conviction to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars and costs, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one month, or to both fine and imprisonment.

Mr. KING. I would move to add in the fifth line after the word 'dollars' the words 'and costs' which were omitted in the printing.

Mr. DOHERTY. I would like to ask whether there is any intention in using different wording in the first section of section 4 compared with the other section. For instance in section 3 it is provided that every one shall be liable upon summary conviction ; and in the second subsection of section 4, the same formula is used. But in the first paragraph of section 4 it is provided that every one who, without lawful or reasonable excuse has in his possession opium shall be guilty of an offence against this Act, and shall be liable on summary conviction. I do not see that it makes any difference whether you insert the words 'shall be guilty of an offence' or not, but they are found in that subsection alone. In section 8 it is provided that when any one is convicted of an offence against this Act, the magistrate may order, in addition to any other penalty, that the drug be seized and destroyed. It might possibly be argued that inasmuch as the first paragraph of section 4 is the only place where a man doing a certain thing is guilty of an offence against the Act, a man who does all the other things mentioned in the other sections shall not be declared guilty of an offence against the Act. I would suggest that the words 'shall be guilty of an offence against this Act,' be stricken from the first paragraph of section 4, or else that you insert these words with regard to all the others so that it may be clear you are treating them all on the same basis.

Mr. KING. I am quite agreeable to that if the hon. gentleman desires it.

Mr. DOHERTY. It is a fair enough argument to say that if you use a different form of expression in two different sections it must have been because you meant two different things, and there is no doubt that the intention of the Act is that all these things which are prohibited shall be placed on the same basis as being offences. I move that the words 'shall be guilty of

an offence against this Act and ' in line 3 be stricken out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAIN. While the minister is devoting special attention in this Bill to what may be called a minor evil, I would remind him that he is not doing anything to prohibit the greater evil of cigarette smoking in Canada. Not so long since petitions signed by thousands of inhabitants of this Dominion were presented to the government calling upon them to prohibit the sale, importation and manufacture of cigarettes and pointing out the great evils arising from the use of cigarettes. I notice that in the examination for candidates for the new navy a number failed to pass the physical test because of the excessive use of cigarettes. I suppose the Minister of Labour has taken the role of moral reformer for the government once held by the Minister of Agriculture, and I would remind him that if he expects to be a successful moral reformer he should deal with the evils which are staring him in the face, rather than seek for evils less glaring. I now invite the Minister of Labour to extend the scope of this Bill so as to prohibit the importation, sale and manufacture of cigarettes. If I remember well the Minister of Agriculture spoke in this House in favour of the prohibition of cigarettes, and while no doubt he is still of that opinion I notice that he is very inactive in urging on the government the introduction and passage of such legislation. If the Minister of Agriculture, as well as my new friend the Minister of Labour are sincere about improving the morals of the people, they will insert in this Bill an anti-cigarette clause. I wish it to be clearly understood that I am in favour of this anti-cocaine Bill, but my protest is that the government has not extended its scope so as to make it an anti-cigarette Bill as well. I venture to say that where there has been one request to this government for the introduction of this legislation, there must have been a hundred requests for the prohibition of cigarettes. If the Minister of Labour is not to-night prepared to adopt my suggestion I trust he will give it his serious consideration, and that he will during the present session introduce legislation to stop the cigarette evil. I might remind him that petitions have come from the important county he represents asking for the prohibition of the importation, sale and manufacture of cigarettes, and I think he should pay heed to the recommendations of his own constituents. I once introduced an anti-cigarette Bill, but the strong masculine majority behind the government refused to adopt it, and so the evil grows and is growing. I may tell the government that this question will have to be dealt with by them, or by some other government, in the very near future. I hope my hon. friend will set to work and pursue energetically his role of moral reformer that he seems to have taken away from the Minister of Agriculture. He is a new minister now, and is quite energetic, and the people will look to him to deal with these other great moral questions. He will not require to appoint a commission to find out whether they are evils. All this information is in the hands of the government, and people are waiting for legislation.

Mr. KING. It is hardly necessary for me to reply as my hon. friend has already indicated to the committee the obvious answer to his own question. This legislation is to prohibit the improper use of opium and other drugs. Cigarettes and tobacco have not yet been considered a drug, and is advantageous to deal with only one class of subjects at this time, and under this Bill. I must, however, thank my hon. friend for directing the attention of the country to the fact that the government has not been indifferent even to the evil of cigarette smoking. As he has pointed out, candidates for the navy have been refused admission, some of them, on the ground that they had been addicted to the habit of cigarette smoking. Action of that kind on the part of the government cannot but have a good moral effect in the country. No doubt that has been the object in the mind of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in enforcing a regulation of that kind.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask what we may expect from the government in respect to the cigarette question?

Mr. KING. That will receive careful consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. That is an old story.

Mr. DOHERTY. I agree with the minister that it would be scarcely proper to include cigarettes among these drugs. I would point out to the minister that it might be undesirable to put this power in the hands of the government. We might pass this Act just as it is, and the Governor in Council will still be free to add tobacco to that schedule. The Governor in Council are taking a power without any limit.

On section 5, dealing in drugs—penalty, prescriptions, penalty.

Mr. SPROULE. I think you are proposing a very onerous obligation on medical men, and a very inconvenient one on patients.

Any person who neglects to make or preserve a proper record in a suitable book of the name and address of the physician, veterinary surgeon, dentist or druggist to whom he

gives, sells or furnishes any drug, and the date of such sale.

—is liable to a penalty. Usually the practice in our country is for medical men to write their prescriptions and to hand them in to a drug store, and these are generally kept in a book. It would be a serious task to copy into a book all prescriptions as they are written, they are usually kept on file. When once the medicine has been used up, the practice is to have the prescription repeated, if needed and the party gives a verbal order. According to my understanding of this section, it would be a violation of the law for a druggist to repeat that prescription, and also a violation for a medical man to order it unless a record is taken of it. You will see how much work and trouble that would entail. I think you would even compel the medical man to make a copy of a prescription that was sold to himself. Supposing a physician wants a medicine for instance, morphine, which he usually carries with him, he may want it in a hurry, but if it is not registered then the druggist is liable to a fine. I think that would be absurd. These drugs are carried by medical men in their cases, and as soon as the supply runs out they get their bottles filled again. How could that be done without their violating the law? This would not be workable without a great deal of unnecessary trouble and expense, both to the druggist and the physician.

Mr. KING. I regard the points to which my hon. friend has referred as being the essence of the section. Nearly every one who has communicated with us on this subject has pointed out the great necessity of placing all possible safeguards about the sale of these drugs, particularly in the matter of registration by a druggist of any sale, no matter to whom it is made.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister mean to say that it is necessary to register every purchase made by a medical man from a druggist of an article which he carries with him every day in the year?

Mr. KING. I would ask my hon. friend to consider an opinion that he will take as being more valuable than anything I could give myself. I have a letter from Dr. Chas. A. Hodgetts, medical adviser to the commission on conservation, who has been appointed by the government for the express purpose of watching matters of public concern of this kind. Dr. Hodgetts says:—

Drugs of this class are really becoming more and more in common use and in the interests of public health all the safeguards it is possible for the Dominion government to surround them with should be promulgated and enforced.

Elsewhere he says:—

Another important matter is that of the repeating of physicians prescriptions containing opium, &c., by chemists. To do so should be made a criminal offence, punishable by fine or imprisonment, together with forfeiture of license by the offending chemist; and physicians who wantonly make use of these drugs should be brought within the criminal law.

From over ten years experience as a pharmaceutical chemist and 25 years as a physician, I can testify to the necessity of strong action on the part of the government, for as the evil of alcohol decreases that of the use of opium and similar preparations will increase and the evil of the latter is of the most insidious nature and therefore more difficult to combat.

I felt myself that there was a good deal in the nature of restriction about that clause. I consulted with some of those who have to do with the sale of these drugs and with physicians, and they were all agreed that if this legislation were going to be effective it could not be made too difficult for people to obtain these habit-forming drugs. It does not follow that because a prescription cannot be repeated except upon the instructions of a physician that the physician must himself give such instructions in person. I presume that the physician could indicate on the prescription when he gave it whether it was to be repeated or not. It is pretty generally conceded that it should not be left to the discretion of the chemist to repeat a prescription when it is known that the habit is formed by virtue of this very practice of repeating prescriptions.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has quoted an authority for whom perhaps a medical man would not have the very highest respect for the reason not that he is not a man of ability professionally but that he is not a practising physician.

Mr. KING. He says that he was a practising physician for 25 years.

Mr. SPROULE. Probably he was in the city of Toronto. It is one thing to be a practising physician in a large city but it is another thing to be a practising physician in the country, where you go out eight or ten miles to visit a patient, and where there is no opportunity of getting these things except you send for them or take them along with you. That is a different thing entirely. I am speaking of an experience extending over forty years as a practising physician when I am at home. I have gone through every stage of the drug business, I have run a drug store as well, I know the usual practice in our country and I am quite sure that there is not an active, practising physician in the country to-day that would not, if this becomes law, violate it every week in the year

Mr. KING. Then I think he ought to be prosecuted every week in the year.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister just shows how little he knows about lines which are not his own. There is no more danger of the respectable physician doing any harm with these things than there is in his carrying a pail of cold water around. He is acting on judgment and common sense. He is not carrying around these things with any improper purpose, but for medicinal purposes, and he is responsible as a physician, as well as the minister is. He has to contend with difficulties about which the minister knows nothing.

Mr. KING. There is nothing to prevent a doctor from carrying around cocaine with him.

Mr. SPROULE. If he is going out in a hurry and he orders a small vial of morphine to be refilled it goes into the case that he must take along with him, and unless he stops and goes through all the routine of registration that is laid down here he will violate the law. It may be that he sends for some more morphine pills, as is very often done. He sends a party in from a place where he is engaged with a sick person at the house. I do not think that a messenger could carry it without violating the law. Then he is not there to register. The druggist might keep an account of it, but you impose upon the druggist a very onerous and unnecessary amount of work. You have in another part of the Act a provision applying to the case where a medical man gives a prescription for a certain purpose, it may require to be refilled again, but that can't be done by the druggist without a violation of this Act. But I am speaking of the medical man engaged in the practice of his profession amongst sick people who requires these drugs from day to day and hour to hour, and who has to take this means of getting them because there are no drug stores near him. If such a law as this is enacted the result will be that hundreds of medical men will violate it over and over again, because they could not very well carry on the work of their profession without doing it. I do not think that any man should be subjected to that disability or danger.

Mr. KING. I am quite prepared to admit that if all physicians had the high sense of duty and the integrity of my hon. friend there would be no need for legislation of this kind whatever, but, unfortunately, as he only too well knows, there are in every profession men who are not a credit to it, and it so happens that in dealing with evils of this kind these are the men that the law has to get after. If my hon. friend can suggest any means whereby that class of men can be effectively prevented from doing the public an injury and at the same time not necessitate the sort of restrictions that we have here I shall be very glad to consider his suggestion, but all the advice that I have received on this point goes to show that some rigid legislation of this kind is absolutely essential. I think my hon. friend does not understand the proposal when he says that a physician could not go about with this drug in his possession and administer it if necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister misunderstood me in that. I did not say a physician could not carry it around with him as a medical man, because I think he could do that. But, I say that he could not send a messenger.

Mr. KING. I think that if he sent an order with the messenger he certainly would be entitled to have that order filled by the druggist, who would be obliged to keep a record which would show the transaction. On that point every one who has had to do with this evil is very strong in saying that such a provision should be insisted upon. I think there is no reason why it should not be.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Under the provisions of this section, would it not be possible for a medical man to send a prescription to a druggist and at the bottom of it to say: 'Give John Smith this dose as often as he requires it'? There is nothing in the Bill to prevent a druggist from giving it to a man as often as he requires it, or the medical man might give the prescription in the first place and telephone a repeat order afterwards, because the second authority does not require to be in writing. The Act could be overcome in that way quite simply. It is only intended to apply to the physician who would do that sort of thing. Therefore, a physician who wants to do it will do everything to get over this section. He might write on the bottom of the prescription: 'Give John Smith as many prescriptions of this as he likes.' Is the druggist legally entitled to make the further sales?

Mr. KING. I would think so.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The druggist would not be liable to any penalty?

Mr. KING. No, he would have the written order of the physician, and as long as he follows the written order he is protected.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Was it not the intention of the minister that the druggist should have a separate prescription every time?

Mr. KING. No, I cannot say that was the intention, it is that no druggist should repeat the prescription unless he had a direct written order. That might be done by separate orders, or by one general order.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It says here that he shall not fill the prescription more than once.

Mr. KING. Without authority.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That would mean that no prescription should be sold more than once, that he should have a new prescription from the physician every time.

Mr. KING. No, it means exactly what it says.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think the druggist should not be allowed to sell for years on the one prescription.

Mr. KING. Perhaps the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) will give his opinion on that.

Mr. SPROULE. In the treatment of epilepsy or asthma, where spasms come irregularly, I give a prescription and instruct the patient to go to the druggist with the number and have it refilled when required.

Mr. KING. Would the hon. gentleman give a prescription to that effect with regard to morphine or opium?

Mr. SPROULE. In some cases they are portions of the prescription, and would come under the penalties of this Act. That system is more economical for the patient, and saves the physician's time. Many prescribing physicians have a percentage coming to them on the prescription, but if it is refilled the physician gets no percentage.

Mr. KING. The only additional trouble under this section would be that the physician would have to indicate on the prescription how often he wanted it refilled. It would fix on him the responsibility of so ordering.

Mr. SPROULE. If that would be a compliance with the law it is the easiest matter to get over it, but a judge might take a different view.

On section 6, prohibition of export to countries prohibiting opium.

Mr. KING. I would like to have it of record that this section is prepared in consequence of the resolution passed at the International Opium Commission at Shanghai to which I have referred and of which the following is the wording:

That the International Opium Commission finds that each government represented has strict laws which are aimed directly or indirectly to prevent the smuggling of opium, its alkaloids, derivatives and preparations into their respective territories; in the judgment of the International Opium Commission, it is also the duty of all countries to adopt reasonable measures to prevent at ports of departure the shipment of opium, its alkaloids, derivatives and preparations, to any country which prohibits the entry of any opium, its alkaloids, derivatives and preparations.

I might add that it is understood Great Britain has recently suggested, in connection with an international conference which is to be held at The Hague next year, proposed by the United States, that in addition to the suppression of the opium traffic, the conference should deal with the suppression of morphine and cocaine. In that connection these sections may be important in their international significance.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. In the interpretation section of this Bill, 'export' or 'exporting' is defined as meaning and including 'the taking or conveying, or causing to be taken or conveyed out of Canada.' I would move that the words 'unlawfully or without reasonable excuse' be inserted after the word 'person' in the first line of section 6. Otherwise a person might innocently do that and yet be liable to the penalty under this Act.

Mr. KING. There can be no objection to inserting those words.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. Would there be any objection to exporting opium to a country which did not prohibit it?

Mr. KING. This section only goes so far as to prohibit its exportation to countries which have prohibited the evil themselves. It was not thought by the International Commission that it would be advisable for this section to go any further.

On section 9—drugs unclaimed for three months destroyed, subject to order.

Mr. DOHERTY. I understand the purpose of this provision that the Customs Act shall apply is to make some provisions of that Act applicable in some way to this particular drug. But the person who reads the Customs Act does not find anything there to connect those provisions with this enactment, and, therefore, he will never discover that the Customs Act has any application to these things. Should there not be some connecting link between the two Acts in the way of some amendment to the Customs Act in order to enable people to discover in the Customs Act that those provisions of the Customs Act do apply to this Act?

Mr. KING. I think the reference here is to certain powers of search and seizure which are given to officials of the customs, and I may say that this section is similar to a section in the Canada Temperance Act. These words are incorporated simply to make it clear that these powers

would apply to any effort to smuggle any of these drugs as well as to the smuggling of other articles. It may be that we are duplicating legislation to a certain extent by this section, as I think these articles would be included in the list of the prohibited articles in the Customs Act, and once they appear there, it would be made clear that these powers extended to them.

Mr. DOHERTY. A man goes to the Customs Act to find what are the prohibited articles, and he does not find these articles among them, nor does he find them in any amendment to the Customs Act. Having done that, he may unwittingly do something to bring himself in contravention to the Customs Act. It would not be very difficult, when Acts of this kind are passed, to pass a small Act amending the Customs Act, so that there would be some connection between the two, which a man would discover on examining the Customs Act, and the Acts amending it. The average man would think that when he had gone through the Customs Act, and the amendments to it, and found out what it prohibited, he had done all that was required, and he would never dream of going behind the Customs Act and examining this one. You surely could not expect a man to go through all the statutes in order to find out if in any particular one there is something affecting the Customs Act. The proper course would be to make an amendment to the Customs Act in the sense of this section.

Mr. KING. I think the suggestion a very good one, but as there are two or three Bills going through which affect the Customs Act, it would be better to deal with them all together at one stroke by a Bill amending the Customs Act.

Mr. DOHERTY. I have no objection, but certainly there should be some amendment to the Customs Act itself which would give information of provisions such as this.

On section 12,

No conviction, judgment or order in respect of an offence against this Act shall be removed by certiorari into any of His Majesty's courts of record.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not see why this remedy by certiorari should be removed.

Mr. KING. This was done on the advice of the Department of Justice.

Mr. McKENZIE. I cannot understand why the Department of Justice should give such advice. It is an extraordinary provision. It is only found in very few criminal Acts. There must have been some case presented to the Department of Justice before it would give such advice. This provision takes away the right of removing a conviction by certiorari, which is a remedy very much valued by the British subject, and I do not like to see any of the old landmarks swept away without strong reason.

On section 14,

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, add to the schedule to this Act any substance, the addition of which is by him deemed necessary in the public interest, and every order in council in that behalf shall be published in the 'Canada Gazette,' and shall take effect at the expiration of thirty days from the date of such publication.

Mr. DOHERTY. While I do not want to take up time, I feel it my duty to insist as emphatically as I can against the adoption of this section. By this Bill we are creating new criminal offences, and this section proposes to vest in the Governor in Council the power, by simply adding the name of any substance whatever to this schedule, to make the possession, the handling in any way of such substance a criminal offence. I most earnestly urge upon the minister the impropriety of parliament delegating this most serious power to the Governor in Council.

It is an exceedingly grave thing for parliament to take the practical omnipotence it holds as a legislative body and hand it over to be exercised absolutely by the Governor in Council; it is asking the council not an executive, but a legislative body. The answer that similar provision is incorporated in other legislation is not to me a conclusive reason. Some one has said by way of criticism of the English system of law resting upon precedent that under it, when a man once went wrong he forfeited forever after the right to be right. However that may be with English jurisprudence, there is certainly no such limitation on this parliament to follow precedent, and I would strongly suggest to the minister that he should strike out this section. We have one exceedingly bad precedent in the other Bill already cited, and I do not think we should let it go down from precedent to precedent. I am of course strongly in favour of the legislation before us, but when we hand over to the government the power to make innocent acts, crimes, it really means the abdication by parliament of the power the constitution confided to it and to it alone. Certainly, between the sessions of parliament there is hardly a sufficient time for a new evil to assume such vicious proportions as to call for legislation to suppress it, and that being so what possible public danger is there in leaving it to parliament each session to deal with the evils that may have grown up in the interval? If we might expect new evils of this nature to spring up from day to day, there might be something to be said in favour of conferring

this power on the Governor in Council but one may very well hope that human ingenuity is not going to be so determinedly devoted to finding new methods of debauching the people of this country as to make it impossible for us to keep apace with it in legislation from session to session. I speak with a good deal of earnestness in this matter, because I cannot conceive anything more undesirable in the way of legislation, and because each repeated instance will afford an additional argument for doing it again until we will have added to what are the legitimate functions of the Governor in Council, practically the enactment of the criminal law.

Mr. KING. In view of the opinion expressed by so eminent a jurist as my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty), it is with diffidence that I still urge the retention of this section. I should hesitate to do so on my own responsibility, but the point has been carefully considered by the law advisers, who have thought it desirable to give this power to the Governor in Council. After all whatever is done by the Governor in Council, so far as criminal legislation is concerned, would be done upon the advice of the Minister of Justice, who, it may be expected, will zealously safeguard the administration of the criminal law were there any probability of this power being abused. I would withdraw the section were there likely to be any doubt as to the intention of parliament in the matter, but in naming the three drugs, cocaine, morphine and opium, parliament makes it plain that it is legislating against what are known as habit-forming drugs, and it recognizes that as from time to time, one form of the drug is suppressed, a derivative of it may rapidly spring up which it is desirable to check as speedily as possible. We have similar provisions in the Patent Medicine Act and in the Act dealing with noxious weeds. The business of parliament is becoming more considerable every year. Larger and more important subjects are constantly coming to the fore and require all the time and attention that can be given them. We should seek to limit rather than add to the number of measures to be brought up for consideration. Suppose it were found that between sessions one noxious weed had cropped up somewhere that was not named in the schedule attached to the Act respecting noxious weeds. Also one new proprietary medicine not named in the schedule to that Act, and one drug not named in this, all of which should be legislated against. New Acts would have to be introduced in each case and with the growing business of parliament it would be found impossible in time to go into such detailed legislation. For these reasons, I think it is desirable to allow the section to remain.

Mr. DOHERTY. The minister says that if it had not been for this clause there probably would have been additional substances included in this Bill which would have given rise to a great deal of discussion in parliament. I sympathize with any desire to relieve parliament of its burdens, but I do not think we should begin with the criminal law. I think it is objectionable to delegate this power of making men criminals to any authority other than parliament itself, however, great our respect may be for that authority, or for the gentlemen who occupy the office that entitles them to exercise that power.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like to ask the minister if the government have discussed the question whether it was right to take from parliament power to declare what should be a crime?

Mr. KING. I would not say that that question had been discussed from the point of view my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If it was pointed out to the Minister of Justice that the effect was to enable the Governor in Council to constitute a new crime, he might not consent to it.

Mr. KING. This Act is a specific Act for a specific purpose. These articles, cocaine, morphine and opium, are articles with regard to which every member of parliament has some knowledge, and the intention is that any power given to the Governor in Council shall relate to these articles or to any other compound or mixture of which they form part. From time to time new combinations of drugs may be made under different names and come into general use. Cocaine may be mixed with something else, and sold under a different name, and the person selling it might seek to defend himself on the score that the drug is not mentioned in the schedule. It is to prevent any such evasions of the law that these general powers are taken.

Mr. DOHERTY. It seems to be that this legislation gives absolute power to the Governor in Council to say that tobacco is a drug, and ought to be treated in the same way as these here mentioned. That would create a situation which it is not intended to create, because every tobacco smoker would become a criminal. I presume alcohol might be treated in the same way.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest, in view of the fact that the attention of the Minister of Justice has not been drawn to this provision, and he being an eminent legal man, the proper thing would be to let the committee rise, report progress, and submit the Bill to him in the meantime. Many people in this country have a high respect for his legal attainments, and would feel better

satisfied if he had recommended this legislation.

Mr. KING. I would hesitate to refuse the suggestion made to refer the matter to the Minister of Justice, but I might point out, that we could have the opinion of the Minister of Justice, before the third reading of the Bill. Moreover, the purpose my hon. friend has in mind might be obtained by an amendment which will make the intention clearer. For instance, instead of the words 'any substance named in the schedule hereto attached' use the words 'and alkaloids, derivatives and preparations of any articles named in the schedule.' It gives the Governor in Council power to add to this schedule alkaloids, derivatives and preparations of any articles included in the schedule.

Mr. DOHERTY. As long as parliament specifies the articles I am satisfied.

Mr. KING. If for the word 'substance' is substituted the words 'alkaloids, derivatives or preparations of the articles in the attached schedule' would that meet the objection of the hon. gentleman?

Mr. SPROULE. It would then throw upon the government the responsibility of going carefully into the matter to ascertain whether it was the part of wisdom to put any of these preparations on the list or not. For instance, take morphine; you could, by the same parity of reasoning put paragoric which is a comparatively harmless drug, and used very frequently, on the list. We will have to depend upon the Governor in Council to exercise common prudence as to what shall be put on the list and what not.

Mr. KING. Certainly. I propose that section 14 be amended by striking out the word 'substance' in line 5, and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'alkaloids, derivatives and preparations of the drugs named in the schedule hereto.'

Mr. SPROULE. What is chapter 5 of the statutes of 1908?

Mr. KING. That is the Act that was passed to prohibit the manufacture and sale of opium. The manufacture of opium has been suppressed in this country. There are only two sections in this Act, one of which relates to a period of six months, which has already expired, and, therefore, it is not in force at the present time, and the other is covered by the provisions of the sections which we have already passed.

Mr. SPROULE. You do not allow the manufacture of opium at all?

Mr. KING. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I do not know that it is the height of wisdom to prohibit it.

Mr. KING. Parliament has already done it.

Mr. SPROULE. It may have done it, but parliament has done many things that are not wise in the judgment of some. There are many things in our country which we could make out of the products of our soil, and I do not think it would be wrong to manufacture anything that we require for medicinal purposes or the arts.

Mr. KING. This Act all through exempts any of these processes when they are for medicinal or scientific purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. Even the manufacturer?

Mr. KING. Yes. The old Act passed in 1908, prohibited the manufacture of opium absolutely. Under this Act the manufacture would be permitted if it were shown that it was for scientific or medicinal purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that is as it should be. Opium is made out of poppies, and poppies will grow here as well as in any other part of the world. There is no trouble at all, if you go into it extensively enough, to manufacture a commercial article that is used extensively in the country. I do not know why any one should be prohibited from the manufacture of an article of that kind.

On the schedule,

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot understand why this list was not made larger. We have many drugs which are used to-day which are just about as dangerous as cocaine or opium. For instance, there are acetanilid, phenacetin, phenalgin, amonial and a number of those coal tar derivatives that injuriously affect the user and produce much the same results as does cocaine. In the ordinary drug stores you can buy these headache wafers containing acetanilid phenacetin, and phenalgin. They affect you just the same as cocaine, and very much the same as morphine. Those who use them contract the habit, and there is no prohibition under this Act for the sale of them. I do not see the wisdom of including in the schedule such a limited number of dangerous drugs as we find in this one, and leaving so many out that are being injuriously used the same as cocaine and morphine.

Mr. KING. My hon. friend will see that it is limited inasmuch as it is left to the Governor in Council to add any of these drugs if it should deem expedient to do so. This is one of the reasons why the schedule is made small. But, there is a special reason for naming these drugs inasmuch as they have all been demonstrated to be dangerous habit-forming

drugs. In regard to the others which the hon. gentleman has named some of them may be such, but I think there are others that he has mentioned that would hardly come in the same class as cocaine and morphine.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman tell me one?

Mr. KING. I should think that phenacetin, speaking off-hand, is not as bad as some of the others.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, it certainly is and it is used very much.

Mr. KING. I know it is used, but I do not think we have many phenacetin, victims.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not expect that the minister in his line of life would come in contact with them, but if he would speak with practical medical men who have been engaged in practice since this drug came into use they would be very likely to tell him that in their experience they have met quite a number of them. As a practising physician I know many who use these drugs simply because of the pleasant sensation, the peculiar soporific effect they produce, until they have become quite strongly addicted to them. Some of these are stimulant narcotics, and others sedative narcotics, but many of them produce much the same effect as cocaine.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that the minister will submit this Bill to the Minister of Justice for his opinion?

Mr. KING. Certainly, but I thought the amendment covered it.

Mr. SPROULE. I think so too, but the House would be better satisfied if it were submitted to such an eminent authority as the Minister of Justice for his opinion as to the wisdom or propriety of allowing the Governor in Council to amend the criminal code in this way.

Mr. DOHERTY. If this is to be submitted to the Minister of Justice I hope it will not be thought that I have been saying this could not be legally done. I have simply said that it was not advisable to do it.

ADJOURNMENT—SUPPLY OF STERILIZED WATER IN PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform you and the members of the House what has been done to secure a supply of safe drinking water for the use of the members and officials of the House. The department has had installed in the building a process for sterlizing the water. This is done by a machine which is manufactured by the Forbes Sterilizer Company. Since the machine has been installed and this process adopted we have had samples of the water tested. On the 11th of this month we sent 11 samples, which were taken from the sterilizing apparatus and from each of the faucets on the different floors, both on the House of Commons and the Senate side. The report is that these samples failed to show any growth and that the water supplied by the Forbes Sterilizers may now be considered perfectly safe. It is not desirable to take water from the tap in this chamber though I think it has not been completely turned off. We have on each floor a tap which carries the water directly from the cooler. The water is sterilized and then cooled so that it is quite agreeable for drinking. I think it is not desirable that any ice should be used in the water, but I trust that arrangements may be made by which the vessels containing the water may be surrounded with ice so that it may be kept even cooler than at present. The report we have is that the water is perfectly safe. Of course it is very necessary that care should be exercised by the officials of the House, and this morning a letter was sent to the clerk of the House as follows:

Dear sir,—In view of the present epidemic of typhoid in the city of Ottawa it is necessary that the utmost care be taken in connection with the drinking water. I enclose a copy of a memorandum prepared for me by the Superintendent of Dominion Buildings stating the steps recently taken by this department to prevent such a contingency in the parliament buildings, and I would suggest that arrangements be made so that only sterilized water be used in the receptacles in the buildings.

(Signed) J. B. HUNTER,
Deputy Minister.

I have not seen the Sergeant at Arms, but I spoke to the deputy sergeant and he informs me that the pages have been instructed to take water only from the taps that lead from the sterilizer, so it is quite safe to send for water.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the process?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand the water is distilled.

Mr. SPROULE. One analysis is not always safe to rely upon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had eleven samples analysed.

Mr. ROCHE. Was the water examined before being sterilized?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The water in its ordinary state had been examined and it was found to contain some germs which might be objectionable.

Mr. DOHERTY. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will resume the consideration of his supply.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 27, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RECIPROCITY TREATY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister whether there are any other documents to be brought down in connection with the proposal presented yesterday by the Minister of Finance, and whether there are any protocols in connection with the negotiations. Also at what date it is proposed to take up again the same question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are no other papers to be brought down, so far as I am aware. I cannot tell to-day when the debate will be resumed, but probably within the course of next week.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to suggest that before we go on with the debate we should have some commercial statistics to guide us, and give us a basis of information—statistics of imports and exports as between Canada and the United States and Canada and other countries.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS FROM SOUTH GREY.

Mr. BLAIN. When may I expect the return ordered some ten days ago with respect to the number of appointments in South Grey during the last few years?

Mr. MURPHY. That is being prepared but it is difficult to get the information.

Mr. BLAIN. A pretty large list, I suppose.

Mr. MURPHY. I do not know about the size of the list, but it takes time to get the information.

Mr. FISHER. I have been trying to get that information, but it involves our asking every employee in the department whether he comes from South Grey or not.

Mr. BLAIN. That should not be a very difficult task. Surely the list cannot be so very large, and the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) could give the information.

Mr. FISHER. We do not know where our officers come from and have to find out from each one.

Mr. BLAIN. When may we expect this return?

Mr. FISHER. We are doing everything we can as far as my department is concerned to get the information, and will send it to the Secretary of State as soon as complete.

MIRAMICHI BAY.

Mr. CROCKET. When may I expect a return moved for on the 12th December, in connection with the bridge at Miramichi bay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make inquiries at once about it.

NORTH BAY WHARFS.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Has the Minister of Public Works any information to give regarding North Bay wharfs, which he promised?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall make inquiries.

HOUSE OF COMMONS AND SENATE.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that the return called for a long while ago with reference to the House of Commons and Senate has not yet been brought down.

Mr. MURPHY. It has been tabled to-day.

UNITED STATES WARSHIPS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. FOSTER. I have still another grievance. I would like to have the return called for about a year and five months ago with reference to the United States warships on the Great Lakes. This particular time may be the psychological moment to have some representation and redress in that connection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I hope to have it at a very early day.

IMMIGRATION STATISTICS.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I asked a question the other day with reference to the publication of the number of immigrants who come to this country and which should be in the 'Canada Gazette' every month and the minister said he would answer later on.

Mr. OLIVER. A resolution was passed by the House of Commons on the 5th May, 1887 to this effect:

That the Customs Department cause to be inserted in the 'Canada Gazette' at the close of each month a statement of imports, of exports, of immigration and of navigation for the month, and also for the expired portion of the fiscal year.

A search into the records of the Immigration Department show that during 18 years, in which immigration has been under contract of the Department of the Interior, no such return has been published, and no such return was ever published notwithstanding the resolution of the House of Commons. And, so far as the department is aware, no such returns were ever published notwithstanding the resolution of the House of Commons.

APPOINTMENTS FROM WENTWORTH.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the government please inform me when I may expect the return showing the number of appointments from the constituency of Wentworth which was ordered by the House some days ago. What progress is being made with this?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) would tell us what he particularly has in mind, the preparation of this return would be facilitated. But, as has been stated by the Minister of Agriculture, every department has to search its record to find whether anybody has been appointed from this or that riding. So far as I can ascertain, no such appointments have been made in the two departments over which I preside, the Privy Council and the Mounted Police. If the hon. gentleman tells us what he wishes to learn concerning any particular appointment, that would help in preparing the information.

Mr. BLAIN. I can only say that the members boast about the number of appointments that have been made as a result of their efforts. They would be able to tell the Prime Minister.

SUPPLY—SALE OF OFFENSIVE WEAPONS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) to certain articles that have recently appeared in the Montreal papers—the 'Herald,' the 'Star,' 'Pa Presse,' the 'Gazette,' the 'Witness,' 'La Patrie,' 'Le Canada,' and other daily papers of January 21, 23, 24 and 25 instant, referring to crime rampant in the city of Montreal, occasioned, these papers state, by the readiness with which lethal weapons, such as stilettos and revolvers, can be procured. Here, for instance, is what the Montreal 'Herald' published on January 23, last :

MURDER AT A PREMIUM.

Saturday the 'Herald' published, with apt illustration, a story of the 'murder mills' of Montreal—the second-hand stores and pawnshops whose windows are arsenals and over whose counters revolvers, magazine pistols, rifles, daggers, stilettos, deadly weapons of all kinds, can be purchased openly by anybody.

To-day, in grim confirmation of the 'Herald's' plea for some restriction in the sale of the implements of murder, the news is published of one actual murder in the streets of Montreal and two attempts which only missed being murder by a freak of fate.

In two of the cases the weapons were revolvers in the hands of men who had no good reason to carry arms—men who under sensible and decent legal conditions could not secure arms and would not be allowed to have arms in their possession.

For the murder of Giovanni Oland on Vitre street and for the shooting of Robert Ford on St. Antoine street Saturday night, justice should not be satisfied with the punishment of the assassins alone—it should strike through them at the murderous system that placed this means of murder in their hands and at the law which blinked complacently at the transaction.

Every deadly weapon sold should be sold only under license and only to men who have secured special permits to carry weapons for good and sufficient reasons. In the absence of such legislation this city maintains itself in the position of a patron of capital crime.

And, Montreal is not alone in this matter. yesterday, walking from these parliament buildings of Canada down Wellington street, as far as the waterworks building. I passed six different second-hand shops on the north side of that street that openly displayed, and offered for sale revolvers, stilettos, daggers and weapons of all kinds. I have here an editorial of the Montreal 'Herald,' of January 23, a part of which I quote as follows :

THE LETHAL WEAPON.

On Saturday the 'Herald' published an article describing the free and open-handed manner in which deadly weapons are sold in a hundred or more of the stores of Montreal. This morning one man was lying dead and another was in the hospital dangerously wounded as a result of the fact that such weapons can be had for the asking by anybody with a dollar or two in his pocket.

There is absolutely no excuse for the freedom of traffic in deadly weapons which is permitted in this city.

In the same issue of the 'Herald' there is a cartoon representing two foreigners looking at a notice on the wall. The reading is as follows :

NEWLY ARRIVED IMMIGRANTS.

Notice.—In order that you may feel thoroughly at home in Montreal the authorities permit the sale to you openly of revolvers, knives, &c. Thus you are enabled to settle your differences in your native way without the trouble of going to law. If you kill any one it is murder, and if you are caught you will be hung. But it is quite easy not to be caught, so do not let that worry you.

CITY OF MONTREAL.

And here, in the 'Herald' of January 24, is a cartoon entitled 'Accessory Before the Fact,' and representing the city of Montreal as a merchant dealing with a customer, a foreigner. And this is the conversation:

Montreal.—What do you want a revolver for?

Purchaser.—I want to kill a man who took my girl.

Montreal.—Tut! Tut! Dreadful; don't you know that is very wicked? However, we have them all the way from a dollar and a half up.

Now, Sir, for the last five years I have introduced and urged upon the attention of the government a Bill making it an offence under the criminal law—

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member (Mr. Lewis), but as he has a Bill dealing with this question already before the House, he cannot discuss the subject at this time.

Mr. LEWIS. I bow to your ruling, Sir, and will not discuss the matter further. I ask the Minister of Justice to take over this Bill and make it a government measure. I am perfectly willing to withdraw my Bill if the government will introduce legislation to bring about the result I seek. I think the time has come when action should be taken. And this is not a matter for the city of Montreal, or the province of Quebec, but is solely a matter for the Dominion of Canada.

POST OFFICE AT WALKERVILLE.

Mr. O. J. WILCOX (North Essex). I spoke in my place in this House on Friday evening, January 13, on the question of the importance of a public building being erected in the town of Walkerville. Among other statements which I made on that occasion was a statement to the effect that three hours elapsed before the mails were distributed under present conditions. I may say that in my head notes appear the words 'a few weeks ago.' If this was not an error on the part of the 'Hansard' reporter, then I was in error in not using the words 'a few weeks ago' that three hours had elapsed before the mail was distributed under present conditions. I have received information from a most reliable source that I was misinformed on that particular point. And in order that I might put myself right, and in order that the postmaster and his staff at Walkerville should not be placed in a wrong position, I desire to say that the postmaster at Walkerville and his staff are both able and attentive, and they are giving to the people of Walkerville the very best service they can with the facilities provided. I may say, also, that I did not realize at the time that the words which I used might be construed to mean that the postmaster was derelict in his duties in the distributing of the mail. I regret very much being wrongly informed upon the matter, and I cheerfully make the correction now. And I am glad the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) is in his seat; it is my desire that no reflection should be cast upon the postmaster at Walkerville and his staff in respect of the information I gave to the House on that particular point.

MR. J. A. MACDONALD AND RECIPROCITY.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Last week it was my privilege to address an audience in St. Catharines, dealing, among other questions, with reciprocity between Canada and the United States. On that occasion I took the opportunity to state, what I have long believed, that the closer union of Great Britain and her colonies, followed, as I have always claimed, by closer union between Britain and her colonies on one side, and the United States on the other, would be for the benefit and upbuilding of mankind at large. I pointed out that anything that interfered with the drawing closer of Great Britain and her colonies would to that extent militate against the upbuilding of mankind. I pointed out also that a year or two ago, when this last phase of reciprocity between Canada and the United States was proposed, I had given considerable attention to investigate the causes at the root of it. We know the old plans: Commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, continental free trade, annexation to the United States—all names familiar to hon. gentlemen in the House, and the battles royal that were fought up and down the country. We are now all aware that the basis of those movements was wrong. The agitators in those days appealed to merely sordid motives; cold dollars and cents were held before the people as an enticement to support such a policy. But a new plan was adopted. I pointed out that the plan had taken a different shape. We found that gentlemen were passing up and down the country explaining it from an entirely different view point. We found, as I showed, that the United States discovered a couple of years ago that they were in considerable difficulty from the maximum clauses of their

tariff. We found that the United States press, and politicians on political platforms, were loud in denunciations of the cost of living in the United States. We found further the large centres of population such as Boston, Minneapolis and Chicago, were openly in favour of reciprocity with Canada as the only means of keeping those business centres intact. I pointed out that Canada's vast natural resources also offered a great field for exploitation to American capitalists and business men generally. They had their eye on our resources, and they wanted to get at them. I pointed out that another object was to encourage trade, not along the lines that both governments in Canada had hitherto adopted, that is, lines between the Canadian east and the Canadian west, and between Canada and the mother land, following parallels of latitude rather than meridians of longitude, but that this new movement was designed to encourage trade on lines running north and south rather than east and west. Another aspect of the movement was the advocacy of universal peace especially on the continent of America. I pointed these things out.

I went further, and pointed out that negotiations had been begun by the Rev. Mr. Macdonald, of the Toronto 'Globe.' Whether he was acting as the secret agent of some one else, or on his own personal responsibility, we have no means of knowing. But we do know, and the country knows, that Mr. Macdonald was at Washington, and brought about a condition of affairs, whether as the secret agent of this government or not, has never been officially announced—he brought about the condition of affairs which permits the Minister of Finance and the First Minister to stand on platforms in this country and speak of the 'friendly approaches' of the United States to Canada in matters affecting reciprocal trade between the two countries. I pointed out that soon after, if not during these reciprocal negotiations, the Rev. Mr. Macdonald, the editor of the 'Globe,' enlarged his sphere of action and usefulness by becoming the paid agent of Mr. Ginn, a well-known publisher of Boston, a well-known advocate of free trade, and a well-known advocate of peace throughout the length and breadth of the North American continent. Mr. Macdonald, I say, accepted a position in the pay of Mr. Ginn, of the old firm of Ginn, Heath & Company, of Boston. I went further, and I showed that while he had the offer of a salary from Mr. Ginn for his entire services, he had the option of taking a certain sum of money, two or three thousand dollars, for part of his time in the service of Mr. Ginn and he might give the balance of his time in the service of the Toronto 'Globe.' I stated that Mr. Macdonald had accepted the latter position, and that part of his time was given to Mr. Ginn and to the United States business, that he took his golden dollars from the Boston institution on the one hand, and his Canadian bills from the Toronto 'Globe' on the other hand for the balance of his services. So that in making his speeches to the country we do not know which paragraph is delivered for the Yankee dollars, and which one for the Canadian bank bills; one cannot well distinguish between them. I think in future this gentleman should label his speeches and say: This paragraph, or this sentence, of my speech, is under the auspices of the Peace Society, and this other one is under the auspices of the reciprocity in trade business. At all events, I pointed all these things out, I pointed out the position which Mr. Macdonald occupied and which he occupies to-day—unless he has abandoned that position. He departed from his biblical training, and attempted to serve two masters. I pointed out further that if I had brought this matter up in the House of Commons, the Toronto 'Globe,' that bedraggled old beldame of journalism, would come out and charge me with hiding myself behind the privileges of parliament; therefore I went out, and upon that platform I made the charge which I repeat here to-day. I went further than that, and added my own conviction, which I repeat here to-day with an extension, and I promise to prove it that the peace agitation carried on by this gentleman was nothing more than reciprocity, continental free trade, commercial union and the annexation of Canada to the United States. That was the ground I took that evening, and before I am through I will prove that that is the platform, or at least the course, taken by these advocates of white-winged peace throughout the country. In days gone by we have often seen the gold bricks of these gentlemen carried around, and therefore when this new gold brick was presented to us it did not excite us in the least, we knew there was something behind it. Accordingly we carried out an investigation. The public were surprised and shocked, liberal individuals and newspapers were shocked, and the 'Globe' came out, after having been taunted several days, with a denial which I shall read later on. I may say here that on Tuesday evening, several days after, I was approached by a representative of the Toronto 'Globe,' who furnished the editor with the exact statements which I have given here—I shall come to that in a short time. On Wednesday this prince of 'Holy Willies' in journalism gave out the following article under this heading:

A MALICIOUS SLANDER.

Under a St. Catharines date line on Monday evening the Toronto 'News' published the following statement:

Quite a sensation is being caused by a charge which was made by Colonel Sam. Hughes, M.P., against Editor Macdonald of the 'Globe,' before a Conservative smoker here on Friday evening. Colonel Hughes is credited with making the following statement:—Dr. James A. Macdonald was sent to Washington to open up the question of reciprocity. He is to-day in the pay of Mr. Ginn, a prominent Boston publisher, receiving $2,500 a year to preach reciprocity.

I may point out that what I did say was that Mr. Macdonald was the representative of the Peace Society, but that in my opinion the two things were synonymous, and I will prove it before I am through.

He was offered several thousand a year to give his whole time to this fad of union between Canada and the United States. He was offered $5,000 for his whole time, but preferred to receive part of his pay from the Toronto 'Globe' and part from a Boston syndicate. Reciprocity means annexation, and annexation the hauling down of the flag which graces these walls.

Now, I will quote from the 'Globe' editorial:

The Ottawa correspondent of the 'Globe' was asked to obtain from Colonel Hughes an acknowledgment or a denial of the authenticity of the report in the 'News.'

Colonel Hughes says that what he stated was that Dr. Macdonald, who was a former pupil of his in his school-teacher period, was offered $6,000 per year by Mr. Ginn, the well known ex-publisher of Boston, if he would devote his whole time to the advocacy in the press and on the platform of the cause of universal peace.

I do not know whether the fact about Mr. Macdonald's former relationship is an effort to make it appear that I had violated any confidential information that Mr. Macdonald had furnished to me. I have never learned directly or indirectly from Mr. Macdonald anything about these matters. Anything with reference to Mr. Macdonald other than the mere question of explaining that the word 'reciprocity' was put in the wrong place, and that the words 'peace association' should have been used instead, was never broached between the Toronto 'Globe' representative and myself, or put in the report. We did indulge in private conversation afterwards, but I shall not betray the confidence that that gentleman reposed in me concerning the editor of the 'Globe.'

Colonel Hughes drew the inference that the advocacy of universal peace was coupled in Mr. Ginn's offer with the advocacy of peace between the United States and Canada via closer trade relations through the medium of reciprocity, the campaign for which had been first started by Dr. Macdonald when the latter was in Washington last spring. Colonel Hughes said that Dr. Macdonald is now receiving $2,500 per year from Mr. Ginn for devoting part of his time to the advocacy of the above causes. Even in its modified form the statement of Colonel Hughes must be classed as a malicious slander.

I stand here to-day and I have the best reason for saying that there is not the slightest deviation from the truth between what I uttered then and what I am saying to-day, that Mr. Macdonald is, or was, unless he has thrown it up, or they have thrown him up, certainly in the pay of the peace society, and certainly drawing gold eagles from that Yankee society, while at the same time drawing Canadian dollars from the 'Globe' for his services.

Even in its modified form the statement of Colonel Hughes must be classed as a malicious slander.

Well, any one who knows the old hypocrite knows that of all the institutions from time immemorial that has graced or disgraced the public life of Canada the Toronto 'Globe' is par excellence the superior for its hypocrisy.

The editor of the 'Globe' is at present, as a result of ill health,——

I am sorry to hear it—

—travelling in southern California, beyond immediate reach of either wire or letter.

I did not know, until the representative of the 'Globe' told me that he was down in California. But, when we consider the gold bricks that these gentlemen hand out in that article in order to cover up rascality, the mere fact that this gentleman is in California, where he will be near the Leland Stanford University, the president of which is Dr. Starr Jordan, the great advocate of continental peace with the barriers removed between Canada and the United States, causes us to question very seriously the idea that Dr. Macdonald may not be so seriously ill as he is represented to be. Possibly he is down there recuperating his health, or it might be that having been sent out to preach the peace platform and not being a success, he is remaining there in order that he may receive more lessons in the art from the great master.

As soon as he can be located, Dr. Macdonald will deny over his own name the utterly base inference of Colonel Hughes that he is in any way under agreement with any person to advocate reciprocity with the United States.

Well, we will see about that later on.

The relations of Dr. Macdonald as an advocate of universal peace with Mr. Ginn of Boston have nothing to do with questions of trade of the internal affairs of any nation. It was publicly announced several months ago in the 'News' as well as in every other

Toronto paper that Dr. Macdonald, while retaining the editorship of the 'Globe,' proposed to relieve himself of much of the detail work of the office that he might devote some part of his time to the advocacy of the cause of universal peace, which he has long had at heart.

So that the 'Globe' practically admits every word I am saying.

In that work he will be associated with some of the greatest educationists and publicists of America, men of the stamp of President David Starr Jordan of Leland Stanford University——

That is the place where every one is supposed to bow the head in solemn reverence.

—and John R. Mott.

Whoever he may be.

It is incredible that men of the type mentioned should receive from the peace foundation of Mr. Ginn any commission to advocate reciprocity or to deal in any way with trade relations.

They say it is incredible, but I shall prove it from Dr. Starr Jordan's own speeches delivered in this city, Montreal and Toronto, one of the slickest advocates of reciprocity under the auspicious guise of peace, that I have ever heard. Even the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in his palmy days, or the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), cannot begin to hold a candle to him.

Colonel Hughes' assertion even in its modified form is one that reflects very little credit on the man who made it, and still less on the papers that, knowing the facts, give it currency.

And what about the paper that, knowing the facts lies deliberately and maliciously about it? Never mind the papers that do not know about it, even if they do not tell a straight story, but the paper that knows the whole of the facts, is the one paper that, under the heading of 'A Malicious Slander' stands out from among the rest and tries to make it appear that I have been telling what is not true. So much for that. It is not necessary that I should go farther than to take from the 'Free Press' a journal which is particularly friendly to the government and the cause represented by it, published in Ottawa of date December 12, 1910, the following report of Dr. Starr Jordan's speech delivered in this city. He spoke on the following Monday in Toronto, and I think, he had spoken previously in Montreal:

The movement for peace must have its centre on the American side of the Atlantic ocean. It is recognized also that Canada holds the key to the whole situation.

I remember that the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur), was present and he straightened himself up and said: What is going to become of the navy?

Reference was made to the 5,000 miles of boundary between Canada and the United States.

Those of us who were present will remember how beautifully Dr. Starr Jordan treated this matter, and I have to give him credit for being one of the slickest artists I have ever seen on a platform. These are his words:

We are impressed as the people of Europe are, with the fact that along this border there is not a warship——

And yet my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), was just asking for a return about warships a few minutes ago.

—not a soldier, not a gun, nothing——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He had forgotten about Col. Hughes.

Mr. HUGHES. I am only quoting this in order that any intelligent man may see the utter fallacy and absurdity of the remarks of this gentleman.

—nothing that looks towards any unfriendly suspicion, so far as violent acts are concerned. The only thing that is wanted to make this boundary ideal is the removal of the customs officers.

Yet the 'Globe' holds this man up as the prince of peace advocates, and says that there is nothing connecting this man with the advocacy of reciprocal trade relations between Canada and the United States. You should know that Dr. Starr Jordan did not speak of the removal of the customs house officers along the outer border, but only the removal of those officers between Canada and the United States which means that the Yankee flag would fly from the north pole to the sandy plains of Popocatepetl. Then, Dr. Starr Jordan on making that remark—and I remember how beautifully he did it—noticed three gentlemen who applauded him and he said:

I only expected half a group of cheers for that and it is mighty good to get that.

Not content with impressing the business men, and the rising generation in the city of Ottawa, after showing us the horrors of war and the blessings of peace, he insidiously donned the garb of the Meek and Lowly one, and on a Sunday, occupying a pulpit, this advocate of white winged peace could not keep his fingers out of the reciprocity pie. And, here is what we find reported as his sermon on page 2 of the 'Free Press,' column 3, delivered in a Unitarian church in the city of Ottawa by Dr. Starr Jordan:

'The establishment of international peace rested with the United States and Canada,' he said; 'Canada particularly was in a very

unique position because of her relation in politics and common thought to the two greatest nations in the world.'

You will notice that he always slicks us down a little before he rubs us up. I watched him very carefully, and he is without exception one of the greatest artists I ever saw to captivate an audience ; why, he had the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ready to sell the 'Rainbow' and the 'Niobe.' Then, after meeting the people in this reverential mood, in a sermon that was well advertised he was catching the spiritual end of the town, he said :

If we can only do away with the custom house officers.

And this in a sermon mark you.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That makes it worse.

Mr. HUGHES. He says :

If we could only do away with the customs officers it would be an ideal frontier, said the speaker, in referring to the fact that in 100 years not a gun has been fired between Canada and the United States.

I need not say anything more. I have at least proven to my own satisfaction that the Rev. Dr. Jordan, and the Rev. J. A. Macdonald, and the whole outfit of them were taking Mr. Ginn's money under false pretenses when they would get on a plat form or in a pulpit to preach the removal of the customs officers between Canada and the United States, for every child in the Dominion knows that means the annexation of Canada, and the dissolution of the British Empire.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Montreal new barracks, $100,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This item stood over in order that I might be able to give information to my hon. friend from St. Anne's (Mr. Doherty) with regard to the new barracks at Longueuil. This is the information in my possession:

St. Helen's island has been handed over to the city of Montreal with the exception of three reserves containing the ordnance store buildings and magazines. These are to be reserved for use of the Department of Militia and Defence until buildings are erected for that department to contain the stores, &c., now accommodated there.

Longueuil site was purchased from various individuals in 1846-7 by the Honourable Board of Ordnance for the purpose of a Tête-du-Pont on the east side of Hochelaga bay, below St. Helen's island for the defence of Montreal. It was recently transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Militia and Defence for the purpose of a barrack site.

The area of St. Helen's island is approximately 123·8 acres and the areas of the three reservations are:—A., 2·735; B., 8·637; C., 9·62 acres.

The Montreal barracks are intended for the accommodation of the permanent troops at the headquarters of the Quebec command, comprising nearly all branches with departmental details and a large number of attached who will be attending for instruction. They will provide a proper school of instruction for the Montreal garrison and the commands and districts. The actual details of the various establishments have not yet been determined, but the totals will probably be about 450 or 500 all ranks, and from 275 to 300 horses.

As regards buildings, there will be approximately 25.

Mr. DOHERTY. Are these buildings to be used for a militarv school?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY. Was it considered whether Longueuil was a suitable and convenient place for a military school for the different corps in the Montreal district. It would seem to me that the Longueuil site is a very great distance away from the places of residence of the officers and men, and the headquarters of the different militia corps in the city. If the agreement were that we should have a military school in Montreal it is hardly fulfilling that agreement to establish a military school at Longueuil which I should think must be six or seven miles away, generally speaking, from the residences of the officers and men of the militia who would use the school

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there is an electric railway.

Mr. DOHERTY. You could hardly cross the river on an electric railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is steamboat connection too.

Mr. DOHERTY. There is an electric railway to the foot of the current and a ferry across the river to Longueuil, but nevertheless Longueuil is a very long distance away from the centre of the city. Taking into consideration the transportation facilities I would be inclined to believe that a school at St. Johns is practically just as accessible as a school at Longueuil would be. When you agree to establish a military school in Montreal and you then establish a military school at Longueuil it seems to me you are far away from fulfilling the spirit of that agreement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Accommodation for 300 horses would be needed and it is very desirable to have a large area of land which could not be got right in the city of Montreal. Montreal is growing rapidly and the means of communication with the suburbs are increasing.

Mr. DOHERTY. Have the militia officers in the Montreal district been consulted about this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no doubt whatever that in accordance with the usual custom the local militia officers have been consulted, but as to that I have no personal knowledge. I do know that the matter has been under serious consideration for a considerable period, and this is the sober judgment of the Militia Department.

Mr. DOHERTY. Of course, if the minister is not in a position to tell us positively that the militia officers were consulted it will not help us any for him to make a guess at it. It does seem to me that it would be a highly proper thing that they should have been consulted, and before we can form a judgment on ths vote we ought to be in possession of the opinions expressed by those interested in military affairs in the Montreal district. Until we have that, we are lacking in information essential to enable us to pronounce upon the desirability of locating these new barracks at Longueuil. Of course, so far as I am concerned, I have no idea of objecting to the erection of a military school and to providing the money for it, but we certainly should have some responsible minister here who could furnish us with the information necessary to enable us to form a judgment as to whether Longueuil is the proper place to spend the money for the purpose. It is another instance that impresses the very unfortunate results of the system under which the minister whose department is really in question, and who in the last resort decides these matters, is not here to give us the information on which to arrive at a conclusion. We have no information as to whether in the judgment of the persons to meet whose wants the school is being provided this is a suitable place in which to put it.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought this was one of the items that was to stand in the absence of the Minister of Militia?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it stood in order that I might get some information.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Militia should be here to give us the information instead of being down in Nova Scotia running elections. He was not elected for that purpose and is not paid $7,000 a year to do that. It is here he ought to be, and we should not be asked to vote this money without this essential information.

Mr. HUGHES. The troops who are to occupy these barracks, are very much dissatisfied with the place. I am told it is very unhealthy, it is low and at certain seasons, damp, and very inaccessible. There is no reason why it would not be better to have it out at Back Mountain so that the boys from Montreal could attend the military school at night, reaching the place by cars. It is impossible to do this at Longueuil.

Mr. M. MARTIN (St. Mary's, Montreal). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer a few remarks in reply to what the hon. member for St. Anne's division (Mr. Doherty) has just stated. When the question of building that military school on Lafontaine park came up, I deemed it my duty, in my capacity of representative of that division, to oppose that proposal, as such a building would disfigure that park. Everybody knows that Lafontaine park is the most beautiful park in the city, next to Mount Royal park.

The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) told us that the Longueuil site was unhealthy, but in my opinion the sanitary condition of the place is better than in any other place in the city of Montreal. Moreover, I am informed by the hon. the Minister of Public Works that this Longueuil site was recently given or transferred to the Militia Department. Now, if the government were to buy a site on the island of Montreal, no matter where, they would have to pay for an area of about forty acres, from $100,000 to $150,000 in the least, and that site would necessary be at a very great distance away from the centre of the city. I have no hesitation in saying that so far as distance is concerned, the Longueuil location would be nearer and more accessible than any other place available on the island of Montreal.

The island of St. Helene has been sold to the government for $200,000, as also that portion of land owned by the government on the edge of Lafontaine park.

For my own part I am entirely opposed to that school being built in the vicinity of Lafontaine park.

Mr. DOHERTY (Translation). I should like to ask my hon. friend whether he considers that there is not to be found on the island of Montreal any land on which these barracks could be built, without disfiguring as he says, or infringing on Lafontaine park.

I think my hon. friend is aware that it would be much more convenient for the young men who shall take the course of that institution to reach those barracks, if they are built on the island of Montreal itself. It is true one may cross the river at the foot of the current. But the greater number of the interested parties live at too great a distance from the foot of the current where there is a ferry across the river to Longueuil. In the winter time, I suppose they would have to cross over the ice, or pass by the Victoria bridge, which would oblige them to take a very considerable roundabout way.

I am surprised that my hon. friend, who is one of the representatives of the city of Montreal, should not realize the inconveniences that would result from building

that military school at Longueuil rather than in Montreal, as this means a very considerable difference.

Mr. DOHERTY. I submit that we have not the requisite information even with the additional light which the hon. member for St. Mary's division is able to throw on the subject. We have the additional information that this establishment is to be used as a military school, but we have no information as to how the conclusion was arrived at that Longueuil was the best place for a military school. As one who has had some military experience in the past, my strong impression is that you are putting a school in a place which will be highly inconvenient for the service to which it is to be devoted. For a considerable time there has been a very strong desire among those who interest themselves in military matters in Montreal that we should have a school there, and the reason why is that many young men who would be glad to take the course if the school were in the city, find it impossible to get away to St. Johns and follow the course there. You can go to St. Johns from Montreal by rail in three-quarters of an hour and the service is most excellent, so that, so far as convenience is concerned, I would just as soon go from my residence in the city to St. Johns and back as to some point in Longueuil. Nor have we any light as to the particular point in Longueuil at which these barracks are to be built, and the parish is a pretty large one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend know where the Tête du Pont is? It is about 190 acres in extent and belongs to the government, and that is the place where it is proposed to build these barracks.

Mr. DOHERTY. This is the first time I have heard that place mentioned, and I do not know in what part of Longueuil it is. This is a matter of considerable importance, concerning which we ought to have some one here able to tell us all the circumstances and what are the reasons in favour of this location. At first glance it is rather surprising to find that a school which we were to have in the city of Montreal is to be located, instead, at Longueuil, and the only reason given us for that location is that the land can be procured there without being paid for, besides the further reason that if you were to build the school in Montreal you would have to disfigure the Lafontaine park. Well, the Island of Montreal is large, and there is a great deal of vacant space in the city on which to build these barracks without at all infringing on Lafontaine park. I sympathize with the hon. member from St. Mary's (Mr. Martin) in his desire that Lafontaine park, which is very beautiful, should not have any portion of it devoted to this particular purpose, but, after all, we are not reduced to a choice between Lafontaine park and Longueuil. There is a good deal of other space in the city available, and we ought to know whether the men interested, those who are going to use the school, have been consulted. If they have been, we should have the result of that consultation. If they have not, they should be consulted before this matter is finally decided.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the use of wasting time? If the minister wants to get his items through, he need not spend any time on this. The Minister of Militia should be here to answer these questions, which cannot be answered without him, and, as far as I am concerned, none of these items should go through until he is present.

Mr. HUGHES. There is another point of importance. My hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) has pointed out the drawbacks in having this school outside the city. These are well known to men of the permanent force, but they are in the regular service, and they dare not publicly and openly object, but they do object very seriously, and I can assure the hon. minister that they would much prefer remaining at St. Johns, or Quebec, or the other places where they now are rather than move to Longueuil. The minister might as well hold this item over until the return of the Minister of Militia, and until the officers and men concerned can be consulted. I am satisfied that fifty places can be found on Montreal island a short distance from the centre of the city where this institution could be located with much greater convenience to the men. Many of these men are in business, and the man who wants to retain his position in business cannot give the time required to go from his work and attend this military school if it be at Longueuil, and you might just as well have it at St. Johns as at Longueuil. But if it were situated in the city, or at Back River, or at fifty other places on the island, a business man could attend the course there without trouble, and if night schools were held they would be a tremendous advantage to the city. I would, therefore, ask that this item should stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will observe that the item is for Montreal new barracks, and I do not take it that, in passing this item, parliament binds itself to an approval of the Longueuil site. I have said that that is where it is proposed to erect the barracks. But everybody will agree that new barracks are necessary, and that it is absolutely essential in order to carry out the understanding that the $200,000 obtained from the city of Montreal

for the sale of St. Helen's island should be used in the erection of new barracks, that this item should pass. If the Minister of Militia were here I think all he would say would be that because of this Longueuil land being owned by the government, and because of its situation, it was deemed the most desirable place.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the minister any report on the sanitary condition of this place? How high above the river is it and what is the fall? I am told that it is dead level and that at some seasons of the year it is unfit to be occupied. I am told also that the ground consists of clay and not sand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have great respect for the opinion of the hon. member for St. James, because he lives in Montreal.

Mr. DOHERTY. I have great respect for St. James, but, as every one knows St. Anne is the particular patron saint of our province, and I am particularly proud to represent a constituency honoured by her name.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I apologize to my hon. friend. From a military standpoint, I have more than respect for my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), and my respect grows to admiration of him with regard to military matters. I have great confidence in his judgment and will consider it my business to present to the Minister of Militia the views which he and the hon. member for St. Anne's have expressed. It may be that, instead of using the land which the department owns, it would be better to go to an expenditure of $100,000 or $200,000 or perhaps $400,000 or $500,000.

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly, no matter what it is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In order to get land nearer the city of Montreal, I would say that by passing this vote it is not understood that parliament approves one site or another, but that all it does is approve the erection of a barracks.

Mr. DOHERTY. If the vote is passed in this way, we shall have voted the money and the barracks will be erected wherever the minister decides without consulting parliament. It is not inconceiveable that parliament might be willing to vote the money for barracks to be erected in a place that would suit the purpose and not in a locality that would not. But to ask us to vote the money and leave the department to decide where it will put the barracks is to give the department absolutely carte blanche. If we are to be judges as to whether this money is to be spent or not, it is an extraordinary position to say that it makes no difference whether the building is to be in one place or another. In other words, that we would be assumed to be as willing to vote the money to put the barracks in an absolutely unsuitable place, if that were shown to be the case, as in a suitable place. I do not wish any misapprehension of what I say. I am not in favour of preventing the construction of the barracks. All I ask is that we should be put in a positon to determine whether the money should be spent where it is proposed to spend it.

Mr. RIVET. May I ask if the hon. member (Mr. Doherty), has received any protest from any military men in Montreal regarding the contemplated site of the new barracks, and if, in speaking as he does, he is expressing the views of these gentlemen?

Mr. DOHERTY. I have not received any protest from the military men of Montreal. I have nothing to show me that they know at all that the military school of Montreal is going to be built in Longueuil. This item in the estimates does not convey that information, for it only says 'Montreal—New Barracks.' And, so far as I know, it is only in answer to questions from the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) and myself, put the other evening, that the fact came out that this new building was to be erected at Longueuil. The minister (Mr. Pugsley) is not in a position to tell me that any communication has been had with these gentlemen or that they have been consulted in any way. Why does the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet) assume that they know anything about it?

Mr. RIVET. I do not assume it.

Mr. DOHERTY. Then, how can he expect that they would have communicated with me? And that leads me to say that the main point I would like to bring before the minister is the one I have already mentioned—though he does not seem to pay attention to it—that the absence of consultation with these gentlemen seems to be a reason why this money should not be voted. It seems to me only proper that these gentlemen, who are in the best position to form a judgment as to the location of the military school from the point of view of meeting the needs for which this building is provided, should have been consulted before this vote was proposed. I am not saying that that has not been done, but the minister does not know whether it has been done or not, and neither do I. I may say, that, on my own responsibility, since I got the information that this building was to be at Longueuil, I have written to some of these gentlemen asking for information as to their views, and I hope to receive that information. The Militia Department may have that information

already, but, if so, surely it should be at our disposal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This ought to be satisfactory to my hon. friend, and I hope it will, for he does not want to prevent the vote from passing, but only wants to have the local militia officers consulted : I give the assurance to my hon. friend on behalf of the Minister of Militia, and will acquaint him with that assurance, that, if these officers have not been consulted, they shall be consulted with regard to the location of the new barracks. I will also present the views of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) as to the question which he raised regarding the location. I think he will agree with me that not all the members of the committee, probably not even my hon. friend himself could form a judgment on this question. All he can ask is that before the minister decides upon a location, he should consult the officers to whom reference has been made.

Mr. BLAIN. The point is not whether the members of the opposition would be able to form an opinion as to where this college should be located ; the question, as I understand it, is whether the government has come to a decision as to where this building should be erected. If they have, the committee surely is entitled to receive that information. It is not enough for the Minister of Public Works to say : Vote the money and I will communicate with the Minister of Militia, and then we will do just what we wish. Surely, that is another new doctrine of the Minister of Public Works. He pays a great deal of respect to my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton—

Mr. PUGSLEY. From the military side.

Mr. BLAIN. I listened to his remarks, but it seems to me that if he wished to pay very much respect to my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) he might accept his suggestion that the item be allowed to stand over until the matter was settled. Surely, after having had so long a time to secure the information from the Militia Department, and to consider it, he should be in a position to do something more than come forward and say : 'We have not decided.' I would like to know who really did suggest that this building should be erected at this point ; was it the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Militia, or the sitting member for the district?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The deputy Minister of Militia has informed me that it is proposed to erect these barracks at Longueuil, on property owned by the government and, which, of course, will cost the government nothing. It is a large area, something over 190 acres. What I said to my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), was that I would represent the views of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton who says there is some question about the sanitary conditions there and also the views of the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), that this is not as convenient a place as some others that might be chosen, to the Minister of Militia, and I have given the assurance that, before finally deciding upon the site, which, as at present advised, is Longueuil, the matter will be looked into further, and the local officers in Montreal consulted. That, I think, is all that can reasonably be asked.

Mr. DOHERTY. The promise was merely that the local officers shall be consulted. That having been done, there will be nothing to prevent the department, overriding their views and going on, with the money we have voted, to build the barracks in some place where these officers do not want it. But we would like to know what they think, for this would influence our judgment as to whether the money should be voted to build this barracks on the site proposed. While I do not doubt that these officers will be consulted according to the minister's promise, that does not secure to us the advantage of their opinion, and it does not leave it to us in any way to influence the decision as to whether their opinion should have weight or not. However, I have urged all that I can urge in the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. The position of the minister is much the same as that of the farmer who consulted his neighbours about the location for his proposed new barn. He invited them to tea, and afterwards showed them over the place and pointed out localities any one of which might be selected. Then he said: 'I have drawn your attention to the facts, and, while I want the benefit of your advice, yet, to economize time I may tell you that I am going to build the barn on that knoll, facing the south.' That is about what would be the result of this proposed consultation. The consultation might not influence the government against putting the building in a place which this House, if it had the information it ought to have, would consider an unsuitable place. But, outside of all that, this House, in my judgment, is doing wrong when we allow estimates to go through in the absence of ministers who ought to be here to give us the information we are entitled to in order to be able to form a reasonable judgment in the question before us. I think the government, when they submit these items, should see that a minister is present who can give the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman who is now leading the opposition, and who

has just spoken, take the ground that there will be an objection to any military items going through until the Minister of Militia returns? If so, we might as well understand it, because I know that they can delay, and even prevent the estimates going through. If the hon. gentleman takes that view, I will agree to let this and all other militia items stand until the minister returns.

Mr. SPROULE. To many of the items there would be no objection. But this is one of so much importance, involving a large expenditure for a public building, that I think the Minister of Militia ought to be here to give us information.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not objecting to this item in itself, and I do not care whether the minister is here or not. But I want it understood that the site is regarded by military men—and I have correspondence galore from them about it—as an unsuitable site. In the first place, in order to reach there by land, one has to go across the bridge and then follow the road down the river side. In order to reach it by water, you have to go down below the rapids to cross over. Every one will admit that it is an awkward place to reach, and I am satisfied that every member representing a Montreal constituency will so advise the minister. We can name twenty places on the island more suitable than this is. I am free to say that I believe the reason Longueuil is selected is that the government have, unfortunately, in their possession a little swamp over there, a few hundred acres of land flat, boggy, heavy clay, in the rainy season, practically impassable—I am giving merely the data that I have received. Now the House will freely vote the necessary money for an important institution like this if it is on a proper and convenient site for the officers and men in Montreal to reach. Therefore, in all kindness I ask the minister to postpone the item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In view of the representations made by my hon. friend I will consent to let the item stand until the Minister of Militia and Defence returns.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). With regard to the St. Lambert building the minister promised to furnish us with the options that were procurred in connection with the purchase of the site, the dates and the names.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have that information. I find there is only one option on file, that is from Mr. Noel Marcil, dated February 11, 1910, for four months, covering lots Nos. 112, 113, 114, 115 and 116, for $4,140. I have a copy of a resolution of the town council of St. Lambert adopted at a meeting held March 5, 1909, as it is here. I think that must be a mistake, and that it should be 1910. There was a letter from the Department of the Secretary of State, dated May 2, 1910, inclosing the resolution purporting to be dated March 5, 1909, therefore, my deputy concludes that there was a clerical error, and that 1910 was the date intended. The site was reported on by Mr. G. S. Gingras, clerk of works at Montreal, on the 21st of May, 1910, recommending the purchase.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The hon. gentleman evidently spoke under a misapprehension of the facts when he stated before that there were several options taken. He will recollect what was said by the representative of the constituency (Mr. Geoffrion).

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was only one written option, apparently. Some times the official of the department visits the different owners and gets their prices, but I would not call that an option.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Were there any other sites in St. Lambert suggested to the government for this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the only one that was considered by the government, the only one which the town was in favour of. The lot is situated right opposite the academy.

Mr. BLAIN. The other evening my hon. friend laid on the table some information in respect to a clock furnished his department at Lunenburg. I noticed, in the correspondence of the minister's department, that he asked the clock dealer to write the specification himself, and he accepted the price offered under that specification. Is that the policy of the government? I thought it rather strange that the minister should ask a gentleman to supply the clock and at the same time ask him to write the specification.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see why it would not be proper to ask a dealer in a special line of clocks to do so. This was not an ordinary clock; it was a clock to be put in the tower of a building. We asked him to send us a specification of the clock he proposed to furnish, along with the price. We did not accept his price. The chief architect fixed the price that was paid, asking him to take a lower price than the one he had fixed. The chief architect knew from his knowedge, and the information he had got from other clock dealers, what would be a fair and reasonable price, and this gentleman accepted the price offered by the chief architect. Now, with regard to asking for specifications, that was done in case of the Quebec bridge; the tenderers were requested to submit their specifications, I mean the proposed new bridge.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister say that $1,600 is a reasonable price for a clock of this kind?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect says that it is, according to his judgment.

Mr. BLAIN. I would direct attention to the fact that the general price of these clocks supplied in his department heretofore was $700 instead of $1,600. If the gentleman supplying the clock was a manufacturer, and this was a special kind, the hon. gentleman's explanation might have some basis. But was it fair that he should have asked tenders from other people supplying clocks, rather than assisting this gentleman to procure the order, and giving him liberty to write the specification himself, finally paying him $1,600 for the clock. Where did this clock come from?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It came from Germany.

Mr. BLAIN. Why did not my hon. friend purchase it direct from the manufacturer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What item is the hon. gentleman speaking on now?

Mr. BLAIN. I am speaking about some information that was delayed and laid on the table for the information of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The discussion is scarcely relevant to the item in the present resolution.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like, by your consent, Mr. Chairman, to give my hon. friend the explanation, so that we may get this disposed of once and for all. There is just as much difference between clocks as there is between watches. If my hon. friend wanted to get a watch would he go around the city and ask people to tender and name the price at which they were willing to deliver watches to him? There are hundreds of kinds of watches and hundreds of different prices. There is a great difference between a striking clock and a non-striking clock, which you can get for about $700.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is a striking clock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, a striking clock of the very best description, and the chief architect tells me that he got it at the lowest price at which such a clock could be obtained. A small amount was paid to the dealer.

Mr. BLAIN. What was that amount?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The installing of the clock was included in the $1,600, and there was considerable work about it. It meant repairing the place in the building and all that sort of thing.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend cannot have correct information, because there is a payment for making the place and doing what my hon. friend said had been done, to a Mr. Pyke.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was for arranging the platform upon which the clock stands, putting in the floor and making cuttings in the tower. My hon. friend got all this information in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BLAIN. Here is a clock to be supplied for the Lunenburg public building. Looking over the list of clocks supplied for public buildings in Ontario and other provinces, I find the price to be about $700. I asked why $1,600 was paid for Lunenburg and my hon. friend answered by saying that this is a very rare clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is a striking clock.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend tells us something, I suppose, that nobody ever knew before, that there are clocks that strike and clocks that do not strike. My hon. friend asks if I would go around the city asking for tenders for a watch. I do not know what my hon. friend would do himself but I know what I would do if I were administering a department as my hon. friend is; I would keep the middlemen out.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was kept out here.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend decides how much they will give for the clock. Information is supplied to the chief architect saying that it should cost $1,600. The chief architect and my hon. friend know full well that this clock is not manufactured in Canada. They know where it could be purchased. Why does the hon. gentleman select an individual supporter in Halifax without asking for public competition when he had decided upon the kind of clock that he wanted, and allow this gentleman to supply it? What is a middleman? A middleman is one who stands between the government and the manufacturer, in this case, when the government want to buy a clock. My hon. friend could have sent for this clock himself, if it was not manufactured in Canada, but instead of that he decides that there is to be a middleman in it and he selects the one who shall supply the clock. When we are discussing these items the hon. gentleman says that we always have public competition No competition in this at all. What would my hon. friend call this Mr. Shultze who purchased this clock in Germany and supplied it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not call a dealer or merchant a middleman.

Mr. BLAIN. I would call a person like this who charges such a price a middleman and a dealer too. The truth is that money could have been saved to the department if my hon. friend had been a good administrator, and if he had not been in the hands of the middleman or the dealer, he can call him whichever he wants. If my hon. friend wanted to carry out the policy in connection with all these important matters of having public competition why did he not ask other people to give prices upon this clock? There were other dealers in Halifax carrying on business in a larger way than this gentleman. This gentleman did not have such a clock in his store. No one else in Halifax had such a clock in his store. Why should my hon. friend select this individual, a political supporter, and say: Put in a clock, and write your own specification when he knew the price at which it could be bought for? My hon. friend comes here and says that there is no middleman in his department. I would like to ask my hon. friend how he draws a distinction between the dealer and the middleman in this case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As I understand it, a man who deals in any particular article and who buys of the manufacturer gets the article at the wholesale price. I could not go individually and buy direct from the manufacturer, and my hon. friend could not. I do not imagine that the government could, and what I understand is that dealers would get whatever discount there would be from the manufacturer, and that it would be deducted from their price. The wholesale dealer always gets that. Suppose we required to make some arrangements about bath tubs; we would buy them from the man who deals in bath tubs. We would not buy from the manufacturer, and I doubt if the manufacturer would sell to us. In this particular case this gentleman was a dealer in clocks. He would get this clock from the manufacturer at the same price, included in which would be his dealer's reasonable profit, as that at which the government or my hon. friend could get it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Did the hon. gentleman try to get a price from the manufacturer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect says that he knew that was the usual price for a clock of that character.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Did the department obtain a price from the manufacturers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. When this gentleman asked a price the chief architect made a counter offer of what he believed the clock was worth. This price of $1,600 includes all the work of installing the clock and the manufacturer would not send a man from Germany to install it. The chief architect tells me that such a clock as this could not be purchased for a smaller sum than was paid.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). What policy does the department follow in erecting a clock in one public building, and not in another? Does it depend on the wishes of the municipality, or the political influence of the representative of the constituency?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We endeavour to meet the reasonable requests of the different places, and in a new building we sometimes provide for a clock, but if there is already a public clock in the town we do not install one as a rule. My attention has been called to a number of buildings erected 15 or 20 years ago by the Conservative government and they were so scarce of money that they left holes in the towers where clocks ought to be.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). They were not so extravagant.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They should not have left the holes there because that was a temptation to the people to ask for clocks.

Mr. LANCASTER. How would you ever get in if they did not leave holes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For instance, in the constituency represented by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Chisholm) we are putting a clock in the public building at Wingham.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Costing $1,600?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no doubt it will cost fully that. I mentioned that to show the fairness with which I endeavour to act.

Ottawa Printing Bureau, new boilers, &c., $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect estimates the total cost at $8,630, and contingencies $1,370, making $10,000. A report from the engineer of the Printing Bureau stated that the boilers had been in continuous use since 1888 and they have been constantly under pressure during all that time. He recommended that these boilers should be renewed, and the chief architect is of opinion that for the safety of property, and perhaps life new boilers should be installed.

Ottawa departmental buildings, fittings, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a vote which it is found necessary to take practically every year for the purpose of fitting up steel file cases, book shelves, steel drawers, &c.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this done by tender after public competition ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By tenders in each case. There are two companies manufacturing

the steel fittings, the Eclipse Manufacturing Company and the Office Specialty Company.

Ottawa departmental buildings, improvements in lavatories, plumbing, &c., $10,000.

Mr. HUGHES. I would again point out that the sanitary accommodation in this building is in a prehistoric condition, some of the accommodation is not up to the standard of a modern railway closet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I remember a conversation with my hon. friend and I gave direction to the chief architect to have the improvements made. He reported to me that he had them made as far as the premises would permit.

Mr. HUGHES. Nothing was done at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret that it was not possible to make the improvements as complete as they should be made.

Mr. HUGHES. Nothing was done at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall have to ask the chief architect to see my hon. friend because he says that considerable work was done.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not think that even a drop of paint was put on the bathrooms and barber shop.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A shower bath was put in.

Mr. HUGHES. I have not seen it. The bathroom should be taken out of the barber shop as any one coming from a bathroom is liable to strike the arm of the barber while he is shaving a customer.

Another matter of importance is that the water of Ottawa is certainly impregnated with typhoid. I believe there are a couple of places in the building where we can get water which is supposed to be purified. If it is a good system, why not put it through all the different departmental buildings ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I made a statement last night of what has been done. We have one supply of purified water on each floor.

Mr. HUGHES. Why not have it all over the offices ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are providing for that. We have communicated with the Finance Department with a view of putting that system in each of the blocks.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me there is an obligation resting on others as well as on the government. We pay a consideration to the city of Ottawa for the provision they have made to give us water for these buildings. It is natural to assume that that means healthy and pure water, and if nothing is dished up but what is mixed with sewage we are throwing away our money and are very careless with regard to the health of those who come from every part of the country to spend four to six months of the year attending parliament. I thought that the First Minister the other evening spoke about this in a very trifling and flippant manner. It is too serious to be dealt with in this way. There is an obligation on the city to furnish pure water in proper quantity and if they do not do that, we should revise our contract with them. There is an obligation resting on the health officer to see that the health of the people is properly loked after in regard to the water supplied for drinking, It was said as an excuse for the failure to analyse the water from month to month, that the health officer had not bottles to send it in. What a trivial excuse, what supreme carelessness it is. What is the city council doing ? What kind of a health officer have we ? Are these conditions to be allowed to continue with the imminent danger which exists ? Already immense trouble, expense, suffering and death have been brought to many people in this city on account of the impure water they are obliged to use. This condition of things has been going on for weeks and it is time the department should wake up and realize the importance of forcing the city to take prompt action. If the city have not an efficient health officer they should call on him to resign and put some competent man in his place, and not allow the health of the people to suffer through so apparent a dereliction of duty in the management of the health department.

Mr. HUGHES. When the officers of the council have been going around indulging in pyrotechnical displays and using their energies in kow-towing to the powers that be, you cannot expect them to attend to the business of the city, and I am astonished that my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) should expect anything of the kind. The attention of the city council has been drawn for years to the danger. A certain medical officer has frequently pointed out to the council and to the health officer the fact that this city is at the mercy of the towns along the river and that steps should be taken to provide a remedy. It would be well to follow the suggestion of the hon. member for Grey and stir the city council up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not appoint the health officer. He is appointed by the Ontario government.

Mr. HUGHES. No, by the city council.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At all events we have no control over him. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is so accustomed to fault finding that he naturally pitches

right in to the city council and its health officer, but we ought to have some little consideration for them. I believe they are doing the best they can in the serious conditions with which they are confronted. Either some other source must be obtained from which the supply of water can be got or else something should be done to sterilize and purify the water contaminated by the sewage which is emptied into the Ottawa river from towns such as Aylmer, Arnprior, Pembroke and Renfrew and others along its banks. The city of Ottawa is doing the best it can. It has engineers endeavouring to find some other source from which water can be obtained. The only thing we can do, in the discharge of our duty, is to sterilize the water and make it as palatable as we can. Our officials are giving their utmost attention to that; and if hon. members will be careful to drink only the sterilized water, they need not fear any danger.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister says that I am so accustomed to fault finding that I cannot allow an opportunity like this to pass.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Does he say that there is not just ground for fault finding?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not against the health officer.

Mr. SPROULE. Parliament is asked to vote a large sum to the city of Ottawa for the supply of water, and we must presume that the city is bound to supply pure and healthy water. If water of that kind is not supplied we ought to stop the pay. The only parties which parliament can hold responsible are the ministers of the Crown. All the minister can say is that he supposes the health officer is doing what he should, but I remember distinctly that instructions were given the health officer to have the water analysed every week or every month but, in reply to a question as to when the last analysis was made, we are told that it was made away back in the month of November. Then the question was asked why did the health officer not attend to this, and the reply was that the city council would see that this was done. When the health officer was asked why he had not had an analysis made, his excuse was that he had not proper bottles in which to send the water to be analysed. Such an excuse should not be tolerated. It is true we can get our water sterilized by distillation, but it may be found that in our private rooms and in places where we take our meals, no such water is provided.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why should not private individuals boil the water and so sterilize it just as is being done here?

Mr. SPROULE. Why should not private individuals look to the health officer whose duty it is to see that we are furnished with pure water? Why should they be obliged to drink sewage water because of the dilatoriness of the health inspector? When there were practically but few cases of typhoid fever in the city, the prediction was made that unless proper precautions were taken these cases would increase, and so they did. According to the newspapers there are 210 cases reported at present and how many more not reported we do not know. In this matter the government are just as lax as the city council and its health officer, because they do not bring their influence to compel the city authorities to do their duty.

Mr. BRADBURY. The government has a large number of employees directly under the control of the Department of Public Works. I do not know that there is any provision for furnishing pure water to the different departments of the government. I do know that there are a very large number of typhoid cases in this city? I understand that the epidemic has become so bad that the citizens have had to secure the old geological survey building as an emergency hospital. I do not know that the government can be held responsible altogether for the water of the city of Ottawa—

Mr. PUGSLEY. How can they be held responsible at all?

Mr. BRADBURY. I do say that the government are responsible for the water their employees are consuming. And I say that, if there is any virtue in the sterilizing apparatus we have in the House of Commons, it is the duty of the government to furnish them to every department immediately. But, outside of this, there is the greater question. I believe the government exercises considerable influence on the city of Ottawa to-day. The government has a contract with the city to furnish water for these buildings. The government has a right, as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says, to expect that pure water should be furnished. There is no doubt that, if the government had taken this matter in hand and had told the city plainly that if pure water was not furnished, the supply would be cut off and we would put in our own plant and the buildings supplied—

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where from?

Mr. BRADBURY. That would be a question to be decided. We might take it from the same source, and do what the city of Ottawa should have done years ago—purify the water. I understand the city is making arrangements now for water purification. But those in charge of the government of the city of Ottawa have been derelict in

their duty to the citizens. Many precious lives have been sacrificed; many people are on sick beds who should not be there. I appeal to the Minister of Public Works, not so much as far as the city is concerned, but for the employees who, in this matter, are directly under his charge, and who cannot come to this House of Commons and raise their voices in protest against the water supplied to them. Every department is running the same danger that the citizens are running of drinking water from the Ottawa river, which is little better than sewage. The minister asks why the citizens do not boil the water. I am not a scientist, but I venture to say that boiling the water is not a sure preventive of danger. If you boil a pail of sewage, how much better is it than it was before? By boiling you kill anything alive that is there, but I have grave doubts whether you remove all danger.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The best physicians say the microbes will be killed.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not agree with the Minister of Public Works. A few days ago I was laid up, and feared an attack of typhoid. I told my physician who attended me that we were taking the precaution of boiling the water, and he said: 'If you boil a pail of sewage, does it make it any purer? You kill anything that is alive, but you do not purify it.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. Microbes have life; surely if you kill them you get rid—

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to see the government have a little life on this question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have been trying to kill the microbes.

Mr. BRADBURY. I say, in conclusion, that this is no laughing matter, but a very serious one. If the cost is $10,000 or $500,000, to provide pure water for the employees of this government, the honour of the country is at stake, and it ought to be done and done immediately.

Mr. HUGHES. The Minister of Public Works asks how the government can do anything. The government has a contract with the city for a supply of water. If the city persists in supplying sewage, the minister can indict the council for maintaining a common nuisance. This would call the attention of these gentlemen to the fact that they have something to do besides self-advertising. I did not intend to speak on this point; I rose, in the first place, to help the minister out on the question of supplying pure water. But, when he asks what he can do, I tell him he can indict these people for maintaining a common nuisance.

Mr. BRADBURY.

Mr. McGIVERIN. I have listened with interest to the discussion, and am glad to hear the expressions of sympathy from hon. members with the sufferers in this typhoid epidemic. The question, to my mind, is one for the mayor and corporation of the city of Ottawa. I regret that, for the past three or four months, there has been such a difference of opinion among the experts as to leave one at present quite at a loss as to avoidance of the danger. It has arisen only within the last two or three weeks, owing, no doubt, to the exceedingly low water in the Ottawa river from which the supply is drawn. It would have been quite impossible for the government or any one else to advise the city council when, apparently, the experts were at odds themselves as to the best course to be followed. But, since this very serious outbreak, every precaution, as I understand it, has been taken to do away with the poisonous condition of the water——

Mr. HUGHES. By whom?

Mr. McGIVERIN. I am not a technical man in this matter, but I understand that some chemical preparation is to be mixed with the water which will purify it.

So far as holding the government responsible is concerned, the responsibility seems to me to rest entirely on the shoulders of the corporation of the city of Ottawa. The fact has already been mentioned that the government has given the use of the geological survey building as a temporary hospital. I may explain that, the moment we learned there was need of more room, the chairman of the board of health, the medical health officer and I went to see the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) on this matter. That hon. gentleman at once gave his consent to the use of the building, and hastened matters in every way to place it at the city's disposal. And the same was true of the Militia Department in trying to help out. I can only say—in common, I am sure, with all members of this House—how deeply I regret that this outbreak has occurred in this city which has always tried to carry out any obligations into which it has entered with the government.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not find fault with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. McGiverin) in seeking to whitewash the government. I was not blaming the government until the minister asked what he could do. I think he could do a good deal. For years, we have been reading how gentlemen in this city have protested again and again against the threatened contamination of the city water. But the mayor and corporation declared that the water was the finest in the world—everything around Ottawa was the finest in the world. As a matter of fact, Ottawa has been drinking the sewage of Pembroke, Almonte, Arnprior, Alymer

and all these other towns on the river. How the people of Ottawa have escaped trouble so long I cannot tell. However, the main thing is that the minister should notify the city that we want pure water, he has a contract with the city. Let him notify the mayor that the city must supply these buildings with pure water. Let him for once put down his foot firmly, while at the same time maintaining his genial countenance.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would suggest that the minister tell the city that he will not ask this item to be carried because the city is not fulfilling their contract. When they are giving us poisonous water to drink they are not giving us what their contract was supposed to call for. When the minister notifies the city that he will not carry this item of $115,000 otherwise, he will be doing something to get pure water. I do not believe for one minute that the city of Ottawa cannot get pure water, and the minister can help the city get pure water if he refuses to pay them this $115,000 until it is supplied us.

Mr. CONMEE. I think the minister could bring a little pressure to bear on the city by letting this item stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY . This item has nothing to do with pure water.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the minister want to drive us to drink something else?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be awfully sorry.

Mr. CROTHERS. On behalf of the members of this House I would suggest that the minister has the remedy in his hands by having an emergency consultation with Hiram Walker.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman be the chief executive officer at the conference?

Mr. BLAIN. I see that the firm of A. K. Mills & Son, Ottawa, have received $5,866 for plumbing, &c., last year. Was any of this work done after public competition?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was for the supply and installation of marble lavatories.

Mr. BLAIN. That is only one item in a total of $25,866.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was jobbing work, there were no tenders invited. It could not be done very well by tender. If you take an old building and tear out the old lavatories and put in new ones, it is something that you cannot do satisfactorily by tender. If I were doing it for myself I would not think of calling for tenders, but would try and get good reliable men. Any one doing it by tender would be sure to exact a large margin for unexpected difficulties.

Ottawa Departmental Buildings—Langevin Block—new boilers and alterations in heating apparatus, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. $5,000 of this is a revote. It is to make provision for replacing four boilers in the Langevin block on the east side, also to complete necessary changes in connection with the heating apparatus. It was done by public competition, after advertisement in the newspapers of Ottawa.

Mr. BLAIN. In how many newspapers was this advertisement inserted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It could not have been in a great many, because it only cost $35 for advertising. I presume it was in one of the Ottawa papers.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the chief architect could tell in which one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He does not remember in what paper it was advertised. It is done through the secretary of the department.

Mr. BLAIN. Was this put in two or three papers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I can safely say there would only be one.

Mr. BLAIN. Which one?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If in only one, it would be the 'Free Press.' But if it was in any of the others, I cannot tell which. I will give my hon. friend a list of the papers in which it was published.

Ottawa Parliament Buildings—improvements, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is to make provision for general improvements to the interior of the parliament buildings and the library. I can tell what was done last year : Tiling the library, $4,025 ; partitions, $1,450 ; ventilation, $800 ; plumbing, $453 ; furniture, $653 ; painting and gilding tower and roof, $600.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will that have to be done every year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Practically the same amount is expended every year.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it spent simply because the money is voted every year or simply because it is necessary ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is actually necessary.

Mr. LANCASTER. It seems strange that the gilding and painting in the library that the hon. gentleman has mentioned have to be done every year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this is to the interior of the building and the library.

Mr. LANCASTER. Do the interior of the building and the library require to be painted every year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. but there are painting, gilding and other improvements necessary to keep the buildings in repair.

Mr. SPROULE. What is proposed to be done with regard to providing more suitable accommodation for the library than we have at present? The library is so crowded both in the basement and on the general floor that it is very inconvenient both to the members and to those engaged in it. In fact, I find it very difficult to get much satisfaction in the library because three times out of four, you cannot get anything you want. There is a general complaint that everything is bundled together and there seems to be no possibility of any system or order being evolved out of it, so that one can go and get anything he wants. There is a number of people in the library, but if you send in a hurry or go in yourself you cannot get what you want sometimes in three or four days and sometimes cannot get it at all. For years it has been apparent that there was urgent need for increased accommodation and the government state year after year that they intend to take it up, but we have not yet any distinct information from them as to what is contemplated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very glad that my hon. friend has mentioned this question which certainly is one of a good deal of importance, owing to the very crowded condition of the library. The matter was mentioned last year and certain suggestions were made to me. One was that an additional story should be put on to cover a portion of the building that is now occupied by the reading room and that we should also extend the library so as to take in the room which is occupied by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), and also the members' smoking room. In that way additional accommodation might be given. Another idea is to erect an additional wing to the eastward in connection with the Senate part of the building. The question of the relative expense of the two modes of affording accommodation has been talked of. Another idea which has been suggested is to erect another building towards the edge of the cliff which would be used as a stack room and have a tunnel connecting the present library with that building. All these are under consideration, and it is expected that the Speaker of the Senate and the other members of the Library Committee will very soon have a meeting at which the chief architect and myself shall be present to go quite fully into the whole matter. I have an idea myself, which is entirely my personal idea, that it is worthy of consideration whether we should not carry out a wing, say, from the western side of the building for the purpose of affording a new chamber for the members of the House where there would be perfect ventilation on each side and which would be open to the pure air of heaven and then utilize this chamber for purposes in connection with the library and reading room. I have that idea; I do not know whether it is worthy of consideration or not, but I do not like the idea of having a couple of hundred people who are constantly in attendance in this chamber in addition to the spectators in the galleries, shut off from direct ventilation and from the open, free air. I do not know whether it is worthy of seriously considering or not.

Mr. BRADBURY. I hope you will develop it.

Mr. LANCASTER. That would be a much better arrangement than we have now.

Mr. BLAIN. I never could understand why files of newspapers ten or twelve years old, are kept piled up in the library from year to year. Why could they not be put in some room? They are not wanted very often and they are taking up the best space in that building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is for the Library Committee to decide.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I take it that I am correct in saying that nothing has been done up to the present except talk. This talk has been going on for years. It seems to me that it is time that somebody got busy, and did a little more than talk. The process of evolution has been so slow that I think we will all be dead before there is a new library if we do not do more than has been done lately.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no control over the Library Committee, but I certainly do think that they ought to have these files of old papers removed. I do not see any necessity for them. I quite agree with the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) that there is no reason why they should be kept there taking up room in the library. I do not know whether they are kept there to emphasize the necessity of additional accommodation or not—I do not suggest that—but that is the effect of it because everybody feels upon going in there that something ought to be done. I think the first thing that ought to be done is for the Library Committee to order these files of old newspapers to be removed because there is no need of keeping them there.

Ottawa parliament buildings, driveway pavement, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have put down pavement on the driveways all around the parliament grounds.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that not an enormous price? It must have been paved with silver dollars.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BRADBURY. What was the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From the 1st April, 1910, to 30th November, 1910, we paid to the Ottawa Construction Company $5,000, to T. S. Kirby for broken stone, $2,439.03, for stone, sand and cement $3,436, and for labour $5,904.03. The appropriation was $21,000 and that left an unexpended balance of $4,220.81 on the 30th November.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is about $17,000. How many yards, or miles, of surface did that cover?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was applied in laying pavements around the east and west blocks, square facing on Wellington street, and covering the roadway in front of the House of Commons. There were 8,000 superficial yards of pavement altogether. It is a very nice pavement.

Mr. LANCASTER. It ought to be a very nice pavement at the price of $2 a yard. Does the hon. gentleman not seriously think this is an exorbitant price to pay for putting a roadway in condition? If the hon. gentleman would take that before any ordinary road builders in any province he would have difficulty in explaining such an expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They had to go down to a considerable depth to make a permanent and reasonably good pavement.

Mr. LANCASTER. How deep did they dig?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was about eight inches of solid concrete put down and it was covered over with asphalt.

Mr. LANCASTER. Has the hon. gentleman ever compared this with any work done by municipalities or other institutions that are constructing these roads in every province? I think that is a most extravagant price to pay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was done by day work under a competent foreman.

Mr. LANCASTER. The different counties of Ontario do similar work to this, and I do not believe they pay any such prices. Has inquiry been made to ascertain what prices are paid for similar work by other public bodies?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About five years ago we invited tenders for the work on Wellington street, and it cost us $2.49 per yard.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was it the same class of work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About the same. There is a great variation in the character of this work, and I understand it runs from $1.80 in some localities up to $2.50. When you come to a permanent pavement for a driveway, which is on a slope, and you have to put eight inches of solid concrete I do not think the cost is too great.

Mr. BLAIN. Why was this done by day work instead of by contract, as formerly?

Mr. LANCASTER. Who was the foreman?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Baxter, an employee of the department, and an experienced man.

Mr. BLAIN. I should think it would be a great relief to the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. McGiverin) if this were done by contract, because it must be a great deal of trouble to him to supply the workmen for day labour. I wonder if it was the influence of the hon. member (Mr. McGiverin) who caused the minister to change the system from contract to day labour. I should think that the city of Ottawa would be a dangerous place to experiment in doing work for day labour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work was done by the permanent staff, with the addition of a few extra men. We had a competent foreman, and I believe the work was done as economically as possible, and it is well done.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this not what is commonly known as tar macadam?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; it is an asphalt composition.

Mr. BLAIN. There is not very heavy traffic around these grounds, and I should think it would not be necessary to do the work as it has been done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a great deal of driving, and I suppose the chief architect thought it was better to make a good job of it at once.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

LACHINE, JACQUES CARTIER AND MAISONNEUVE RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 44) respecting the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway.—Mr. Geoffrion.

On section 4,

Mr. RIVET. I have an amendment to offer to section 4 of the Bill. The amendment is not important, and I understand the committee have power to accept it, waiving the rule. The effect of the amendment is to give the company power to connect its line with the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway. The amendment provides:

Subject to the approval of the Commission the company may connect its line of railway with the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway.

Mr. SPROULE. We have usually followed the course in the Railway Committee of giving the company power to amalgamate with such lines as are set out in the Bill. This was not done in this case, and, therefore, following the usual custom, it should not be done in the House. It is an important amendment and no notice has been given.

Mr. RIVET. If there is an objection, of course I shall have to give notice of the amendment, and will ask the committee to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to be informed of the route of this railway. Section 1 declares that a railway authorized by the legislature of Quebec, which would therefore be regarded as provincial in its character, shall now be declared a railway for the general advantage of Canada. Personally, I am opposed to putting in that declaration unless there is some evidence before the committee that the road is of rather a national character and not simply local.

Mr. SPROULE. In the committee I objected to the principle of taking over these provincial lines and bringing them under federal jurisdiction without some strong reason, because there are often provisions in the provincial Bill that we destroy by making the railway a federal line, thus bringing it under another authority and jurisdiction. We had the same thing last year in connection with Ontario railways. By taking them under our jurisdiction we removed them from the control of the Railway Commission of Ontario. That occurred in connection with telegraph and telephone lines. Then there was the other objection which the Minister of Public Works has raised. We have of late years made it a rule to compel the party who desired to have a provincial railway declared to be for the general advantage of Canada to give some specific and justifiable ground for making the declaration which transfers the road from the control of the one to the other. But in this case even the local Act was not looked up. The discussion was hurried through and little time was given to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was not present when the Bill was before the committee. We generally discuss those features to which my hon. friend refers pretty thoroughly, but he was present and says they were not thoroughly discussed. I plead guilty to being quite partial to putting all the railways possible under Dominion jurisdiction, on account of the control we thus get over the traffic, which is conceded to be very complete under our Board of Railway Commissioners. The point has been raised during the past year, in fact a case is now in progress, in which it is contended that even where a provincial line connects with a Dominion line the Dominion Railway Commission has no power to even regulate the through rates on that part of the line which has a provincial charter. This makes it all the more necessary, even to control through rates, that we should have jurisdiction. If my hon. friend will give notice that he is going to move this amendment and let that stand until the next meeting of the committee, the promoter will be here.

Mr. NESBITT. There was a discussion about that in the committee and the provincial statute was turned up to see where it differed and I understand an amendment was added in sections 3 and 4.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was under the impression that instructions were given to have the names of those other railways with which this one is connected inserted in the Bill. The committee will remember that Mr. Wainwright came before the Railway Committee, and said that they were extremely anxious the Bill should go through in order to give them a connecting link between the Grand Trunk railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific. So urgent was the demand that there was no opposition, and his request was granted.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that was in connection with another Bill entirely.

Progress reported.

SECURITY TRUSTS CORPORATION.

House in committee on Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Security Trusts Corporation.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Mr. NESBITT. This Bill was considered by the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no knowledge of the Bill, but if it has received the consideration of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, I shall not object. If there be any objection, I shall be glad to look into it. No doubt the committee gave it very careful consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. The consideration of the committee was largely along the same lines as that of a Bill we passed the year before last, about which there was a good deal of controversy. I think it was the Bill of the Prudential Loan and Trust Company. There is one amendment that, in my opinion, should be made that does not appear in the Bill. It should be a part of all Bills to incorporate trust or loan companies, insurance companies—though it does not apply so much to these—as banking companies. It should be provided that whenever such a company becomes possessed of money or valuable consideration which does not belong to the company, but for which there are no claimants and no heirs, that property should be transferred to the state. At present these companies treat such moneys practically as their own. It was urged by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) that this provision should be in a general Bill. I think it would be natural to have it in a general Bill, but, in the meantime, I think we should make it a part of every special Bill of this kind. Of course, I am not going to try to stop the Bill for the purpose of making this amendment, but I draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to the matter. No individual is allowed to do what these corporations do—appropriate money which does not belong to them because they happen to become possessed of it and no heir or claimant is found. If the property were real estate, it would pass, under the law of escheat, to the province.

Mr. FIELDING. Does not that apply to personal property?

Mr. SPROULE. In connection with real estate the province of Ontario has asserted its claim in some such cases. And, in the case of personal property held by individuals, it passes to the state, but I am not aware of instances in which this rule was applied to these companies.

Mr. FIELDING. I find that the law clerk has made a memorandum that one of these sections is not so carefully drawn as it should be. I suggest that we allow this Bill to stand, and the points raised can be inquired into before it comes up for consideration again.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance to subsection 3 of section 6 which reads:

> 3. The company may, by by-law, provide that a resolution in writing signed by all the directors shall be valid as if it had been passed at a meeting of the directors.

That practically does away with the holding of directors' meetings and I do not think this sort of thing should be encouraged. The business is supposed to be directed by the joint action of directors, after consultation. But, if the matter be left in this shape, each director practically becomes a rubber stamp for the manager. And we find that that is the origin of trouble in many of these cases. I think that such a provision should not be in any of these Bills.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that similar provision is to be found in other Bills. I cannot recall the particular case, but I recollect the question being before the committee, and the argument was put forward that, in matters of no very great concern, it was found inconvenient to get the Board of Directors together, and the convenient way was to send a memorandum round and have each director sign the resolution. And I have known that to be done in graver bodies in cases of emergency. Of course, it might be difficult to draw the line between matters requiring conference and matters more of routine requiring merely the formal approval of the board. I will bear in mind the suggestion, which is in the direction of safety and prudence, and will call the attention of the law officers who advise us in such matters to the observations of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart).

Mr. SPROULE. I drew attention to this matter in the committee, and thought that the provision had been struck out. I thought and still think, that the provision is a bad one. The reason urged in its favour is the difficulty of getting the board together. But this is a trust company belonging to one province so that its directors are not scattered so far that they could not be got together for the companies business. I have seen the working of this law in one or two instances where, had it not been checked in proper time, it would have been likely to do great harm. When it is proposed that the board should take certain action, a paper is prepared and sent to each director with all the reasons that can be advanced why the resolution should be signed at once and sent on. There is usually some plea of urgency and some intimation of pending loss if the action proposed be not taken. The memorandum does not bring out all the facts that would be brought out in a discussion at a board meeting. But the individual director dislikes to burk or check the proposed action, and so, instead of directing, as a director is supposed to do, he signs and sends the resolution on. The effect is to give power into the hands of a small executive. I think it is a bad provision, and should not be allowed in these Bills.

Mr. HENDERSON. The objections to this provision were not overlooked in the committee. The section was fully considered before being adopted. We thought there was a sufficient safeguard in the fact

that all the directors—not a majority only —have to sign in these cases. If the same question were brought before the board, it might be brought before a bare quorum a majority of whom would carry. We thought that the proviso that every director's name should be signed would be an equal safeguard. We came to the conclusion that we would allow the clause to go through, because it had gone through if I am not mistaken, in the case of the Prudential, a Bill that as I understood the matter, had received very careful consideration in the committee and had been made something of a model Bill. But having adopted that Bill only a year or two ago, it was thought well to allow this clause to go through.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman's arguments are neither strong nor sound. I do not think you will analyse any question that is presented before a board as well by sending it to one individual with all the arguments on one side and more on the other, no board is doing its duty which does this. In the first case you are more likely to make the directors figure-heads than intelligent and useful officials. Take the Farmers' Bank, how easy it would have been to pass something around like that. The manager, who seemed to dominate everything, could get it signed.

Mr. NESBITT. How much good would it do to have a meeting?

Mr. SPROULE. That a certain number of men there did not attend to their duties was not on account of the fact that they did not meet but because they didn't do their duty when they did meet. But if they desired to pass around something, would it not be more easy to do it if there had been only a few sharp men on the board? I know one party that had to make two trips to New York to safeguard the interest of himself and friends on account of a provision such as that, made foolishly or maliciously by the manager and one or two of the members of the board who were acting in concert with him, and who stood to benefit if it was carried through. The result was that he was endangering the financial interests of all the members of that board and of that company. If it had not been burked they would have suffered a serious loss.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not sure but that I may say that the hon. gentleman's arguments are neither strong nor sound, as he characterized mine. Now, I still submit that with a board of four, which you could have with this company, because that would be a majority of the seven, the smallest number of directors, you might have on that board a very strong minded man who was sufficiently persuasive to induce the other members of the board to come to his opinion. If you sent the motion around to the various directors, and let them sit down in their quiet and reflective moments, and consider the whole question for themselves, I am not sure but that you would get a much better judgment than you could where you had one strong minded man dominating the rest. I still hold that the opinion expressed by the committee was wise and sound.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a motion that the committee rise.

Mr. NESBITT. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) expresses my views completely.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before the committee rises, I want to ask an explanation of section 15. There is a section in this Bill which provides that this company may do business throughout Canada, but subject to the laws of the province, and if there is any conflict, the laws of the province shall prevail. Now, I do not think we are doing our duty in this parliament to incorporate a company and then say that its powers shall not be exercised if they happen to conflict with the law of any province. That is not good legislation.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that is a good clause. You would not want to enact anything in one province that was in conflict with the laws of that province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But let not the province enact a provincial law which is in conflict with a Dominion statute.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Act respecting the Observance of the Lord's Day is based upon that principle exactly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think perhaps that was a law of an exceptional character. But here we are claiming jurisdiction to incorporate this company for Dominion purposes, with power to do business throughout Canada, and yet the effect of this would be that in one province they could do certain things, and in another province they would not have the same power ; their power might be different in each of the provinces of Canada. If we have authority to incorporate this company with power to do business throughout Canada, then we should not make it subject to the laws of each particular province in which it might happen to be carrying on business.

Mr. SPROULE. What would happen if, when your Bill became law, a province should make a law of their own saying that you should not do business in that province unless you complied with certain provisions of their law?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should say that their law was void unless there was a question

of taxation. They might impose a tax on the company, as they do. But any statute which attempted to interfere with the larger rights which this parliament gave to a company, would, I think, be ultra vires of the provincial legislature. But here we assume to pass an Act, and then we say that it may be picked to pieces in any province.

Mr. SPROULE. We have done the same thing to-day with an insurance company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been a case under consideration as to the powers of a provincial legislature to incorporate a company to do business throughout Canada. But here there is no question of our authority to incorporate this company. But we are saying that although we give you such rights, these rights must be exercised subject to any law of any province, and if there is any conflict with that, the provincial law shall prevail.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I understand there is a stated case being sent to the Privy Council to determine the respective rights of a province and the Dominion in case of conflict. There may be concurrent jurisdiction.

Mr. FIELDING. That the Bill might involve possible conflict between the province and the Dominion is something that I have not had before me. It strikes me, as it is read by the Minister of Public Works, that the earlier part of the clause as to doing business subject to the laws of the province, might mean that inasmuch as trustee laws are under the jurisdiction of a province as dealing with property and civil rights, in the exercise of their functions as a trust corporation they have to bear in mind that trusts are regulated by the province and not by the Dominion. The law of trusteeship is a provincial law, and I think the intention must be that they should carry out the provincial law. They would become a corporate company for trustee business, but they would have to do their business subject to the law of the province as respects trusteeships. I think that is what it is intended to mean. The latter part of the clause respecting possible conflict, is more serious.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE. THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Pickup.

Bill (No. 66) respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Stratton.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the London and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Bill (No. 67) respecting the Burrard, Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Taylor (New Westminster).

Bill (No. 82) respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company, and to change its name to the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Empire Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Railway Company. —Mr. German.

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Hunt.

SUPPLY.

The order for private Bills being exhausted, House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just before six o'clock we had considered the amount for the driveway pavement—$20,000. I rather think the discussion was concluded. If no other hon. gentleman has anything to say it might be carried.

Mr. CROTHERS. My recollection is that the minister said that $17,000 had been expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the 30th November, $16,779.19.

Mr. CROTHERS. What was the number of yards?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 8,000.

Mr. CROTHERS. There is $3,000 or $4,000 to be expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would lapse on the 31st March.

Mr. CROTHERS. I also understood the minister to say that a number of men in the permanent employment of the government were utilized in making this pavement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS. I did not understand if their salary was included in this $16,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, although they are permanently employed we pay them out of the vote for each particular work.

Mr. CROTHERS. That would be the total expenditure including the salary of the men employed on the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS. If the concrete is eight inches thick, and well laid I do not think

the price is an exorbitant one. I have had some experience in laying pavements.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is exceedingly well laid. I noticed it before the snow came and I was much pleased with it.

Peterborough post office building, addition to, $9,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision towards the erection of a one story brick adjunct on a stone basement 36 feet frontage by 50 feet, the full depth of the building, extending the frontage to North lane. This is an addition to the ground floor of the building and to the working space of the post office. There has been some little money expended. The total probable cost will reach $12,999.70. The whole amount is a revote.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is $1,000 of this not a revote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have expended up to the 31st of December $386.70 and we assume that by the 31st of March we will have expended about $1,000.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is this an addition to the present post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is it the intention to proceed at once with the construction of this addition?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is under contract now.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I understand that theis building is only one story?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). It would seem to any one looking at that post office that it is altogether too small for a city the size of Peterborough. Now that you are making an addition to it you should at least make a two story building of it. I think you will be cramped for room if you do not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All they are asking for is the enlargement of what is called the working part of the office, and the Post Office Department is satisfied.

Mr. SEXSMITH. The minister should deal as generously with Peterborough as he does with other places in the matter of public buildings. Peterborough is an important city, one of the most important in the province of Ontario, and I surely think the minister ought to build a post office that would do credit to the place as well as accommodate the public. Peterborough is not like some of the villages of 700 or 800 inhabitants where you erect a $30,000 building. It is a rapidly growing city, and should have more generous treatment from the government.

Mr. CROTHERS.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is already a very good post office there with which the people and the Post Office Department are well satisfied. We are now building an addition which will give ample accommodation for some years to come. I trust my hon. friend will not urge me unnecessarily to expend public money on this building. Of course if you were to believe hon. gentlemen opposite one would suppose that I would be very glad to have an opportunity of expending money.

Mr. LANCASTER. In some places.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not want to be unduly pressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sexsmith) because I think very much of him. There is also a public building in Peterborough for a customs house and it really is not necessary to expend any more money on this post office than we now propose.

Mr. SEXSMITH. As the minister is going about the job it would be cheaper for him now to make the building a two story one than to do it later. The building would have a much better appearance if he did.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be no advantage at present, and I would not wish to put up a two story building just for appearance sake.

Mr. LANCASTER. You could put another story on that building for the $1,600 you spent on a clock where it was not necessary.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Does the addition front on a street?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it extends through to the north lane.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the government own the land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the building is on our own land.

Mr. SEXSMITH. If it is necessary to increase this item to make a complete job of improving the post office in Peterborough so as to accommodate the people for some years to come, I would urge on the minister that now is the time to do it. I think the people of Peterborough should be generously dealt with.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Peterborough has an excellent post office building now.

Mr. SEXSMITH. It is quite a small building for such an important city as that. Does the minister intend to make changes in the interior of the post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we propose putting up additional fittings.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of a roof is there to be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A flat roof covered with gravel and felt.

Port Perry public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to erect a public building at Port Perry in the county of Ontario, for post office purposes, &c.

Mr. BLAIN. North Ontario?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, South Ontario. Out of last year's appropriation of $5,000 we have paid $1,800 for the site, and we assume that by the 31st of March we will have expended $1,195 more, making $3,200, leaving $1,800 as a revote and we ask for $15,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the contract let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. The population of Port Perry nine years ago was very close to 1,500. The postal revenue last year was $3,223, money orders issued $15,200, money orders paid $20,000.

Mr. BLAIN. From whom did you purchase the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From Miss Elizabeth Sinclair for $1,800. The property consisted of two lots, one of them being 40 feet 6 inches by 89 feet. Port Perry is a thriving town, there are 30 stores, 2 banks, a sawmill, a flour mill, a machinery shop, &c.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I have been observing the different towns in which post offices are to be built and am convinced that one town has been forgotten by the Minister of Public Works, that is the town of Meaford. It has a larger population and a greater revenue than any of the towns with which we have been dealing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is it in my hon. friend's constituency ?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Yes. I find that the population and postal revenue of the towns in which buildings are to be erected are as follows:

Town.	Postal Revenue.	Population.	Cost of Building.
	$		$
Elora	3,500	1,200	14,000
Fergus	4,300	1,296	14,000
Listowel	6,000	2,693	18,000
Mitchell	4,097	1,945	18,000
Mount Forest	4,924	2,019	18,000
Port Perry	3,223	1,500	15,000
Meaford	6,300		

I have not the exact population of Meaford, but it is nearly 4,000. If all of these other places are entitled to postal buildings, I cannot see how, in the light of the minister's announcement, that it is the postal revenue, the number of industries and the population that determines the erection of buildings, Meaford is not more entitled to a building than these other towns.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Have they not good accommodation there now ?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. No, just a small building, the rental of which is three hundred and some odd dollars.

Mr. PUGSLEY. $300 ought to rent a very good building in a town of that size. Where the postal revenue is larger a greater allowance is given to the postmaster and he can rent better accommodation. As an illustration, my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. Wilcox), referred to the necessity of better accommodation at Walkerville. He corrected his statement to-day and I also got a letter from a gentleman in Walkerville who said the hon. gentleman's statements were entirely without foundation because there was very excellent accommodation at Walkerville; the postmaster had rented very suitable premises and there was not that urgent need for a building that the hon. gentleman sought to make the House believe there was. So it might be in Meaford; with a rental of $300 there might be quite good accommodation.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. To follow that to its logical conclusion, if the minister would get better premises in all these towns he would get better postal revenue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, if we had better postal revenue we could have better premises.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That is why I want better premises, because we have a greater postal revenue than any of the towns the minister has mentioned, and a customs revenue as well. I am prepared to say there is twice as much revenue, postal and customs, as in any of the towns the hon. gentleman has mentioned. I really do think the town of Meaford is entitled to a public building. We do not want anything elaborate, but just need a comfortable, respectable building in which to do public business. I ask the minister for this in all earnestness. I am not pleading for anything, but I want to stand up for my rights. I lay claim before the minister on these grounds.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Meaford is an important place, a place which, I am glad to know, is doing considerable business. I had the pleasure of visiting Meaford last summer. It is to be borne in mind that the Department of Public Works is spending a very considerable amount of money for the improvement of the harbour of Meaford. That makes a considerable difference.

Some towns which are inland, where they have no public moneys expended, may have a stronger claim for the immediate construction of public buildings to meet public necessities than towns where a large amount is being expended for the improvement of the harbour and so for the development of business. My hon. friend knows that Meaford is a town of something over 2,000.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Nearer 4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know it is a very good and thriving town. I had not the opportunity of going all over the town. But I think we are spending money to a very good public advantage in Meaford in improving the harbour. My hon. friend's representation as to the need of public buildings will, I can assure him, have my careful consideration. If I remember rightly, this is the first time the matter has been brought to my attention.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am obliged to the minister for his consideration. I would point out that in the case of Owen Sound which is also a lively town of about 14,000 the same arguments for its not receiving a public building might have been advanced, but the government gave a public building costing $10,000. If it was proper to do it in Owen Sound, where we receive considerable harbour assistance, the same thing might apply to Meaford.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Both towns are in the same constituency ?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That should not make a difference, every town should stand on its own merits.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the hon. gentleman see that having just erected a very handsome and expensive public building in Owen Sound in the same constituency as Meaford and that as we are spending a good deal of money in the harbour at Meaford we might well consider the claims of other places where no public money is being expended and where there is need of public buildings, especially where there is no public building at present in the constituency. However I shall be very glad to give consideration to the claim.

Mr. BLAIN. If the hon. minister intends to discuss it from that point of view, that will lead to considerable difficulty, for the reason that he has been expending a very large amount of money in South Ontario at different places.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it should happen in the not far distant future that I should put in an amount for Meaford, will the hon. gentleman object to it?

Mr. BLAIN. So long as the minister spends the money wisely, every item of expenditure will receive fair consideration from this side. But the difficulty is we do not know what is his policy, and he does not seem to know it himself. Therefore, we are not able to apply a fair test to his expenditures.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose we may take it for granted that the hon. gentleman would approve of expenditure upon buildings in towns of a reasonable size and which are in need of public buildings, always providing, as is actually the case, that the money is wisely expended?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Perhaps if the minister would answer a question of mine, it might be of some assistance to the electors before the next election. Would it make any difference in his own attitude towards the erection of a public building in Meaford, if the electors there should see fit at the next election to return a supporter of the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have always been very careful not to make any promises with regard to the erection of public buildings.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I notice that the minister is very anxious to establish post offices in small villages which are in the party fold. For instance, he puts up a $25,000 building in a village which has but a population of 700. In Napierville, a village with 900 population, he puts up a $15,000 post office. But Meaford, with a population of 4,000, has no attention given it. Port Perry, with a small population, gets a $15,000 building, whereas Milton, with 1,800 people, with no other public building in that district, and which is an inland town and a shire town, has no attention paid to it whatever. Neither has Parry Sound, with 4,000 people, or Uxbridge, with 2,000 people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the trouble with Uxbridge?

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL. It has a Tory representative.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is an amount in the estimates for Uxbridge.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The trouble is you will not spend it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we will.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Come to western Ontario—

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had a very delightful trip through there last summer.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, but you only went through a certain section represented by members of your own party, and did not go through the other ridings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was at Meaford, Owen Sound, Goderich and Windsor.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is only a very small portion of western Ontario. The minister knows well that his policy is merely to grant post offices to constituencies on his own side, which return supporters to this government.

Mr. TOLMIE. What about Port Stanley?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No doubt the minister made the promise before the last election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. TOLMIE. What about Chesley?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I merely rose to enter my protest against the manner in which public moneys are being expended on these buildings.

Mr. SINCLAIR. On looking over the list of public buildings, I am greatly surprised to find hon. gentlemen making the statement that all the money is spent in Liberal constituencies. Such is not the case in many instances. For example take the province of Nova Scotia where there are eight items for public buildings The first is Halifax citadel, new quarters for single men. Then Halifax Dominion building—post office. Then Halifax quarantine station, and again Halifax Dominion buildings. These are all in the constituency represented by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When were these buildings started, and were they not promised previous to the last election?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am not able to say when they were started.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What is your point?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am talking now about the expenditure in my province. Then we come to the item of the Lunenburg public building, which county is represented by a Liberal. Then to Parrsboro', which is in the county of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes).

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is the money being spent on this, or is it simply in the estimates?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How long has it been in the estimates?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is the money being spent or is it simply remaining in the estimates to be spent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The moneys are ready to be spent when required.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understand that we are voting the money for the purpose of spending it.

Mr. BLAIN. Voting it for political purposes.

Mr. SINCLAIR. In the province of Nova Scotia there are five items of expenditure in constituencies represented by Conservatives, as I have shown, and only three in counties represented by supporters of the government. I am not so well acquainted with Ontario, but look at the items in that province for a moment. The very first is in the town of Athens, which, I understand, is in the constituency of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It was not in the estimates of 1908.

Mr. BLAIN. Take the next one.

Mr. SINCLAIR. There is a vote for Chesley which is a town in a Conservative constituency.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That was put in the estimates immediately before the last election for party purposes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I may tell you also that there has not been a dollar spent there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the site is bought and the contract is about ready.

Mr. MEIGHEN. There has not been a cent spent on the building, as the minister knows.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). And I venture the opinion that there will not be a dollar spent there until the eve of the next election.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Take Gananoque in the constituency of my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When was that put in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is an irrelevant question.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The dates of these items are not so important as the fact that we find many of them in Conservative constituencies. Passing on down, we have four considerable items in the constituency of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards).

Mr. MEIGHEN. Were they put in?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understand that some of these are new items. There is another item for Sudbury, in the constituency of Nipissing. I am just blundering through these Ontario towns, because I am not so well acquainted with the geography as I would like to be. The next that I notice is Toronto—no less than four items one of them for $100,000 which is more than is voted for the whole province of Nova Scotia in which we have twelve Liberal members. Then we come to Uxbridge, in the constituency of my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe).

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the date?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). That vote was promised on the eve of an election. Not a

dollar of it has been spent, and I prophesy that not a dollar will be spent until the eve of the next election.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It is very appropriate and honourable that the promise should be carried out. Now, I do not know how many votes there are in Quebec and other provinces. But there is a considerable list. My criticism of the present administration is that it is too liberal to hon. gentlemen opposite. Under the old administration, for fourteen years the county of Guysborough which I have the honour to represent, did not appear in the estimates of the Dominion at all.

Mr. BLAIN. How is it doing now?

Mr. SINCLAIR. For fourteen years out of eighteen under that administration, the county did not appear in the estimates. For four years it was represented by a Conservative, and during that period some small votes were given. I question if you will find a record like that under the present administration in any county in Canada. The Minister of Public Works in the old administration came down to the capital of my constituency and made the bald statement that if we wanted to get public works we must vote for the Conservative party. That is the doctrine hon. gentlemen opposite have been taught and that they practised when in power. I think that they are rather surprised to find us voting so many public buildings in constituencies represented on their side of the House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If I needed anything to confirm the statement I made, the remarks of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) would furnish it. He has not shown a single case of a public building in any Ontario constituency represented by a member of the opposition which was not promised on the eve of the last election. He says that the government are carrying out their promises. But, why do they make these promises and then, year after year, vote this money but never spend a dollar of it? What right has the government to monopolize the expenditure of public money for constituencies represented on their side of the House, and to make promises to constituencies represented on this side in the hope of changing their representation. He tells us of statements made in years gone by in his own county. But his own followers from Nova Scotia, speaking at Lethbridge, held out to the people there a definite statement that, unless the present government had a representative from the district, the people need not expect a post office building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) will withdraw that statement. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), when a similar statement was made on a previous occasion, rose in his place and denied that he had made any such statement. The hon member (Mr. Armstrong) is bound to accept that denial, and I have no doubt he will accept it cheerfully.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I presume I shall be forced to accept the statement that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) made. But the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) remembers that the Prime Minister, on that very occasion, distinctly gave the people to understand that he would grant them a post office, and repudiated the position taken by the hon. member for Pictou. Be that as it may, the hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) has simply emphasized the position I took in this matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the Prime Minister was at Lethbridge, his attention was most emphatically called by the people to the urgent need of a public building. Lethbridge is a place of about 14,000 and is increasing at the rate of from fifty to one hundred per cent a year. The post office accommodation there was utterly inadequate. The matter had been under the consideration of the government for some months, and we had made up our minds to erect a public building. What was wrong in the Prime Minister, at a time when no election was pending, and every reason to suppose that the appropriation would be made long before an election, telling the people that he was impressed with the necessity of a post office, and would ask the Minister of Public Works to provide for one? That is all he did.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not quite all. At the same meeting, when the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said whatever he did say, the Prime Minister corrected him, and put the—

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is denied.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have said it in the presence of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and he did not deny it, and will not dare to deny it, and I do not propose to take a denial at second-hand from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley).

Mr. PUGSLEY. The member for Pictou denied it.

Mr. LANCASTER. But the Prime Minister has never denied it. He corrected the matter going to the public press, and said that if they got only what they deserved they would not get a public building, but he would be more generous, and deal with them better than they deserved.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the Prime Minister took the trouble to deny every false statement made with regard to himself he would be kept busy. I do not think the matter

has been seriously brought to his attention. If the hon. gentleman would draw it to his attention I am sure the Prime Minister would feel it of sufficient importance to refer to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Of course, we are bound to accept the statement of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). But a reference to the newspaper files will show that the newspapers of that city do not accept the denial, and neither do the people. As to the statement of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that this government was not influenced by the political complexion of the members for a constituency, it may appear merciless to make any reference to it, because his claim so completely fell down while he was speaking, and his absolute refusal to answer the questions put to him showed the weakness of his position. But if he goes through the whole Ontario list of public buildings he will not find an item for a new public building that has been inserted since the election of 1908 in any constituency represented by a member of the opposition.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And the hon. gentleman will find no new items in any constituency represented by a Liberal.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I repeat what I said. Now let him go through the list, and he will find no less than eight items of new public buildings inserted since 1908, in constituencies represented by members supporting the government. Now does that teach any lesson to the hon. gentleman? If not, he must be obtuse politically. Now let us come to Nova Scotia. He says that in some building in Toronto, there is an appropriation greater than for the public buildings of Nova Scotia. I believe that appropriation is $100,000, and that the public buildings in Nova Scotia he refers to amount to about $90,000. But let him turn to rivers and harbours in Nova Scotia and he gets, not $90,000, but $847,000. And if he goes back to the supplementary estimates prior to the election of 1908, he gets appropriations of $448,000 in Nova Scotia for public buildings, or about eight for every constituency in the province, and all made in the month of July just on the eve of a general election. Now the principal of bribing constituencies could not be placed on a lower level than the Minister of Public Works has placed it, and he only adds to the general demoralization of politics by protesting that he is not following that principle. It would do less harm to the country if he frankly admitted that he was governed by the political complexion of the member of the constituency. I asked him a few moments ago whether he would say that if the people of the riding of North Grey, at the next election, returned a supporter of the government, his attitude would be at all altered with respect to a public building in Meaford, and he answered that he always avoided giving promises. Now will he assure this House that his attitude towards that constituency will not change if it sends to parliament a representative of a different complexion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman should not ask me for an assurance. I would hesitate very much to give him an assurance.

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). There is an item in the estimates this year for the constituency of North Grey, there is also an item for the constituency of East Grey.

Mr. MEIGHEN. They were in before 1908.

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). The member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), last week made a considerable comment on what North Wellington was getting. The constituency I represent has never had a dollar spent in it until this last year or two, and it was always represented by a Liberal. East Grey and North Grey have items, but South Grey has no item. I think the item for East Grey has been put in the estimates since the election of 1908. The minister would know if I am correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the estimates for the previous years here. I may say that I sometimes have a feeling that I am doing even more for constituencies represented by our friends opposite, than I ought to do; and a good deal of fault is found with me by some of our friends because they do not get the public buildings to which they think they are entitled and they blame me for erecting public buildings in constituencies represented by our opponents. Sometimes it makes it more difficult for me to give grants in constituencies represented by hon. gentlemen opposite, when I find them so lacking in appreciation. In an election which took place a short time ago down in Nova Scotia, one hon. member sitting on the other side of the House went there and claimed credit for every item of public expenditure which had been made in the county, he said he was entitled to credit for it——

An hon. MEMBER. Who was it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson). He claimed the entire credit for grants which had been made, grants to wharfs and other improvements. I have that upon authority so strong that I must give all credit to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. When did that take place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Six or eight weeks ago. That hon. gentleman went upon the platform and denied to the government, denied to me, denied to our supporters any credit for these improvements, and claimed that he was entitled to the entire credit for them all. It is conduct such as this by our friends opposite that makes it a little harder for me sometimes to grant them all the improvements they ask for.

Mr. MEIGHEN. In the absence of the hon. member for Digby, I think I would be safe in denying that he made any such assertion, or claimed all the credit.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is my information.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. As the hon. member for Digby is not here it seems to me that this is an assertion that the minister is not entitled to make.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will come to the Nova Scotia items for wharfs and the hon. member for Digby will have the fullest opportunity of speaking on the question.

Mr. BLAIN. We have just sent for him now.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Are all the expenditures which have been made in the riding since the hon. member for Digby was elected, proper expenditures?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, every one.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Were these expenditures asked for by the hon. member for Digby?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A number were asked for by our own friends as well.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. gentleman would be perfectly justified in asking for the expenditures which have been made in that riding?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then, what fault has the hon. minister to find with the hon. member for Digby?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will tell the hon gentleman. Instead of the hon. member for Digby getting up on the platform and saying that the Minister of Public Works has expended public money wisely and properly in his constituency and in the public interest, the hon. gentleman got up and told the people that the government was not entitled to the slightest credit. I see that the hon. member for Digby is now in his place and I will repeat the statement that I made. I was saying a short time ago that it made it a little more difficult than it would otherwise be because hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of going through their constituencies and claiming the sole credit for public expenditures made by the government, and I had in my mind more especially the hon. member for Digby, who, I was informed, went upon different platforms in the last local election in Digby, claimed for himself the entire credit of the expenditures which had been made by the government in the county of Digby and contended that the government and the friends of the government were not entitled to any credit at all but that he and he alone had succeeded in getting these moneys expended in the county. That was the statement I was making, and what I said in the absence of the hon. gentleman was that I did not think that that was a course that hon. members opposite ought to take. If the expenditure is wise the government ought to be given the credit for it.

Mr. CROCKET. I suppose it was public money that was expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Clearly public money that was expended. In my own judgment it is entirely a misconception on the part of an hon. member of the opposition to say, that because he makes a representation to the minister, the minister considers the representations along with the representations of others, and an amount is put in the estimates, he is entitled to claim all the credit of it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). If a constituency is represented by one of the minister's own political friends and public money is expended in that constituency, is the representative entitled to the credit, or is the Minister of Public Works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government is entitled to the credit of it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Not the representative?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The representative, as a supporter of the government, when he goes to the people, claims credit for the government and claims that the public ought to support the government. But the hon. gentleman in one breath stated: I am entitled to the credit for these expenditures, but the government is not entitled to any credit.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then the minister acknowledges that it is the proper principle for his candidates to go to a constituency and say: You should support the government because they have spent a certain amount of money in your constituency?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is fair to say that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That is what I call bribery in the different constituencies.

Mr. JAMESON. Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has referred to me personally in the House, it is only right that under the circumstances

I should make some remarks on the subject. With regard to these expenditures which are being made in Digby and with regard to the appropriations placed in the estimates for that purpose, the minister very well knows that I drew his attention on several occasions, personally and by correspondence, to the necessity of these works. I had the pleasure of several interviews with the minister and I also had considerable correspondence with him on the subject. I do not think that I ever asked for an expenditure that was not perfectly warranted by the facts and necessities of the case. I furthermore think there were many instances to which I might refer in which the minister did not comply with the requests that were made in that behalf. But the minister has gone further and has said that upon public platforms I have claimed the entire credit for these votes. The minister is labouring under a misconception. On the contrary, it was the gentlemen who were opposed to me and to the Conservative candidate in Digby who thus claimed the entire credit. It was my duty to myself, it was my duty to the constituency which I have the honour to represent, to, in so far as I could, rectify that misconception and counteract those influences. I did not begin it, nor did I begin the discussion with regard to these public works in Digby or the votes made therefor. I did not do so because I did not think it was a question which should enter into a local election, but when I noticed that gentlemen who were opposed to the Conservative candidate were going about the county of Digby and asserting that they and not I had made the representations upon the strength of which these votes were made and these public works were going to be undertaken, I felt it was my duty, to set the matter right. I also understand that these gentlemen were exhibiting letters from the Minister of Public Works himself, stating that it was upon their representations that these votes were placed in the estimates. I thereupon took the correspondence which I had had with the hon. minister, and I also took the different issues of 'Hansard' which referred to these matters when they were brought up in the House, and I read them, as I considered it was my duty to read them before the electors of Digby. It was not I who projected this question into the local election. I did not think it was altogether proper, I thought it was entirely out of place, but when the question was raised by gentlemen on the other side and when they sought to detract in every way possible from the efforts of myself as a Conservative sitting in this House and representing the county of Digby, I thought it was only right and proper to set the matter right. The minister seems if I gauge properly the state of mind in which he was when I entered the House, to have been a little irritated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. JAMESON. I am glad to know that ——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not a bit.

Mr. JAMESON. Because I do not think the minister has any reason whatever to object to a statement of bald facts and facts, which are borne out by the records, on the part of any man who has the honour to represent a constituency in this parliament. The statement which I made upon every occasion was simply that these were the facts as disclosed by the records, that in so far as I was personally concerned I was perfectly satisfied that any gentleman who had assisted should have the credit to which he was entitled, but that I also, as the one who had brought these matters to the attention of the minister and the House, felt that I was entitled to credit, in so far as the records disclosed my efforts in that particular regard. I do not think that the minister, when he hears this explanation from me, will question the propriety of what I did. If this question, which came up on that occasion should arise again, I should do exactly the same thing under similar circumstances.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rather was given to understand that the hon. gentleman had denied credit to anybody else, but that he had claimed the whole credit for himself. Did the hon. gentleman give due credit to the Minister of Public Works for these useful public works that he was having done in the county?

Mr. JAMESON. The minister has stated what he understood to be a fact, namely, that I had denied credit to any person else, and he also has asked me whether or not I gave credit to the Minister of Public Works. I do not know that I said in so many words that the Minister of Public Works was entitled to any particular credit for this expenditure of public moneys in Digby, or for the votes made for that purpose, but I certainly read the correspondence between the minister and myself, my own letters to the minister and the minister's reply to me. I also quoted from 'Hansard,' in which my statements were reported, and the statements of the minister in reply, and I allowed the electors of the county of Digby and others present to draw their own conclusions. I merely did that because it had been put up to me that I had done nothing whatever in the way of assisting to get these works, or urging their necessity on the minister. I did not begin it; it was begun by my political opponents, and I only displayed the records in self-defence, so that the people might understand how matters really stood.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman from Wellington (Mr. Martin) said there had been a considerable expenditure of public money in East Grey, and he instanced the expenditure of $1,000 in Thornbury to repair a wharf. I would remind him that that is the only appropriation in these estimates for East Grey. I think the work is needed; I am not complaining about it, and even though the amount is small, the people will be grateful for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No one suggests the hon. gentleman would complain of an expenditure there.

Mr. SPROULE. No, but in the county of Wellington no less than four of these public buildings have been erected or are under way in small villages, some of them within two or three miles of each other when there are large counties in which there is no expenditure on public buildings at all. It would seem to me that is due to the fact that the county of Wellington is represented in this House by three Reformers and that the other counties happen to be represented by Conservatives. I think the comparison I make is a fair one. Further, I do not think that the amount proposed to be expended in East Grey, in Thornbury, $1,000, is likely to influence the electors one way or the other.

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). I was not finding fault with the expenditure of public money in East Grey or in Wellington, but I cited it to show that the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite that money was being promised to influence voters on the eve of an election, was not correct. I do not think any man could imagine that the money expended in Thornbury could carry the election against the hon. member for East Grey, and I do not think that item was in the estimates until after the election of 1908.

Mr. PERLEY. It strikes me very forcibly that the Minister of Public Works has shown us very clearly to-night what his idea is in trying to administer this department. I was very much astonished at some of the remarks he made, not because we did not know that was the way he looked at things, but because we did not expect him to acknowledge it. He sets to work and he asks the hon. member for Digby if he gave the Minister of Public Works credit for making improvements in the county of Digby, and he also gets up in this House and states that he thinks the government of the country ought to have the credit for these improvements in that constituency. Surely the Minister of Public Works knows that the people of this country think that he is spending their money and not the Grit money of this country. And when the minister erects public buildings in any constituency he is supposed to erect them on some principle and in the public interest, but to-night he has acknowledged to us right here that he is using the machinery of the Public Works Department practically for the purpose of trying to bribe the various constituencies in this country. We have felt all along that that is the principle on which he decides where he will carry on public works in this country. We see, before the elections, hundreds of appropriations brought down for public works that are left over from year to year, and we find such items in the appropriations for Ontario, which are now before us. We have items here revoted every year since 1908, which were put in by the government as the minister himself says, in order that the government might have credit for building the works in these constituencies, and so that the government might be able to get the people to vote for their candidates. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is an extraordinary thing for a minister of the Crown in this country to get up and claim that he and the government should have credit for building public works in any constituency, and should appeal to the voters of the country to vote for his party because he has done so. I would like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, if any one could possibly make a balder statement as to the attempt to bribe the constituencies of this country by means of public works erected by the expenditure of the money belonging to all the people of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is all very well for my hon. friend to talk that way. Suppose there is a public work that he thinks is needed in a constituency and the government does not build it, surely he would blame the government, and on the other hand surely it is not an unreasonable recognition of what the government does, if in any constituency it has met the public requirements so as to encourage trade by the improvement of harbours or the building of wharfs; surely it is not unreasonable to suppose that a member of the opposition going on the public platform who claims credit for getting that work done, should say: So far as this constituency is concerned I recognize that the government has met the reasonable demands of the public and has done in this respect what ought to be done for the advancement of the interests of the people, and in meeting their just and reasonable demands. What I object to is that a member of the opposition should claim credit to himself when certain things are done, while at the same time he condemns the government for things that do not happen to be done.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who did that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had that story and we do not want it over again.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It was denied.

Mr. PERLEY. I object to the principle laid down by the Minister of Public Works in this regard. If the Minister of Public Works would adopt some principle in expending the money under his control with regard to distributing it throughout the country in places most needing it, according to their size and the revenues they contribute, irrespective of who represents these constituencies, there would be no objection. If the minister should go to the people after the election and say: I have administered my department fairly and honestly for the benefit of all the people of Canada, then he could take credit to himself for administering his department wisely. But, it is neither right nor just that the minister should go into a particular constituency and say: You are a community of 700 or 800 people, I have given you a building to which you were not entitled in fair play, and therefore you should vote for this government. That is not proper.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would never say they were not entitled to it.

Mr CONMEE. I take exception to the views expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley), and I do not know that he realizes himself what he did say. He made the statement that the Minister of Public Works had come here to-night, that he had put these items on the estimates for the very purpose——

Mr. PERLEY. I did not say that.

Mr. CONMEE. I took your words down.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Read them; you haven't got them there at all.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman stated that these items were put in the estimates for the purpose of getting the support of the people for the government candidates. If the hon. gentleman did not make that statement, and if he denies that he did, I will have to take his word.

Mr. PERLEY. I know the hon. gentleman does not want to be unfair. What I said was that the Minister of Public Works said that when he erected buildings in a community he and the government should have credit for so doing, and what his statement practically meant was that when the elections came on the people should vote for him on that account.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I said was if the government with respect to my constituency had done justice by that constituency, had acted fairly by it, had done what was reasonable and proper for the development of the place by the improvement of harbours, &c., it was only fair that the government should get reasonable credit for that.

Mr. CONMEE. I have to accept my hon. friend's explanation, but I fear that when some gentlemen speak, they perhaps go further than they intended to go. But hon. gentlemen know that they go on the platforms of this country and condemn the government for not having expended money in certain cases. I have never met one of them on the stump who did not take that ground. In the House every day attacks are made on the government for extravagant expenditure, for wasting money in building public works, wharfs, &c., which hon. gentlemen allege are not prudent expenditures; but when it comes to their own constituencies, every one of them has his hand out, every one is on his feet pleading for some expenditure in his own riding. I do not think that is consistent. We have resolution after resolution submitted, condemning the expenditures of the government. Hon. gentlemen do not as a rule condemn any particular expenditure. I have been watching the proceedings of the House for some years but I have not seen hon. gentlemen moving to strike out this item or that item very often, they are very careful about that, they are afraid to put themselves on record as against this or that public undertaking, for which the government are spending money.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was the hon. gentleman present the last time we were in supply, when we moved to strike out an item ?

Mr. CONMEE. I say there are few cases where hon. gentlemen do more to strike at a particular item.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentlemen said never.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say any such thing. There are a few cases where hon. gentlemen are very careful not to strike at any particular item and seldom if ever, condemn an item of expenditure in the constituency of a Conservative member.

Mr. MEIGHEN. In the very nature of things such items would not be likely to be subject to attack.

Mr. CONMEE. It is legitimate for hon. gentlemen to condemn the government for not having made any expenditure they think should have been made that has been voted, but it is just as fair for a government supporter to take credit to the government because the government did make expenditures which he and the electors think meritorious.

Mr. LANCASTER. We are obliged for this lecture, but as a business man, would not the hon. member not condemn a manager of his, who would spend $25,000 on a building where a $5,000 building would do ?

Mr. CONMEE. If a superintendent of works represented that a foreman or manager in another department had expended $20,000 on a building that should have been erected for $5,000 and on investigation, I found that he had misrepresented and drawn on his imagination that he had no foundation in fact for his statement, I would dismiss the superintendent—and that is what the ridings of the hon. gentleman should do with them.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman would condemn a man who, in building for him a building that should cost $5,000 or $6,000 placed a cupola on it and lined it with diamonds and gold and clocks, the hon. gentleman knows that our objection to the heavy expenditure has never been proved unfounded. Last session I pointed out that if they took $100,000 and built ten post offices they would be doing more service to the country than by building only four post offices at $25,000 each.

Mr. CONMEE. A superintendent who in building a warehouse would add a cupola and line it with gold should be dismissed. My hon. friend knows that there has been no such case as that, that he was drawing on his imagination, that it is a mere fiction in the mind of my hon. friend.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. CONMEE. It might be economy to build substantial buildings as far as the money goes as otherwise they might have to be renewed.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that as a rule, a town of 600 or 700 inhabitants needs a $10,000 post office? Why you would see such a post office long before you saw the rest of the village. At the same time there are places in the country going without buildings, producing ten times the revenue and progressing ten times as rapidly. The hon. gentleman talks about drawing on the imagination, can he find in his imagination any justification for a $10,000 or $12,000 edifice in a village of 600 inhabitants ? He knows quite well that a $5,000 building would be all that place would need for the next two or three decades.

Mr. BLAIN. This is all due to the partisanship which hon. gentlemen opposite introduced into the Public Works Department many years ago. Prior to the election of 1900, one of the ministers then in office sent out a private circular addressed to the Reform candidates all over Canada. I have a copy of that circular in my hands but shall not read it as it has been put on ' Hansard ' in former discussions. The first question it contains is this : Does your constituency require any public works? If so, would you recommend that it be done by public competition or day labour? Thus inviting the Reform candidates all over Canada to take this circular into the election and tell the voters to say whether they required a public work, and also whether that work should be put up to public competition or be done by day labour. That circular, signed by a cabinet minister, was sent out to the Reform candidates all over Canada. No doubt many hon. gentlemen behind the Minister of Public Works received that circular.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was a long time ago.

Mr. BLAIN. It was just prior to the election of 1900. I read it at the time in the presence of hon. gentlemen opposite, and not one dared rise in his place and contradict me. Therefore, if there is flagrant partisanship in the Public Works Department—

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which there is not.

Mr. BLAIN. It was introduced into the department by this government. Talk about partisanship, why up in Wellington, when the government were selecting a site for a public building, an advertisement was put in the papers calling all the Reformers of the village together for the purpose of selecting a site.

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). I deny that.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman deny that there appeared in a newspaper in that village—

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). What newspaper?

Mr. BLAIN. I will give the name. Does he deny that there was an advertisement calling the Reformers together in order to decide what site should be selected for a public building?

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). I utterly deny that statement. There never was such a thing done in North Wellington.

Mr. BLAIN. When the hon. gentleman was in his seat the other day it was stated in answer to that charge: ' Oh, but the government did not select the site which the Reformers named.'

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). I never said a word about it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is barking up the wrong tree.

Mr. BLAIN. No, there is no tree I could bark up in which my hon. friend would not be found in connection with such matters.

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). What paper do you refer to?

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman knows that this was a case which occurred in Wellington county. Did it happen to be in the county of South Wellington?

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). I represent the north riding.

Mr. BLAIN. Did it happen in the other riding?

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). I cannot tell you.

Mr. BLAIN. I made the statement the other night and it may be that the public building was in the other riding of Wellington, but the statement is all right.

Mr. MARTIN (Wellington). It is not all right. You connected my name with it as the representative of North Wellington, and I certainly deny it and you ought to apologize.

Mr. BLAIN. If I am incorrect as regards the riding my hon. friend represents, I still make the statement that an advertisement such as I have described was published in a newspaper in that county, and that may have been in the south riding.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend does not suggest that the Public Works Department had anything to do with any public meeting either in South or North Wellington.

Mr. BLAIN. The Public Works Department had to do with the circular to which I referred in the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all—not the slightest thing to do with the circular.

Mr. BLAIN. Why, the document was signed by the acting Minister of Public Works, who was a member of the government at the time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has just been referring to a public meeting of the Liberal electors in the riding of South Wellington, and I understood him to say that the Public Works Department was responsible for that. The department had nothing to do with it.

Mr. BLAIN. I was not saying anything of the kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what I was referring to.

Mr. BLAIN. I was pointing out that at the very root of this partisanship was this circular to which I have alluded and which no minister of the Crown has ever cared to deny.

Seaforth public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lot has been purchased and the building is to be used for post office and customs purposes, also for armoury accommodation for a company of the 33rd Huron regiment. It is expected to cost about $20,000 without the site. The postal revenue is $6,050, customs duties $14,615, money orders issued $25,610, money orders paid $31,359. Nine years ago Seaforth had a population of 2,300.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). When was the first vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 1908-9.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Has the work started?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans are being prepared, and the lots have been purchased. We paid to one gentleman $1,300, and to the other $2,700. The two lots cost $4,000. The land is quite large. The frontage is 91 feet, and the depth 132 feet.

Mr. BLAIN. In what riding is this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. South Huron. Seaforth is a good town. Its postal revenue is about $6,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Was the old building burned down?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no building there now.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who selected this site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An expert of the department.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the expert send in a report?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister that report here?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not here.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total cost for this Seaforth building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will cost $20,000 exclusive of the land.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the fittings? And what will be the total cost of the building ready to occupy?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect informs me that the fittings will bring the cost up to something like $25,000—not exceeding that.

Sudbury public building, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in the constituency of my genial friend from Nipissing (Mr. Gordon). He will agree with me that Sudbury is an important town and well entitled to this public building.

Mr. MEIGHEN. This was in the estimates prior to 1908?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Have the plans been prepared?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are not yet ready.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Is it the intention to commence building this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the present intention.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). The building now in use there is far from being large enough. I hope work on the new building will be started soon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I assure my hon. friend we expect to start this year.

Mr. BLAIN. When was the estimate for this building first put in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1907-8.

Mr. MEIGHEN. And the minister states it is the intention to spend the money this year. I presume that the necessary corollary is that there is to be an election next year?

Tilbury public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lot for this has been bought. Tilbury and Tilbury east together had a population in 1901 of 4,200.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is this a new vote, or is it one of the election votes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Leave out the alternative and I will answer. We calculate to get this building for about $15,000.

Mr. BLAIN. In what constituency is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In West Kent.

Mr. CROTHERS. No, in South Essex.

Mr. PUGSLEY. However, it is needed in whatever constituency it is. We have a fine lot with 108 feet frontage, and a depth of 99 feet.

Mr. LANCASTER. What did the site cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It cost $1,975.

Tillsonburg public building, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tillsonburg is in South Oxford. The postal revenue last year was $7,500; customs revenue $25,000; money orders issued $26,000 ; money orders paid $23,000. Hon. members will see that it is an important place. The population, in 1908, according to Lovell's 'Gazetteer' was 3,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the building to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to cost $25,000 in addition to the site.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are you renting there now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. At what rental?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the post office, $375 ; for customs house, $160.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). When was the first vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1907-8.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Is it the intention of the minister to bring down a supplementary estimate for a public building at Sturgeon Falls. He is aware that two years ago a lot was purchased there for that purpose. And less than a year ago the post office there was burned down. At present, the postal business is being carried on in a building which probably did not cost more than $300. It is simply a disgrace to allow the post office to be carried on any longer in such a building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give an assurance that an amount will be put in the estimates this year for the purpose referred to. Of course, that is a matter I cannot speak of until the estimates are brought down. But the outlook for Sturgeon Falls is not sufficiently good just now to warrant us in undertaking the expenditure for a public building.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. minister mean the political outlook?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The sulphite mill there has not been running since 1906, and I believe that the mill and the timber limits are now in the courts, and are about being sold, if they have not been sold already. Until prospects improve, we should hardly be justified in the expenditure for such a building as we contemplated at Sturgeon Falls. However, the matter is under consideration, and I cannot say at present what will be done in regard to the estimates of this year.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). The mills the Minister of Public Works has referred to will be sold in April, and after that the business will be much larger than it is at present. If something is not put in the estimates now and a building started within a short time, matters will go from bad to worse. Even now it is simply a disgrace to allow any government business to be done in such a building as we have there. The revenue at present is $3,611; postal orders issued, $22,300 last year. In view of the fact that in other places with seven or eight hundred population and a revenue about the same, buildings worth $15,000 or $20,000 are being erected, I think I have a right to complain. Unlike some other members here, I realize that we who are

in opposition cannot expect much in the way of getting public buildings. I would have no complaint to make if these buildings which are being put up in towns represented by supporters of the government were put up in places where the revenue justified the expenditure. But when they are being put up in these little obscure places where there is very little revenue, I think we have some reasonable cause for complaint. In this instance particularly, I think the Postmaster General would be justified in seeing that something was done forthwith. I hope he will take the matter up. Now, I am not asking for any other building in the constituency I represent, although I may mention that so far as the revenue is concerned, we could present strong claims. Take for instance, Cobalt. Last year the revenue was $25,756; postal orders issued, $486,000, Cobalt ranking with many of the lesser cities of the Dominion. Yet the business there is being carried on in a very poor building not at all fit for the business. I believe something should be done immediately to relieve the situation in these two places particularly. I may say that I am prepared to give the Minister of Public Works all due credit for everything that he does.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure the hon. gentleman will feel that I am endeavouring as far as I can to treat the important constituency which he represents with justice. We are spending a good deal of money in that constituency. We are providing a wharf at Haileybury and another at New Liskeard, we are dredging the river and Lake Temiskaming, we are building a dam at Latchford for the purpose of improving navigation, we have provided for the interprovincial bridge over the North Temiskaming, and we are providing now for a public building at Sudbury. I regret that I do not see my way clear to put in an item for a building at Sturgeon Falls. I do not want to discourage my hon. friend, or his constituency, but the paper mill there has not been operated by the receiver, and business has greatly fallen off. The postal revenue there has decreased a good deal. It is $600 less than it was four years ago, the customs duties are only about one-fourth what they were four years ago. Money orders paid have increased, but money orders issued are $11,000 less than they were four years ago. However, I hope these industries will be started again, and I can assure my hon. friend that the claims of Sturgeon Falls will have my careful consideration.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). What about Cobalt ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The difficulty we found at Cobalt was to buy a lot. The prices were away up beyond what we thought was reasonable. I think it has been arranged to rent temporarily suitable accommodation at Cobalt. I hope before long to be able to visit Cobalt, with my hon. friend the Postmaster General, when the matter of a new post office will have our best consideration.

Uxbridge public building, $15,000.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). This is a very deserving expenditure. Would the minister inform the House who recommended the purchase of the lot ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Uxbridge stands in the same category as most of the buildings in the smaller towns. The population in 1901 was 1,657. The postal revenue is $4,111; money orders issued, $27,068; money orders paid, $17,854. We have purchased a lot, and propse erecting a building to cost $15,000, exclusive of the site and exclusive of armoury accommodation. My hon. friend asks on whose recommendation the site was bought. In the first place, a strong recommendation was made in the shape of a letter from Mr. Grant, the then member of parliament, and from Mr. Alexander Graham.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister read that letter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the substance of it: The erection of a public building at Uxbridge was recommended by G. D. Grant, Esq., and Alexander Graham, Esq., December 31, 1907. Their letter gives the population of the town, its industries, speaks of it as being the centre of an excellent agricultural country, drawing its trade from a large section, gives the postal revenue, and presents very strong reasons for the erection of a public building. With regard to the site, I sent an expert from the department who recommended the site which was chosen, and which seemed to meet with general approval at the time.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Did any public bodies, such as the council or board of trade, pass resolutions favouring this site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no record of any.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Had there been any communications from any public bodies to the minister adverse to this site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there was one that, according to my information, has met with the favour of my hon. friend. I do not know whether my hon. friend promoted the action of the council or not, but I understand that the action of the council met with the approval of my hon. friend. The O'Neil site recommended by the council after we had made the pur-

chase of the other will cost $1,500 more, it is very uneven, being about 20 feet higher than the street level, and would necessitate heavy excavation and the erection of a retaining wall. The Hutchinson site which we had purchased before getting this resolution from the council only cost $1,200, and is an infinitely better site. It is on the opposite corner of the same street, and only 40 or 50 feet from the present post office, which situation it has occupied for a quarter of a century. It has a frontage of 60 feet against a frontage of 32 feet for the O'Neil property, and the town council—I hope I have been misinformed when I say that it has been represented that they were prompted by the hon. gentleman—have asked us to pay $2,700, or more than double the amount, for another property that has little more than half the frontage, and which, according to my information, is situated some 20 feet above the level of the street, a very uneven lot, and one which would be absolutely undesirable in so far as the public interest is concerned.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I desire to inform the House and the minister that in so far as I am personally concerned I have not expressed any opinion or indicated any preference with regard to this matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad of it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I was not instrumental in securing the council's action in passing a resolution in favour of that particular site ; in fact, I very discreetly kept out of the dispute. The O'Neil lot which is recommended by the town council is central. It is one that could have been purchased infinitely cheaper than the price which the minister mentioned. But the chief Liberal worker in Uxbridge went to Mr. O'Neil and told him to keep up a good, stiff price, that the government were going to purchase it, or secure an option, and that no doubt he would secure his price. He stiffened up his price, but the other man sold his lot simply because a few Liberals living in the vicinity were supporting that lot which is situated at their end of the town. I understand that the Minister of Public Works has received a resolution from the town council advocating the purchase of the central lot, which would admittedly serve the municipality much more advantageously than the lot at the other end of the town.

Mr. PUGSLEY. By no means admittedly because the lot we bought is right opposite the present post office which is in the central part of the town.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Because the central post office has been situated in one end of the town for a generation is no reason why the new post office which will last several generations should be situated in one end of the town. There is no reason why because it has been in an inconvenient place to a great many citizens who go to the post office it should be located in the same end of the town, and still continue to be an inconvenience. The following resolution was sent to the Minister of Public Works :

To the Hon. Wm. Pugsley, M.P.,
Minister of Public Works, Ottawa.

Whereas the government has decided to erect a post office in the town of Uxbridge.

And whereas the government has purchased the Hutchinson site, which is situated in the west end.

And whereas two-thirds of the population of the said town of Uxbridge reside east of the said Hutchinson site.

And whereas the O'Neil site, which is more centrally located, can be purchased at a reasonable price for the erection of a post office.

And whereas the public library and market buildings are situated on opposite corners to the O'Neil site.

Therefore, the municipal council of the corporation of the town of Uxbridge do strongly recommend the honourable Minister of Public Works to purchase the O'Neil site, believing that the erection of a post office on the said O'Neil site would be in the interest of the great majority of the residents of the said corporation.

Dated at Uxbridge the 26th day of November, 1910.

(Sgd.) W. R. BEAL,
Mayor.
W. H. CROSBY,
Clerk.

I would suggest that the Minister of Public Works should in future communicate with public bodies representing the municipalities and not with his own private supporters in these various towns. I think he would find that it would work far more satisfactorily, would serve the public much better, and that he would secure better advice. It would not be partisan, biased advice, but the advice of the municipality as represented in the municipal council. I would like to ask if it is the purpose of the minister to erect an adjoining armoury in connection with the post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is intended to provide armoury accommodation.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The options were obtained some time in 1908.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was voted in the session of 1907-8.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Will the minister kindly tell us the reason of the delay? This is 1911. The people are clamouring for the accommodation and it is very badly needed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were several reasons, and not the least was the delay

caused by the inquiry which had to be made about the sites in consequence of the action of the council in urging us to secure a different site. That caused a very considerable delay. Then, there was the delay of a year which took place in common with almost all of the other public buildings owing to the decline of the revenues when it had to stand over. Outside of this I do not know that there has been any undue delay, certainly not more than has been caused in connection with many other buildings. I may repeat what I have already said that we have a great many public buildings for which parliament has made appropriations and the chief architect is working upon the plans one after another as his staff is able to follow up the work.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The resolution passed by council is dated November, 1910, so that there was a delay of two years in the erection of this building before the council took action at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the hon. gentleman approved and made representations in parliament in regard to the unsuitability of the site.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I did not object to the site at all; I was simply urging the erection of a building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that the hon. gentleman made representations with regard to the site as well.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Are the plans prepared?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans have been prepared and now are in the Post Office Department for approval.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Will the work be done by contract or day labour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By public tender and contract. All public buildings are done by public tender and contract.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). When may we expect the advertisement to appear?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell until we get the plans back from the Post Office Department.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). In the course of a month or two?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the course of a couple of months or so; I cannot tell exactly.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Not longer than two or three months?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not like to say because I do not exactly know.

Wallaceburg public building, $15,000.

Mr. BLAIN. We want a little information about this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the purpose of erecting a public building in Wallaceburg. We have purchased a good site at the corner of Nelson and James streets 60 x 90. The postal revenue is $6,603, customs revenue $235,410, money orders issued $18,038, money orders paid $16,124, imports $1,279,308. We propose that this building shall be for post office and customs purposes. We have bought the site for $3,000.

Mr. BLAIN. On whose recommendation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This has been urged by Mr. Gordon.

Mr. BLAIN. What constituency?

Mr. PUGSLEY. East Kent. Wallaceburg is a very important and growing town.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the cost of the building complete and ready to occupy?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $20,000 estimated, outside of the land.

Waterloo public building, $41,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Waterloo is a very important place. We have a contract already let for the erection of the building. We have bought the land for $5,000; we have let the contract for $36,975, fittings, lock boxes, &c., $5,000; sidewalks, &c., $1,000; contingencies and superintendence, $2,669; total probable cost, inclusive of the site, heating apparatus, wiring, fittings, furnishing, &c., $51,072.69. The building is for post office, custom house and accommodation of G Company, Waterloo regiment. Postal revenue last year, $11,423; mail orders issued, $17,922; mail orders paid, $66,414. In revenue, $509,941; estimated customs revenue, $60,666. It is in the constituency of Waterloo North.

Mr. BLAIN. The constituency of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. MEIGHEN. When were the plans approved by the departments concerned?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Contract entered into on 3rd October. This was voted in 1907 and 1908.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Just before the election. When were the plans approved by the departments concerned?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In June or July.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is the minister sure of that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what the deputy minister tells me, to the best of his recollection.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Then there is no necessity for waiting longer to let the contract than three or four months after the approval of the plans.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the ordinary course I would think not.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What would be the extraordinary course that would entail longer delay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If there were a considerable number of plans approved at the one time the specifications would have to be printed and take their turn at the Printing Bureau, and then the working plans have to be prepared after the approval. How long it will take depends on the quantity of work on hand; my hon. friend can see that.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I can see that. If that is the outside time required in one constituency it should be the outside time required in another.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not necessarily.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I suppose the preparing of the specifications is done in order of the approval of the plans.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That does not follow.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Why should you change the order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect is allowed to use his judgment as to that.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the minister think it not dangerous to leave that to the chief architect? Surely the minister is responsible for seeing that justice is done in the several constituencies.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend would not expect me to look after these details.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I have a strong suspicion that the minister does look into them carefully. Does he state that there is absolutely no interference from himself after the plans are approved.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not like to say that, because sometimes if there is a strong complaint made to me as to the delay I may send a memo or telephone the chief architect asking for the cause, and he gives me what I always thought was a reasonable explanation of the delay. To that extent I do interfere. He might think that I thought it desirable to proceed with that particular building and probably he would look into it. I cannot recall any particular case in which it has hurried him up, but that is what I sometimes do.

Mr. MEIGHEN. So that the member for the constituency can do nothing once the plans are approved.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I remember in the case of the Portage la Prairie building, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen), wrote me about it, and I sent a memo at once to the chief architect asking what caused the delay, and I was informed the plans had been sent to the Militia Department for approval. I followed that up in order to see what was the delay there. I can assure my hon. friend that I gave no instructions which would cause or justify any delay. I made the usual inquiries with regard to the building at Portage la Prairie that I do in respect to those in constituencies represented by our friends.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Have the working plans and specifications been prepared in that case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have not been fully prepared, but are pretty nearly prepared.

Wiarton public building, $10,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Where is Wiarton?

Mr. PUGSLEY. North Bruce. I had the pleasure of visiting Wiarton last summer and I was very much impressed with the necessity of a public building there. Wiarton is situated upon the lake and they have a little bit of a building, which is totally inadequate for the accommodation of the people. We had a splendid public gathering and I looked at the Mayor's office, which was no better than the post office, and I told him that if he would undertake to erect a new building which would be a credit to the street, I would consider the question of a post-office.

Mr. BLAIN. Did you go any further than that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is all.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is the minister sure he spoke to the mayor, because there is no mayor. This is a village with a reeve.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, yes, there is a mayor, and a fine looking mayor too.

Mr. LANCASTER. He is a fine looking man, but he is not a mayor, unless the village became a town last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not yet purchased the site, but we propose putting up a building at a reasonable cost of perhaps $15,000 or $20,000. Wiarton has an excellent harbour, which is being improved, and it is not only a good town at present, but it has an excellent future.

Mr. BLAIN. Who urged this public building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Tolmie.

Mr. RHODES. It would be interesting to know if his worship the mayor has kept his part of the bargain?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is quite certain he would.

Mr. BLAIN. There was a sugar refinery there a few years ago that was closed up. That seems to be an objection in the Sturgeon Falls item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has not affected this town because the revenue here shows an increase.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend was up there in the summer and rather suggested he might do something for them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was very much impressed with the necessity of doing something.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any correspondence about the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet, I thought there would be no difficulty in getting a site at a moderate price.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). What is the population?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nine years ago it was 2,423.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I thought the minister intended to keep the cost of buildings in such towns below $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is larger than usual. I was speaking rather of places under 2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the mayor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. German, a very excellent man indeed; he is a Conservative.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is why you were so much impressed by him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was impressed, there is no question about that. I think Mr. Tolmie, the hon. member for the constituency was able to point out the advantages of the town.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is it the minister's intention to put the officers at work on this plan and start this building before other buildings for which votes have been standing for two or three years are commenced?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no present intention of doing so.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is it the rule of the department to have the buildings taken in turn?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not an inflexible rule.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). In fact a very flexible rule. In the county of Ontario there are two votes: one in Whitby, which was taken in the fall of 1908 when the elections were on, and one in my town of Uxbridge. To-day, South Ontario being represented by a Liberal, the Whitby building is completed, but for the Uxbridge building the working plans have not been commenced. That is not a fair way to treat the members of the House. The minister has put a vote in the estimates this year for a public building in Port Perry. Will he allow the Port Perry building to be erected before the Uxbridge building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The intention to provide a public building in Port Perry will not prevent the building at Uxbridge going on with reasonable speed.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Will you proceed with the Port Perry building before the Uxbridge building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no present intention of doing so.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Would that not be a great hardship on the Uxbridge people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would depend on the circumstances.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Monday being private members' day I suppose will be entirely taken up by private members?

Mr. FIELDING. As usual, yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 30, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RECIPROCITY—DUTIES ON PULP AND PAPER.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I would like an explanation from the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), or the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) in regard to a very important question of construction of the tariff arrangement recently made. The construction put upon it in some quarters seems to be quite different from that conveyed to this House. In the New York 'Herald' of Saturday last appears a despatch from Washington, from which I read a few sentences in order to explain what I desire to know:—

The American Newspaper Publishers' Association insists that paper and wood pulp will be free as soon as the agreement becomes law. The official announcement issued by the State Department yesterday said regarding this matter: 'Printing paper is to

become free on the removal of all restrictions of the exportation of pulpwood.'

This would mean that unless the restrictions in the way of the provincial charge were removed paper would continue to come in at the Payne rate of $3.75 a ton, plus $2 a ton countervailing duty.

The agreement made by Mr. Knox and Messrs. Fielding and Paterson makes paper, paper board and pulp free with a provision which, stripped of all verbiage, says free paper and pulp provided no export tax of any form or device should be imposed by Canada on paper or wood pulp or the wood used in the manufacture of 'such paper.'

It is felt here that if this means wood used in the manufacture of 'such paper' for export it does mean free paper, because no tax is imposed by any of the Canadian provinces on pulp wood cut from Crown lands which enters into the manufacture of paper made in Canada, whether for home consumption or for exportation to the United States. Should this be true, then the real issue has been waived and the purpose attained by the use of an ambiguous expression deliberately framed.

There is the statement, in effect, that a proposition deliberately framed—and with the implication to deceive—will allow free paper under the agreement. I would like to hear from the Minister of Customs an interpretation of that clause of the agreement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is not here. I have only to say that the agreement is exactly as set forth in the correspondence between the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs and Mr. Knox, and already laid on the table of the House.

PRIVILEGE—MR. KNOWLES.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw). I wish to make reference to a few lines in an article in the press. I refer to the 'News,' a paper published in my own city—

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) wish to put a question?

Mr. KNOWLES. I wish to speak to a question of privilege—is it not in order?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) did not say what he was going to do, and I wished to know.

Mr. KNOWLES. I quote a few lines from this newspaper, the 'Morning News,' of Moosejaw, dated 27th inst.:—

For four years a Liberal member, Knowles of Moosejaw, has set himself down for practically the same resolution, but never proceeded further than having it printed again and again in the programme.

And the closing paragraph contains these words:—

That Mr. Knowles had used his annual low tariff resolution as a means for blocking the real discussion of the matter in the House of Commons is now pretty well known.

I would not take up even the minute or two of the time of the House I wish to occupy were it not that I find that it seems to be taken for granted in this House, and even more so outside the House, that I had such a motion and that such a motion was used for the purpose of blocking the discussion with regard to the matter of lowering the tariff duties. I find that such papers as the Montreal 'Gazette,' the Ottawa 'Citizen,' the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' the Toronto 'News,' and even the Toronto 'Globe,' which is supposed to be an organ friendly to Liberal members, take more or less this view of it. This motion of mine was on the Order Paper for two sessions. It was first placed on the Order Paper on the 15th of February, 1909. Newspapers, or persons, who say that this notice of motion has been before the House for four years are absolutely in error. As the date when it was first given notice of was comparatively near the close of the session, the last private members' day being the last Monday in March, the motion was never called during that session. So that, for the purpose of criticism, there is eliminated entirely the session before last, because my motion was never reached that session, and there remains for me to account to the public, to my constituents and to hon. members of this House, only that notice on the Order Paper last session. It was placed by me on the Order Paper with the full intention of bringing it before the House. Even taking the very worst view of the matter, that worst view would be that I had the notice upon the Order Paper for one session, and it was not gone on with. That is by no means unusual. I dare to make the statement that every session dozens of motions go by the board on the taking away of the last day for the discussion of private members' business in the same way as my motion was taken away last session.

With regard to this motion, I had intended to proceed with it. I was asked by different hon. members on the other side who wished to be advised as to the day when I intended to proceed with the motion. I told them of a certain day when I had made up my mind to proceed. I recall having told my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) of the date and also my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner). Upon my telling the hon. member for Souris, as he had asked me as a matter of courtesy when I intended to bring on the discussion, he, for the first time, informed me that he understood an arrangement had been made between the chief whip of the other side, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), and the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that a motion of the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) in connec-

tion with the Georgian Bay canal should be taken up. I went to see the hon. member for North Renfrew, and he said he had been informed by his chief whip that it was so. Though my motion had priority, yet, as a matter of courtesy—as, I think, the hon. member will bear me out in saying—I decided to defer bringing on my motion. It turned out that this was the last private members' day. Of this, so far as I know, notice had not been given, and I was not aware of it. Had I been aware of it, I would have hesitated to give up the place of priority which I held. The hon. member for North Renfrew took the day and afterwards the House resolved that no more motions from private members should be heard that session. Therefore, I wish to say this motion never was used to block discussion. During the first session, when it was on the Order Paper, I could not discuss it, even though I wished to do so, because it was never called, and last session, after I had decided to proceed with it on a certain day, it was because of my desire to show courtesy to an hon. gentleman on the other side that the matter was not brought up for discussion on that day.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Since the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has referred to me, I think it is but right that I should make a statement to the House. Last session I well remember that when I had a motion on the Order Paper, I spoke to the hon. member, who had a motion in precedence of mine, and he was good enough at that time to give way to me. The facts as stated by him with reference to me are perfectly correct.

SPRINGHILL STRIKE.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). I desire to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) as to the present position of the strike at Springhill, N.S., which was commenced, I think, in 1909. And may I ask him, also, if any of the Canadian militia are in attendance to keep order there?

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). I understand that at the present time about 600 men are employed in Springhill. The men who went out on strike about a year and a half ago are still out—or a large number of them are; some of them have left for other places. I am not aware as to there being any Canadian militia at Springhill at the present time, though I could not speak definitely on that point.

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend answer that at some other time?

Mr. KING. Yes, I will find out.

RECIPROCITY ANNOUNCEMENT AND THE PRESS.

Mr. RHODES. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to put a question to the government based upon an editorial which I see in the Manitoba 'Free Press,' of Saturday, January 28, which paper is I believe the government organ in the province of Manitoba. It reads as follows:

SHABBY TREATMENT.

The Minister of Finance in connection with his announcement of the tariff arrangement with the United States, treated the newspapers and the public very shabbily in failing to see to it that the moment he rose in his place in the House at Ottawa to make his statement, there were furnished to the representatives of the newspapers of Canada in the press gallery copies of the new schedules, and a summary resumé of the whole arrangement.

In making his statement, the minister was speaking not only to the House, but to the country. In listening to that important statement, the men in the press gallery were the representatives of the people of Canada—decidedly more so, in that special sense, than the members of the House. The people of the whole Dominion were keenly expectant in regard to that statement. At Washington the government was guilty of no such failure to discharge the duty, it in like manner owed to the eagerly waiting public of the United States.

At the time agreed upon between the two governments for the announcement of the tariff arrangement, the new schedules were handed to the press correspondents at the capital of the United States, together with a comprehensive summary, containing about a thousand words setting forth the substance and meaning of the arrangement. The afternoon papers throughout the United States were thus able to lay before the public the main facts in regard to the tariff arrangement, its scope, and its bearings. It was from Washington that the first comprehensive news of the tariff arrangement came to Canadian papers, hours before a word of information came from Ottawa.

At Ottawa it was not until after Mr. Fielding had come to the end of his speech, about six o'clock, that there was furnished to the press correspondents one copy of the undigested schedules—a great mass of figures, requiring to be studied carefully, before it could be dealt with. There was no summary available, such as at Washington was furnished before four o'clock in the afternoon to the press correspondents.

I would like to ask if the grievance complained of in this editorial is justified, and if so, why it was that the newspaper press of Canada had to get its first information from Washington. I would ask also if that was the practice followed one year ago when the Minister of Finance was at Washington?

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend wants us to follow the American method we will

have to adopt the American constitution. The methods of procedure in regard to these matters are so different in the United States from those which have been established in Canada that it is rather difficult to make comparisons. Answering the latter part of my hon. friend's question first; a year ago, at the last session of the House when a certain arrangement was made at Washington, the understanding was that this should be made public at or after a certain hour. Our American friends have a practice of issuing these things in advance under seal, to be released at a given hour. That did not form the subject of any discussion then, but what happened was that when, soon after three o'clock, I rose in the House to present the result of the negotiations, at that very hour there was I believe in the telegraph offices in Ottawa a full report of the whole matter, having been kept, as they say, under seal from Washington, and having been given out in advance according to the American method. In the present instance, it was distinctly understood that no communication should be made of the agreement itself, or of any part thereof, until after four o'clock in the afternoon. Now the American method is that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State of the United States, having no seats in the Congressional bodies, either in the Senate or House of Representatives, their method is to send a message to these bodies, and the moment the message is delivered, it is available to the public. Our method of dealing with such things is different. The practice is that in all matters of tariff changes the House of Commons is first informed; therefore, I did not feel at liberty to give out the details of this arrangement until I had informed the House of Commons thereof, and this necessarily occupied a little time. It is the different method of procedure in the two countries that accounts for the delay my hon. friend has complained of.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman says. But if, when he were at the finish of his speech he had had several copies, or a summary of the agreement, to hand to the press, it would have been a great convenience, and would have helped the newspaper men in making up their report that evening, instead of having to depend upon the only one copy that was given out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I cannot understand how the Canadian constitution, or the British constitution, or anything else that we value, would have been greatly violated if the Minister of Finance had handed out these schedules when he began his speech. We on this side of the House would very much have appreciated a copy at the commencement of his speech instead of at the end of it, and I think it would have been perhaps no more than ordinary courtesy to have given it to us then instead of at the conclusion of his speech. He will realize, as every hon. gentleman will realize, that it is very difficult to pick out the substance of comprehensive proposals such as these were, only having them under one's hand just as he rises to speak. The same is true of the men in the press gallery. When the Minister of Finance was about to announce the proposals, and had actually stood upon his feet, then it seems to me some summary of these schedules, or something of that kind, could have been given out without violating any principle of the constitution; and it would have been a great convenience, and would have saved a great amount of labour, not only to the men in the press gallery but to others.

Mr. FOSTER. Besides that, it doesn't seem to me that any rule or practice would have been violated. Do I understand the Minister of Finance to say that these schedules which he laid on the table giving the duties for certain articles, are to-day in effect, and that entries are being made on them?

Mr. FIELDING. Nothing of the sort.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no reason in the world for this secrecy, except in a case where you are bringing down tariff duties where the very moment the Finance Minister lays these changes on the table of the House they become actually operative, and duties are paid in accordance therewith. No duties are paid in accordance with these schedules, and no practice or any rule of this House, so long as I have known anything about it, would have been violated if, forty hours before the Finance Minister got up to speak, he had given those schedules to the members of parliament, and to the members of the press. There was nothing binding upon him except, as I understand it, his pact with the administration of the United States, and that would have been satisfied if, at the time he rose this information had been put into the hands of the House, and the public. What I mean to protest against is that the Finance Minister tries to shelter himself behind a rule or practice of this House regarding tariff changes going into effect instantly, and that therefore, there must be no knowledge given of them until they have been announced in the House. These did not fall under the category, they were simply possible things that may come into operation, and may not; and if they do come into operation, it will not be at the present time, but upon proclamation and certain things being previously done by the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry that our method of procedure in this matter has

not met with the favour of our hon. friends opposite. But I cannot see that there is any ground for complaint. It is a fact that in the United States the moment a document dealing with a matter of this kind is delivered to congress it becomes accessible to the public. Our method is different. Whenever anything of that nature is to be propounded it is explained in the House of Commons first by the Minister of Finance, and until he has done that, the document is not delivered to anybody. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition suggests that it would have been courteous if he had been furnished with a copy in advance. I cannot agree with him at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I say when the minister began his statement.

Mr. FIELDING. That was in advance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not call that in advance.

Mr. FIELDING. I would call that in advance of every other member in the House. In this case I sent my hon. friend in advance of all others a copy of the documents because I did not want him to have to wait until they were printed, and to that extent the usual courtesy was extended. I do not think it is the practice to give even to the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition advance copies of these documents before the House is made familiar with them. I can understand the natural grievance of the press and that they were very anxious to get the information. I do not blame them for that; I can appreciate that, because I was long enough in journalism to know all about it, but I really cannot see that there is any grievance. My hon. friend from Toronto says that there should have been several copies. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there were several copies of nearly every document—

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Does the hon. Minister of Finance say that there were several copies of the schedule available?

Mr. FIELDING. There were several copies of every document that I brought down. There may not have been enough to give one to each member of the press, but these were our busy days, and we could not prepare a large number of copies for distribution. Although I am not as communicative sometimes as the gentlemen of the press would like me to be, I think they cannot dispute the fact that whenever there is any information that I can give to them in the way of printed or any other documents I am always willing to oblige them. I think that really in the time at our disposal every effort was made to satisfy the gentlemen of the press, and I do not think that there is any general complaint from them in that regard.

RECIPROCITY—INQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to renew a request that I made in the absence of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Perhaps the Finance Minister has been made acquainted with it. It is that just as soon as possible the statistics of trade bearing upon the arrangement which the Finance Minister laid before the House on Thursday should be put into the possession of members of the House. That statement would include not only the trade between ourselves and the United States, but also a list of any articles of common trade between us and the countries with whom we do that common trade; that is, Great Britain, the most favoured nation treaty nations and the overseas dominions. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, of course, has that all made up, because he gave the result of it, and he could not have done so if the information had not been available. It is well that we should have that before the House goes on with the discussion of the subject.

Mr. FIELDING. I shall endeavour, as far as possible, to comply with the hon gentleman's request.

RECIPROCITY—DUTIES ON PULP AND PAPER.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Now that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is in his place, I would like to press for an answer to the question that I put before he came in. The New York Publishers' Association say, in a report issued from Washington, that the arrangement, as it now stands, will be interpreted to mean the admission of free paper in the United States. I would like to ask if that is the minister's view of it?

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid we will have to leave to our American friends the interpretation of their own item. What we are clear about is the interpretation on our own side. They make a condition respecting the terms upon which they will admit free paper. There may be some room for dispute as to their own interpretation of this condition; we must leave that to them. But on our side of the line we have a clear and distinct understanding that until they admit paper of the kind specified from all parts of Canada we will not give them the reciprocal advantage of free paper in Canada.

ADDITIONAL LETTER CARRIERS FOR MONTREAL.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN (St. Mary, Montreal). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker,

before the orders of the day are taken I wish to inquire from the Postmaster General, if he cannot see his way clear to give an additional number of letter carriers for the city of Montreal. For a long time I have had occasion to observe that the letter carriers are overloaded with postal matters of all description. Even this morning, in going down town, I met at least a dozen letter carriers getting out of the street cars, on their way to the streets where the distribution is to be done. They had to carry on one arm such a load of newspapers and other postal matters, that they could not see in front of themselves, and besides, they had to carry a mail bag for letters in their other hand. If, under such conditions, it happens that a letter is lost, no blame can attach to the letter carriers. I hope that before long an additional number of letter carriers will be appointed for the city of Montreal.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). (Translation.) In answer to my hon. friend I may say that I will get information as to these facts from the post office secretary, at Montreal, and if there is any necessity to put on a greater number of letter carriers, I shall make my hon. friend aware of it.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—HALIFAX TERMINALS.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), in my absence the other day, made an inquiry of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) concerning dock accommodation at Halifax. The situation is this: Some few months ago the Board of Management of the Intercolonial railway visited Halifax and decided that some improvements in the way of additional accommodation should be made there. The department authorized the engagement of Mr. Kennedy, of Montreal, who is an expert in harbour matters to go to Halifax, make an investigation and report as to what was needed. His report has not come in yet and it is too late to do anything this season. In the meantime some temporary arrangements were made to handle the traffic as well as possible this year. We hope in a few days to receive Mr. Kennedy's report and to take into consideration the much needed improvements with regard to wharf accommodation at Halifax during the coming year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to press upon the minister somewhat strongly the feeling of the board of trade and citizens generally that there will be more or less congestion in Halifax this year on account of the very marked increase of shipping business that is expected.

Mr. MARTIN (Montreal). I know nothing of this matter personally.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there is some reason for that belief.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know nothing of it personally but an increase in the business is very confidently expected this year and there will be a great congestion of traffic. I would like to suggest that whatever temporary arrangements are to be made should be made as promptly and effectively as possible.

Mr. GRAHAM. The work, I think has been completed; whatever it is, I am not in a position to say.

BRITISH FLAG ON GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. THOBURN. I would like to bring the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to an item that I read in the Almonte 'Gazette' copied from the Brockville 'Recorder' and which is as follows:

> An order was received at the post office today from the Public Works Department at Ottawa saying that the Union Jack must be hoisted over the post office every day in the week from sunrise and remain in that position until sunset. The order is general throughout the Dominion.

I wish to say to the minister that I am not referring to this matter from any desire to find fault, but the very reverse, for if I had my way I would like to see the Union Jack fly over every public building in the Dominion of Canada. The only reason I refer to it is to know from the Minister of Public Works if the statement is correct and if it is to be general. If so I hope it will be thoroughly enforced, for up to the present time I have not seen the Union Jack flying over the post office in Almonte except on public holidays.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Thoburn) that the matter has been under consideration, but no such general order has been given as is stated in the paper. I will make further inquiry and see what foundation there is for the statement contained in the paper, but I feel quite sure that the order is not so general in its character as has been intimated there.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there any flag other than the British flag ordered to be flown on public buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, none but the British and Canadian flags.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECURITY TRUSTS CORPORATION.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Security Trust Corporation.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

On section 5,

5. The company shall not commence business until at least one hundred thousand dollars of stock have been subscribed and thirty-five thousand dollars paid thereon in cash into the funds of the company to be appropriated only for the purposes of the company under this Act.

Mr. FOSTER. It would not be a bad idea to insert the word 'bona fide' before the word 'subscribed' in this section. It cannot militate against the Bill, and it may serve a useful purpose.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I have no particular objection to that, but I do not see why it should be inserted in this Bill when it is not in any other similar Bill to my knowledge.

Mr. FOSTER. Certain recent developments show that the insertion of these words may serve a very useful purpose. I suppose the promoters of a company of this kind would have no other object in view than that it should be bona fide, and therefore there can be no objection. I would advocate the same for every like Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think it makes any difference whether the words are in or not; I have no objection to them.

Mr. NESBITT. If you insert the words 'bona fide' it will suggest that there is something wrong and I do not think there is any necessity for them any way.

Mr. FOSTER. These words serve a very useful purpose in the Bank Act, if proper care is taken.

Mr. NESBITT. I do not see that they serve any useful purpose in the Bank Act according to the hon. gentleman's own statement the other evening. If there are any subscriptions at all why should they not be bona fide?

Mr. FOSTER. Even although the Bank Act calls for bona fide subscriptions, the subscriptions in a certain case were not bona fide. If the words bona fide be inserted here, and if there should be any doubt, it makes it very easy for the minister to ask for adidtional proof.

Mr. SPROULE. What occurred in the Farmers' Bank was that the subscriptions were made by the notes of the subscribers which were discounted and these were called bona fide subscriptions, which, of course they were not.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There having been objection raised, then under rule 112 no important amendment can be proposed without notice.

Mr. SPROULE. It is admitted that the intention of the Bill is that the subscriptions should be bona fide, and I would ask you, Sir, do you rule that the insertion of words to better carry out the intention of the Act is an important amendment.

Mr. NESBITT. The insertion of the words is a superfluity. The minister has just as much right to inquire into the nature of the subscriptions if these words are not in as he has if they are in the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be all true, but if you insert these words it advertises to those who are getting up the concern and to those who are subscribing that there are not to be any fake subscriptions. The hon. member (Mr. Nesbitt) could have made the same argument before the Farmers' Bank got its incorporation, but there is not the slightest shadow of a doubt that in that case there were both fake subscriptions and fake payments on subscriptions, and if I mistake not the excuse for the action of the government was that they did not suppose it was necessary to go back of the usual form of subscription and the affidavit thereto. That incident ought at least, make this House not unwilling to insert words which cannot in any way be detrimental to the institution, which are undoubtedly significant in calling attention to the fact, and which would also afford a good standing ground for the minister to make inquiry.

Mr. LENNOX. It is important we should have these words inserted in the Bill even if only to call attention to the matter. Recent developments have shown that subscriptions are not always bona fide. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Nesbitt) complains that their insertion suggests a possible impropriety, but we have good reason to think that there have been improprieties and there may be improprieties again. It is quite common in legislation to use words of this character, and it is perfectly right and exceedingly important at this time, when we have had such startling evidence of attempts to get around the clear provision of the law, that parties in cases of this kind shall be given clearly to understand that the subscription must not be a sham or nominal one, but a bona fide subscription. This is so important that if objection is taken, I think the matter ought to stand over until the notice can be given of this necessary amendment. All along the line of our banking institutions it will be necessary for us to take stock of the situation exactly as it is to-day, and make very careful and important amendments to the legislation governing banking. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. FOSTER. I give notice, then, that when the Bill comes up again I will move that as an amendment.

Mr. FIELDING. If the chairman rules that it is an important amendment, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not wish to take too technical a view of the matter; but the mover of the Bill himself is entitled to notice of any amendment. The actual debate seems to lend force to the view that it is of some consequence, and for that reason I think my wisest course is to stand by the rule and to state that such an amendment should have one day's notice.

Mr. FIELDING. In that case, may I suggest that we be permitted to take up the other sections of the Bill, so that if it stands over it will stand only with reference to this one point.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I presume that as the mover of the Bill, I would be at liberty to waive any objection as to notice of the amendment. I do not consider the proposed amendment such as I would ask a day's notice of, because I am perfectly willing that the words 'bona fide' should be inserted; and, taking that position, I do not think it necessary that the Bill should stand over. It seems to me, however, that in the section the public is fully protected, for $200,000 of stock must be subscribed and $70,000 paid in cash, and that being the case, surely the subscriptions must be bona fide.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood that that was agreed to by the hon. gentleman who had the Bill in charge; but the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) seemed to have such a strong and vital objection, and his objection was urged with such force, that it brought the House up standing, and here we are.

Mr. LENNOX. I am willing to withdraw my motion in order that we may consider the other provisions of the Bill, after which I will renew the motion.

Mr. FOSTER. If the mover of the Bill thinks he can mollify his colleague from Oxford, we might put in the words 'bona fide' and go on.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I do not wish to take up the time of the committee. I am willing to let this section stand if any member of the committee wishes that to be done.

Mr. NESBITT. If the mover of the Bill does not object, I am sure I do not.

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

On section 6—directors.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the hon. gentleman's object in raising the number of directors to 21?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. MILLER. I may say that when this Bill was before the Banking and Commerce Committee, that question was raised, and it was pointed out that charters had been granted to other companies doing a similar business, and having 25 directors.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I have any knowledge of companies, a large directorate is not conducive to good business management. It is impossible to get the directors together.

Mr. MILLER. It was argued that it is a good thing for a company obtaining business to have a pretty fair representation on its directorate, and this company is to have power to do business in several provinces.

On section 6: resolutions may be signed by all directors without calling meeting.

Mr. FIELDING. This is one of the points to which attention was drawn when the Bill was brought before the House. I find that this provision has been inserted in several Bills, the argument for it being that which was so forcibly presented by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) the other night, that is to say that a memorandum signed by all the directors would be much more likely to represent the wish of the body, than a resolution passed by a board quorum at a formal meeting. If a quorum were allowed to sign the memorandum there would be more objection, but as all must sign the memorandum it was thought by the committee that that was sufficient protection. I confess I do not like the method of legislation, but it is found in several other Bills; I have no very strong opinion about it, there is a precedent for it and we try, as far as possible, to have uniformity of legislation in these matters.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the effect of the resolution that they need not call a meeting of directors, but if they get a memorandum signed by all the directors that will be equivalent to a resolution of the board of directors?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is a very bad thing. You have no consultation, and the man who is very intelligent and experienced is in no better position than the man who has little intelligence and no experience. The document is put before each one separately and there is no chance for that consultation which is really the object for which a board of directors exists. And if there is anything that will tend to laxity in business and bad results, if actually carried out, I think it will be that system by which some one having an interest in the subject could go around and button-hole each director separately, put

his own views before the director and get his signature. In that way you might get resolutions passed which, if a meeting was called, would never be considered.

Mr. SPROULE. I objected to this in the committee for very much the same reasons as have been advanced. I did so because I had seen and actually knew the baneful effects of such a system. When a paper of that kind is sent around it is accompanied by all the arguments in favour of doing it and doing it quickly and the directors are urged that unless they do it, some danger or loss will arise. All the arguments in favour of it are presented but none of the arguments against the proposition, whereas if the board were called together they might take a directly opposite view after consultation and hearing officials of the company. I move that section 6 be struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the mover of the Bill if he persists in this end and if so what his reasons for doing so are?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). One of the main reasons for asking this power is the distances that prevail in our province, which are much greater, for instance, than in Ontario. A trust company may be formed in Ontario and possibly all the directors will reside in Toronto so that you can get them together very easily but in our province it is difficult to get together say twenty-one members of the board of directors of a company. As to the argument of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) if we have twenty-one directors a quorum will consist of eleven members, and eleven directors could pass any resolution they liked providing they agreed on it at any particular meeting of the board. The section says :

> The company may, by by-law, provide that a resolution in writing signed by all the directors.

The whole twenty-one. It seems to me that the shareholders or people interested in the company are better protected by a resolution signed by twenty-one directors than they would be at a meeting where possibly only eleven were present.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. member not rather have the reasoned opinion and decision of eleven men meeting and canvassing the whole thing than the unreasoned decision of twenty-one or twenty-two scattered all over? I have seen a board of directors come together with a proposition before them unanimously in favour of the proposition at the beginning of the discussion but after questioning the officials and discussing the matter the board absolutely changed its mind. You always have at a meeting of the board of directors, some one who is like a permanent head and understands the history of the company and the matter under discussion much better than any individual director and it is by having an opportunity to avail themselves of the knowledge, experience and information of that person that the directors form their best decisions. To make this board nondeliberative would be equivalent to electing members to this parliament and then saying to them that they need not come and sit in parliament, that a memoranda would be sent to them on each piece of legislation, and that if the majority agreed to it, it would become law. You take away the really valuable thing, deliberation.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The hon. gentleman takes it for granted that if any resolution is put before a director at any particular place for his signature, he will not consider it, but will sign it. It must be remembered that he may have the advice of the very man who is the head of the company and knows about its business and he has before him the reasons why the resolution should be signed. I am not sure whether this power has been granted to all companies I am about to mention, but I was informed in the Banking and Commerce Committee that it had been granted to the Northwestern Trust Company, Chapter 113, Dominion Statutes, 1907 ; the Western Trust Company, chapter 180, Dominion Statutes, 1906; Prairie Provinces Trust Company, chapter 121, Dominion Statutes, 1909, and the Prudential Trust Company, chapter 124 of the Acts of 1909, on which the Bill we are now considering is exactly modelled, and as I said a few moments ago the very strongest argument I can advance for the written resolution signed by the directors—all the directors and not a part of them—is the great distances we have in the western provinces. Some of these directors will be in the province of Saskatchewan, but some will probably be in Alberta, or Manitoba, or perhaps British Columbia. It may be impossible to get all these directors together. This is not like a trust company confined to the province of Ontario or the province of Quebec.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). There is a wider reason for this change. What is this company doing? It is administering trust funds. If we are to insist upon the law of trusteeship, if we are to recognize the importance of trusteeship, how can we say that a man can discharge his duty as trustee by signing a document presented to him as director and with no opportunity for full consultation with his fellow directors? If we are to uphold the idea of trusteeship, it is imperative that trust funds controlled by a board of directors should be administered by that board in consultation. And, while I am on my feet, I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that it is time we should have a uniform law in the formation of trust companies as for the banks. Also,

it is high time that the returns of the trust companies should be published, as the returns of the banks, more or less, are published. The government gets returns from the trust companies, but, they are not published so far as I know. As to the point immediately before the committee, I think that the administering of trust funds by signing documents received by the directors individually through the post or otherwise is a violation of the first principle of trusteeship.

Subsection 3 agreed to—Yeas 35, Nays 29.

On section 8, business of the company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Subsection (j) of this section provides as to the real estate to be held by the company. It says:

—but the company shall sell any real estate acquired in satisfaction of any debt due to itself, other than as trustee or in an official capacity, within seven years after such acquisition, unless such time is extended by order of the Governor in Council, otherwise such real estate shall revert to His Majesty for the use of Canada.

I am not quite sure what is meant by 'shall revert to His Majesty.' It would rather imply that some time or other the property had belonged to His Majesty, and after having been vested in a company, was now to revert to His Majesty for the use of Canada. I call attention to that. I do not see why real estate in provinces which were provinces before confederation, and which was Crown property, should revert to His Majesty in right of the Dominion of Canada. It might be all very well in the western provinces, but certainly in the old provinces it should go to the provincial government.

On section 15,

Mr. FIELDING. A question arose on this clause the other day in apprehension of a conflict between the federal and provincial authorities. I find the clause is in a number of charters, and the explanation is that which I gave at a venture the other evening, that inasmuch as the laws of the provinces deal with trusteeships, and as all we do is to create a company for the management of the business, what is really contemplated by these words is that the company incorporated by the Dominion in the management of trustee business must operate under the laws of the province, and not do anything in conflict therewith. That I think is all that is intended. I find it has been in a number of Acts. I do not know whether the Minister of Public Works will regard that as a sufficient explanation ; but at all events, that is the theory upon which this clause has been put into a number of Bills.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think the fact of there being similar provisions in charters of a number of other companies, carries so much weight, because the custom is for the draftsman to copy the charters which have been previously obtained. No doubt that has been the case in the third subsection of section 6. I would have no objection to section 15 reading as follows :

The powers and authority hereby granted to the company shall be exercised in any province subject to the laws of such province in that behalf, so far as they are not inconsistent herewith.

But it does seem to me that to make a statute of this parliament entirely subject to the laws of the provincial legislature, and then to go further and declare that whatever may be enacted in this chapter should have no force or effect if it is inconsistent with the laws of the province, not only laws which now exist but laws that may be passed in future, is I think to subordinate the powers of this parliament to the powers of the provincial legislatures, and I do not think that is proper legislation.

Mr. FIELDING. But suppose provincial laws were inconsistent with this Act, if the provincial legislature were within their own jurisdiction, their laws would prevail.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, because when parliament incorporates a company with power to do business throughout Canada, then the authority of parliament is supreme.

Mr. FIELDING. Only within certain limits.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not like to differ with my hon. friend, but it has always been my view that the moment parliament gives authority to incorporate a company for purposes which are of a general character, Canadian in their character, giving a company power to do business throughout Canada, then parliament must be the judge of what power should be vested in the company, parliament is the sole judge of that. For instance, when parliament creates a railway company with power to build railways throughout Canada, parliament can give powers of expropriation. No provincial legislature could alter this charter because parliament is supreme, and so, if it is a fact that this parliament has power to incorporate the company at all it has authority to vest it with the powers deemed necessary to enable it to carry on its business. It seems to me that the section ought to be read that it should be subject to the laws of the provinces in so far as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that already the provinces have intervened in cases like this and even if the Bill were drawn as

suggested by the Minister of Public Works they would still claim the right. In the case of insurance companies some of the provinces have refused to allow them to do business in the province unless they complied with certain provincial statutes, one of which was the payment of a fee, and the other registration in the province. I know that such is the case at the present time. British Columbia has, I understand, challenged the authority of corporations doing business under federal charters, so has Manitoba, and in both cases these companies were obliged to comply with the requirements of the law or otherwise refrain from doing business in these provinces though they had their charter from the federal parliament. That is the way I think this would work ; if you said that they might exercise such powers in so far as they were not inconsistent with the Act that would not cover it all.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether the question has much sense in it at all, but there is an authority granted to a company to be exercised in any province subject to the laws of that province. It is situated, we will say, in Regina under the laws of Saskatchewan. A trust has been put into the hands of the company by the province of Alberta. The Alberta laws are different from those of Saskatchewan. Does the trust make it necessary that the laws in accordance with that trust should follow the origin of the trust? They may be greatly different. Would this company have to carry out each trust according to the laws of the province from which it originated? What do the solons of the House say about that not including the Minister of Finance because he is not a solon.

Mr. FIELDING. He does not claim to be a solon.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Minister of the Interior were here I would appeal to him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there is a great deal in what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says, but if you pass this section as it is, each province could legislate as to this particular trust company. Alberta could legislate in one way, Saskatchewan in another, Ontario in another, Quebec in another, and each province might have different provisions which this company would be bound to obey because parliament has said : It is true, we give you certain powers, it is true we state what you shall do, it is true we make provision for the holding of the meetings of the board of directors, and the way in which you shall handle trust moneys, but in every province you must comply with the laws that the provincial legislature may pass, and any Act at all which is inconsistent with this would override this statute. I think this parliament ought not to declare that any charter which it gives to a company may be overridden by the legislature of any province. The hon. member for East Grey spoke of provincial legislatures claiming the right to prevent a company incorporated by this parliament from doing business without paying a tax and taking out a license. I admit that, and I think that the Privy Council held that they had that power in the case of Parsons v. Citizens Insurance Company, that power being based on the right of the provincial legislature to impose taxation for the purpose of raising a provincial revenue. That is under a clause of the British North America Act. Therefore, I am not prepared to dispute that if this company is incorporated by parliament it may be required to pay a tax or a fee and to take out a license. But that is altogether a different provision. In this case parliament is abdicating its functions, and saying that whatever the provincial legislature shall do with regard to this company shall be the paramount law, and shall override whatever this parliament has done with regard to this company. That is why I object to it.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) thinks this point important I would rather he should draft an amendment, and let the Bill stand because on a question of a possible conflict between the provinces, and the Dominion, even if it affects only this one particular charter, I should like to have the advice of the Department of Justice. It is really a very important question, and it has an effect upon other things. I know the purpose of the clause, and it is a good purpose. It is important to draw a distinction between the powers of a company created as a man with authority to do business, and the nature of the business which is governed not by the Dominion but by the provinces. That is what those who drafted the clause had in mind. Whether it is adequately expressed in this clause is a matter for our legal friends to determine, and I would like to have the advice of the Minister of Justice with regard to it.

Mr. CARVELL. I would suggest that if the promoter would simply drop out the latter half of the section because the laws of the different provinces have to prevail whether we want them to or not it would meet the case. I could give an illustration. This company is authorized to loan money on mortgages and it becomes a matter of civil contract. The legislature of each province has a perfect right to pass any laws it chooses regarding these contracts. For instance, we had the matter discussed only a few days ago on the Bill introduced by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) being an amendment to the In-

terest Act. We held, and I believe rightly, that this parliament has no right to say to a company: You must cancel the mortgage. All we can say is: You must not charge any more interest after a certain time. The legislature of the province, however, can say that the company, after the payment of a certain amount of money, must discharge the mortgage from the records. It is the law of the province which has to prevail. I think that if all after the word 'behalf' were omitted we will have accomplished all we can accomplish and there will be no conflict between the federal and provincial authorities.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would meet my views.

Mr. LENNOX. I think that what the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) says would accomplish what was suggested, but I entirely concur with the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that this is a matter of sufficient importance to justify us in getting the advice of the Minister of Justice so that we will be absolutely sure about what we are doing in this matter. The different provinces have the right to regulate contracts. By this Bill we are creating a body corporate to do business, but the provinces have asserted their right to regulate the manner of carrying on business in their various jurisdictions. It would be unfortunate if there should be any conflict as to the proper exercise of that jurisdiction. The provinces, more than we, are concerned with the manner in which this business shall be carried on. I entirely agree with what the Minister of Finance says. I do not feel that I have given this matter sufficient attention to be able to say what shall ultimately appear to be the right thing to do, but I think this is a matter that should receive the consideration suggested by the Minister of Finance, and that it should stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 16, annual statement to be given to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FOSTER. Just as a matter of information, may I ask the Minister of Finance if in carrying out similar legislation in regard to other companies, he could tell me what is required other than the four things that are set out? I would ask the minister how the operation of that clause has worked with regard to other companies?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not like to answer the hon. gentleman offhand, but so far as I know returns have been sent in and if they appear to conform with the Act I do not think any question would be raised. I would like to look up the returns of these companies before I could answer more definitely.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). That emphasizes my point that it is high time that trust companies doing business in Canada should send their returns in on a standardized form just as in the case of railways. These returns should be published, and in that way we will get some idea of what business they are doing. There are a large number of trust companies now doing business in every province and they are getting to have an enormous influence in connection with financial affairs in this country. At present these returns are sent to the department and they are, as I understand, examined in but a perfunctory way. The time has come when there should be uniform legislation in regard to trust companies, as there is in regard to banks and railways.

Mr. FOSTER. The point gets additional force in the fact that trust companies incorporated in the provinces have to give very much fuller returns than trust companies incorporated by the Dominion parliament. We may have trust companies come seeking legislation here for the very purpose, in their view, that they would not have to submit to so much publicity as if they were incorporated in a province. Publicity is not a bad feature, and we should demand from the trust companies incorporated by us no less information than is demanded by the provincial governments from trust companies incorporated by the provinces. Are joint stock companies, incorporated by the Dominion, obliged to give any return?

Mr. FIELDING. Companies incorporated under the Joint Stock Companies Act do not make returns, but those incorporated by special charter are, in most cases, required to and do make returns.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this matter is worthy the attention of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. It is.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Finance will, I think, agree with me that we should demand from the companies incorporated by us no less in the way of publicity than is demanded from companies which are incorporated by the provincial legislatures.

Mr. FIELDING. That seems reasonable. We have had banks, and insurance companies, and loan companies, for a very long time, and in the light of experience we have found it expedient to have general legislation in regard to them. Trust companies are a more modern invention, but they are becoming somewhat numerous, and there is force in the suggestion, which I think has been offered be-

fore, that we should have, if not some general legislation, at all events some standard returns and some publicity. The whole subject, in view of recent events, is well worthy of careful consideration, and I will see that it is not overlooked.

Mr. SPROULE. And further, loan companies and insurance companies should send in a return as to how much unclaimed money remains in their hands. My own view is that that money should be transferred to the state after the expiry of a certain period.

Mr. FIELDING. A colleague of the hon. gentleman has a Bill before the House for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. And there should also be legislation to compel companies incorporated under the Joint Stock Companies Act to forward returns. There should be such a proviso in all such special Acts as that before us, and I had intended to move to that effect before the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. We cannot do better than give this matter a moment's consideration. The trust companies touch the people's interest very closely, and they have originated out of the fact that in some instances in the past the estates of deceased persons have been squandered. One of the most important functions of these trust companies is to act as executors in administering estates. We have had no scandals so far as I am aware of in connection with trust companies, but it would not be a very hazardous prediction to say that if we are not careful in our legislation we may have them some time in the future. The trust companies exercise a most important function in that they handle the money of people of limited means. They are very desirable institutions, but it is the duty of this parliament to see that they are hedged about with every possible safeguard in any legislation we pass regarding them. I emphasize the necessity for full, accurate, and published returns. As the years go by the necessity for this is growing inasmuch as to a large extent the same men are connected with a number of these public financial institutions. The people who are connected with banks are very often connected with trust companies, mortgage companies and insurance companies, and it is not easy to trace the money from one transaction to another or from one company to another. Therefore it is necessary that in this matter the government should exercise the most careful supervision. In saying that I have no reason to believe that any existing company has done anything that is not absolutely fair or that this company will not follow the same honourable course that has been followed by other companies. But this is a company which will have the custody of the moneys of a large class of people. We institute these trust companies to discharge duties which used to be discharged by private executors and we should be very careful to see that they are so instituted as not to have the disastrous results which have often followed from the appointment of private executives.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any provision giving this company power to take money on deposit?

Mr. FIELDING. Subsection (g) of section 8 provides that it may receive moneys for investment and allow interest thereon for a reasonable time until invested.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the shareholders of these trust companies subject to any double liability?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Why should they not be the same as banks in that respect, seeing that they receive trust moneys?

Mr. FIELDING. The fact that during all these years the wisdom of parliament has not imposed any such double liability suggests that there are probably good reasons. There is certainly a broad distinction between a trust company and a bank. A trust company's powers are large, but those of a bank are larger, and the double liability might be right in the one case and not in the other.

Mr. BLAIN. That same argument might be urged against the revision of any law. These large corporations open their doors to receive the savings of the people of this country just as banks do. It is true, their line of business is different; but their responsibility to the wage-earner is the same, and I cannot understand why the shareholders of a bank doing a very much smaller business in some parts of Canada should be subject to the double liability, while the shareholders of a large corporation doing ten times as much business are not subject to the same liability. It seems to me that this is a matter that ought to receive some consideration from the Minister of Finance. I suppose that the failure of the Farmers' Bank causes legislation of this kind to be more closely criticised than it would be otherwise, and it seems to me that a good time to surround institutions of this kind with every precaution in the interest of depositors is before we have any great disaster among them. When this whole matter is up for consideration, I think it would be in the interest of the people of Canada and would be appreciated by them, if my hon. friend the Minister of

Finance would give some attention to this matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a disputed opinion. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) is against a double liability.

Mr. BLAIN. I differ with the hon. member for South York on that point.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). I believe the protection of the public in the case of banks is public inspection, and not double liability. If we had public inspection, the chances are that we would not need the double liability; or we might have the security of both. Certainly I do not see the sense of the government which charters a bank evading the responsibility of its inspection and putting that on the shoulders of the shareholders by involving them in a double liability. A wise system of public inspection would protect both the public and the shareholders.

Mr. MILLER. I think there is another reason besides the one given by the Minister of Finance why it may be right to impose the double liability on the shareholders of a bank and not on those of a trust company. My hon. friend from Peel might argue just as well and reasonably that the shareholders of a loan company should be subject to a double liability, because they handle a very large amount of the people's funds which they take on deposit.

Mr. BLAIN. Why should they not?

Mr. MILLER. The reason is that the government gives to a bank a great and very valuable monopoly, in the right to issue notes and in unusual methods and privileges by way of securing advances made by them. No such monopoly is given either to trust companies or loan companies. The business of a trust company is carried on by private parties all over the Dominion; so also is all the business done by a loan company. Why should not the shareholders of a manufacturing company have a double liability as well as those of a loan company?

Mr. LENNOX. They do not take deposits.

Mr. MILLER. But they have many small stockholders who entrust their money to the chief stockholders who are looking after the business, and sometimes they do take deposits.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister not think this matter should receive the attention of the government and the Finance Department? The arguments of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) are altogether insufficient. I could not see the force of the argument that because we ask that shareholders of a trust company should be held for double liability, therefore the stockholders in a manufacturing establishment should be so held. There is a very great difference, as my hon. friend understands very well. I urge it for this reason, that they are both banking concerns. The trust corporation is a banking concern in the eyes of the depositor, just as a bank is. We have had some great disasters in Ontario in financial corporations, such as the York Loan, in Toronto, and the Atlas, in St. Thomas.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). These were not trust companies.

Mr. BLAIN. These bring great disasters to depositors, and wherever a set of men, whether in connection with a trust company or a bank, receive powers from this parliament to accept the wages and savings of the people of Canada, we should put every possible restriction around them, so that their interests should be protected. I can see no force in any argument advanced this afternoon in favour of the contention that the shareholders of a bank should be called upon for a double liability while the shareholders in a trust company should not. Banks, as in the case of the Farmers' Bank, sometimes hold small amounts of money compared with the amounts held in trust by these other corporations, and I cannot see why one should be held for double liability and the other escape altogether. The Minister of Finance may say that because England has never had any government banking restrictions and has not now, after all her experience in financial matters, therefore we should not have government inspection in Canada. If we accepted arguments of that kind we could find proofs on every hand to sustain any argument.

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Finance is not in any different position from my hon. friend in respect to this matter. We have both been sitting in this House and voting for charters for trust companies without any such provision. We must have seen some distinction between them and a bank, or else we would not have helped to put their charters through. However, we live and learn, and, without discussing the Farmers' Bank, or the question of bank inspection, both of which will no doubt be discussed in due course, and confining myself entirely to trust companies, I would say that we must at all times be careful in the incorporation of financial institutions to surround them with reasonable checks and guides, and if the experience of either the Dominion or the provinces is calculated to suggest any additional checks and restrictions, I certainly agree that we should profit by them. I do not think that we should come to the conclusion that we should impose a double

liability on trust companies as on banks. The difference is very material. However, on every question of that nature I quite agree with hon. gentlemen opposite that we should exercise the utmost care and what my hon. friend and others have said along the same line to-day will receive our very careful consideration.

Progress reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 101) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Sealey.

Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the Imperial Traction Company.—Mr. Rankin.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MR. ROBERT KELLY.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Is one Robert Kelly in the employ of the government at Vancouver, British Columbia?
2. If so, in what capacity and what are his duties?
3. Is the government aware that the following Canadian Press despatch appeared in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of January 26, 1911:—

'Vancouver, B.C., January 25.—At the Chinese investigation to-day, Joseph Martin, M.P. for St. Pancras, Eng., renewed his charges of graft against the Liberal organization in Vancouver, couching his remarks in general terms. He stated that he knew nothing of his own personal knowledge of fraud in connection with the Chinese investigation. He added that Sir Wilfrid Laurier could remedy matters in five minutes by refusing to accept Robert Kelly's appointments. "If I had charge of an investigation," added Mr. Martin, "I could prove it to the hilt without any question. I would not give any evidence myself, but I would call a lot of people who would have knowledge. I have been told there is graft in every department in which Mr. Kelly saw a dollar to be made. Nobody could get an order or a contract from the government in the last nine years except through Mr. Kelly."

'Mr. Martin, when asked for names by Mr. McCrossins, said he would suggest Mr. Kelly as a witness, also Mr. Templeman and R. Smith, M.P. "As it is," he added, "the Liberal party has disappeared in a cloud of smoke." '

4. Is it the intention of the government to appoint a commission to investigate the serious charge made by Joseph Martin, M.P.?
5. Is Joseph Martin, M.P., a member of the British parliament?
6. Was the said Joseph Martin, M.P., formerly a member of this parliament and a supporter of the present government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1 and 2. Robert Kelly is not in the employ of the government.

3. Yes; members of the government have read the testimony given by Mr. Martin, and reported in the Ottawa 'Citizen'. All I have to say personally is that during the nearly fifteen years that the present government has been in office I have only received one communication from Mr. Robert Kelly.

4. There is an investigation now going on.

5. Mr. Joseph Martin is now a member of the Imperial House of Commons.

6. Mr. Martin was a member of this parliament, but not since the present government came into office.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC DEVELOPING COMPANY.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar):

1. Has the government or any department of the government bought any land from the Grand Trunk Pacific Developing Company? If so, how much land was bought and what price was paid for it?
2. For what purpose or purposes was each parcel bought?

Mr. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Answering for my own department, I may say that the department has not bought any land from the Grand Trunk Pacific Developing Company, but the company has offered a free site for a public building in Prince Rupert.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there any other department that can answer anything about it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not. We have made inquiry.

Mr. LENNOX. The matter is probably rather in the jurisdiction of the Railway Department. I think it had better stand for the present.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS.

Mr. AMES:

Is it the intention of the government during the present session to bring in a measure affecting the naturalization of aliens?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

THE FARMERS' BANK FAILURE.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. Did the Finance Department or any of its officials, the Finance Minister or any other member of the government, receive any communications, verbal or written, previous to the issue of the certificate of the Treasury Board to the Farmers' Bank, cautioning, warning or suggesting inquiry as to the standing or character of the promoters, or the proceedings by which the deposit was procured?
2. If so, did the government make any inquiry or investigation with the view of satisfying itself as to the bona fides and sufficiency of the undertaking?

Mr. FIELDING. The government did not receive in any form any information which afforded ground for the refusal of

the certificate. At one stage of the transaction, some shareholders, through their solicitor, applied to have proceedings delayed until he might be heard. The solicitor afterwards withdrew this request. After the certificate issued, a communication from the Canadian Bankers' Association, bearing same date as that of the issue of the certificate, reached the department next day, stating that there was some question as to the regularity of the subscription. The procedure in respect to the issue of the certificate to enable the Farmers' Bank to do business was substantially the same as in other cases of similar character.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

* Mr. BORDEN:

1. At what date is it expected that the Quebec bridge will be completed?
2. What has been the total cost to date, respectively, of the remains of the structure and the portion which fell?
3. What has been the total cost of the bridge to the country up to the present time?
4. What is the estimated actual value of the ruins or remains of the structure?
5. What is the estimated total cost of the bridge when completed?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Various tenderers name dates from June, 1914, to December, 1916, all contingent upon the masonry being completed by November, 1911.

2. The following is the only one of this nature, in regard to which the Board has any information:

Removal of debris, contract price.	$45,000
Amount paid to date	31,995
Removal of old false work, contract price	22,750
Amount paid to date	13,644

3. $7,154,987.49.

4. The steel remaining the property of the government as follows:

	Lbs.
South side yards	2,369,891
North side yards	18,070,703
Two approach spans	2,200,000
	22,640,594

It is very difficult to determine the value of this material, taking into consideration the expense of handling, loading, transporting and having no knowledge of the use to which it will be put. For the present all that can be figured on is what it would be worth as scrap, which has a value of about $10 per ton. This would make this material worth about $113,000. It is difficult to estimate the value of the material in the present piers, in regard to the new structure, but a safe estimate would be $300,000.

5. As the tenders are still under consideration, it would not be in the public interest to make public the amounts.

Mr. FIELDING.

MR. FREDERICK J. NASH.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. Who are the employees of the government in the inland revenue service in Charlottetown?
2. Is Frederick J. Nash, of Charlottetown, an employee of the Dominion government? If so, what are his duties, what is his salary per month, how long has he been employed, and what are his office hours?
3. What is the total amount he has received as salary from the time of his first employment to 1st January, 1911?
4. What is the number of hours the said Frederick J. Nash has been on duty each day since his first employment up to 1st January, 1911, as per time-book in the office where he has been employed?
5. Has the said Frederick J. Nash ever qualified for a civil service position?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. In the excise branch: Samuel C. Nash, Theophilus Moore and Frederick J. Nash. In the Weights and Measures Branch: E. Davy, H. Hughes. In the Gas Inspection Branch, J. H. Bell.

2. Frederick J. Nash is an employee in said office at Charlottetown. His duties are to supervise such licensed establishments and do such other work, as may be assigned him by the collector of the division. His salary per month is $58.33.

He has been employed since May 26, 1908. His office hours as an excise officer are from 8 a.m., to 5 p.m.

3. $1,819.52.

4. The collector advises me as follows: 'F. J. Nash has had full charge of Messrs. T. B. and D. J. Riley's Tobacco Factory since his appointment, has performed his own and deputy collector Moore's duties during three months of 1909 when the latter was on sick leave, and has assisted in office.

5. Yes.

CARILLON CANAL WATER-POWERS.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Who is now the lessee of the hydraulic powers of Carillon and Pointe Fortune?
2. On what date did this lease come into force, and how long has it existed?
3. Was the lessee bound to carry out certain obligations before the end of the first year, and did he do so in the terms of the lease? If not, is the lease therefore cancelled?
4. If the government has not cancelled this lease, does it intend to do so shortly?
5. What is the rental and how much has the government received from this source since the leasing to the last person?
6. Does the lessee still owe any arrears?
7. Who have been the lessees for the last twenty years, and how much has the government received each year from the different lessees?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Lease granted to the General Manufacturing Company of Canada, dated July 26, 1898, and to Crawford Ross, of the City of Ottawa, dated 12th December, 1908.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Yes. The lease is not cancelled.

4. It has been represented to the government that a strong company is being formed fully competent to develop this water-power under the present lease. A reasonable time will be given them to perfect their plans and begin operations.

5. $2 per horse-power per year, and $100 land rent from Crawford Ross. The government received $100 from Crawford Ross; see answer to No. 7.

6. Yes, $150, payable March 15, 1911, in advance.

7. The only other leases for water-power besides those mentioned above were: A lease to William R. Hibbert, of St. Andrews, P.Q., dated 18th May, 1897, cancelled 6th June, 1899; lease to John P. Mullarkey, dated June 3, 1901, and cancelled on 16th May, 1906. Paid by John P. Mullarkey $500 in 1901, and by Crawford Ross $50 in 1909, and $50 in 1910.

NETHERLAND LOAN COMPANY.

*Mr. MONK:

1. Has the government officially notified Mr. Preston, Canadian Trade Commissioner at Amsterdam, Holland, that his statement about Sir Charles Fitzpatrick being the source of the information that led to the withdrawal of Dutch financiers from a proposed investment in western Canadian farm securities, is contradicted by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court? If so, what is the nature of Mr. Preston's reply?

2. If the government has not notified Mr. Preston about Sir Charles Fitzpatrick's denial, is it the intention to do so, and also obtain from Mr. Preston full explanation in regard to the matter?

3. Has the government had any further correspondence with the Commissioner of Trade in Holland on this question since the adoption of the resolution by this House for the production of the correspondence bearing on the Netherlands Loan Mortgage Company?

4. Will the said correspondence be laid upon the table of the House?

5. What steps does the government intend to take in order to remove the impression created by the alleged depreciation of the west as a suitable field for the investment of European capital?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. and 2. No, for the reason that communications were immediately received from Mr. Preston containing the information that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick had publicly denied having given any depreciatory information respecting western Canada.

3. Yes.

4. Yes, if the correspondence be moved for.

5. The department has already issued an official statement respecting the high regard in which western farm lands are held by some of the principal loan and investment companies.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. At what date was the present Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia appointed?

2. Was there any correspondence with the government or any minister of the government in reference to the continuance of the lieutenant governor as a director of the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company?

3. Was there any verbal communication with or between members of the government on the subject matter of question?

4. Was there any consent by the government or any member of the government, or understanding on its or their part, that the lieutenant governor might continue to act as such director?

5. Is the lieutenant governor still a director of said company?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

Mr. McGregor was appointed Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia on October 18, 1910.

Neither in the case of Mr. McGregor nor any other lieutenant governor was there any correspondence with the view of imposing any conditions in relation to any Lieutenant Governor's business. In all cases matters of that kind are left to the Governor's judgment. The government does not know whether the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia is or is not a director of the Nova Scotia Steel Company.

BANK FAILURES IN CANADA.

*Mr. FOSTER:

Has the Finance Department obtained the reports of the several curators appointed for the banks that have failed during the last five years?

Mr. FIELDING:

The Department of Finance has asked for and obtained from the several curators or liquidators reports upon the financial condition of the several banks referred to.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. Is the government aware that Mr. H. C. McLeod, late general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, is alleged to have publicly stated that since 1865 over $40,000,000 have been lost by the shareholders of insolvent Canadian banks? If so, is such statement correct?

2. Is the government aware that it is asserted by the same gentleman that there are fully eight times as great a percentage of failures among Canadian banks as is to be found of insolvent United States National banks? If so, is such statement correct?

3. Is the government aware that the same gentleman has asserted that there is a greater percentage of failures among Canadian banks

than among banks of any other country? If so, is such assertion correct?

4. Is the government aware that the same eminent Canadian banker, Mr. McLeod, publicly stated that the Bankers' Association of Canada was aware that a number of Canadian banks were submitting false reports to the government? If so, did the government take any steps to verify such assertion?

Mr. FIELDING:

1, 2 and 3. The government are aware that Mr. McLeod has from time to time expressed his views as to the operation of the Canadian Bank Act. Whether such views were correct or otherwise the government have not felt called upon to say. Mr. McLeod's statements and views were summed up in a pamphlet which was widely circulated in December, 1909, which pamphlet does not contain the allegations referred to in the hon. gentleman's question. The chief purpose of Mr. McLeod's pamphlet was the advocating, in connection with the pending revision of the Bank Act, of some form of external bank inspection. From the arguments used by him in this pamphlet, the government are of opinion that he would quite approve of the method of external inspection provided in the Bill now before the House.

4. Mr. McLeod's statements respecting falsification of returns have not been understood to refer to any intentional falsification, but to a practice of long standing, but now discontinued, concerning the method in which many of the banks have kept their circulation accounts.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. Is it true, as publicly stated by Mr. H. C. McLeod, late general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, that since 1865 over $40,000,000 have been lost by the shareholders of insolvent Canadian banks?

2. Is it true, as claimed by the same gentleman, that there are fully eight times as great a percentage of failures among Canadian banks as is to be found of insolvent American National banks?

3. Is Mr. McLeod's statement that there is a greater percentage of failures among Canadian banks than there is among the banks of any other country, a correct one?

4. Is the government aware that about a year ago an eminent Canadian banker, Mr. McLeod, publicly stated that the Bankers' Association were aware that at that time a number of different Canadian banks were submitting false reports to the government?

5. Were any steps taken to verify that assertion?

Mr. FIELDING:

Answer to previous question applies.

DAIRY INDUSTRY.

Mr. BRODER:

1. What was the nature of the memorials presented to the government on the 19th January, 1911, with respect to the dairy industry of Canada?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario).

2. Has the government yet taken into consideration the requests contained within the said memorials?

3. What action does the government propose to take in connection therewith, and when?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. The government was asked to appoint an official weigher of butter and cheese at Montreal, and also that cheese buyers should be licensed and required to give bonds.

2. Yes.

3. The matter is still under consideration.

UNITED SHOE MACHINERY COMPANY.

Mr. NORTHRUP:

1. Is the honourable the Minister of Labour aware that an application has been made before a judge of the Superior Court sitting in and for the district of Quebec under and in virtue of the Combines Investigation Act for an investigation concerning the affairs of the United Shoe Machinery Company of Canada?

2. If so, has the minister instructed anybody to appear for him or for his department or to speak for him on the said application?

3. Has the Minister of Labour or any officials of the Department of Labour or anybody on behalf of the government assisted or aided in the preparation or organization of the committee who are applying for said investigation, or otherwise assisted in bringing the matter before the courts?

Mr. KING:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. No.

PRINTING BUREAU INVESTIGATION.

Mr. NORTHRUP:

1. Is all the evidence that was taken in the investigation into the Printing Bureau affairs by the honourable the Secretary of State printed in the blue-book laid on the table by him?

2. Was the evidence taken under oath?

3. For what cause was Mr. R. E. Cook dismissed from the service?

4. On what particular facts was the charge against him based?

5. On whose representations was such action taken?

6. Who is the present superintendent of stationery, if any?

7. If none, who is discharging the duties of the office, and at what salary?

8. Who is the present accountant of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, and how long has he filled the office?

9. Is he duly qualified under the Act?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. The Blue-book contains all the evidence of which any written record was made. In addition to the witnesses examined at the Printing Bureau, many other persons were interrogated at different times and places, but no record was made of their statements. Information was also obtained

through an examination of the files of several departments, and of a large number of papers and documents all of which were returned to the places whence they were obtained, without any minute or their contents being made.

2. No person was examined under oath as the investigation was a departmental inquiry, and it was not deemed necessary to issue a commission authorizing the taking of evidence under oath.

3. For disobeying instructions, wasting public moneys, placing orders outside the Bureau without securing competitive prices, and for untruthfulness and incompetence.

4. His dismissal was not due to any charge being made against him, but to the facts elicited in the course of the investigation.

5. Action was taken by the Secretary of State as the result of his investigation.

6. The office is vacant.

7. The former assistant superintendent of stationery who has been promoted to the position of superintendent of stores and distribution at the salary of the late superintendent of stationery, namely $2,500.

8. J. A. Frigon, since the 4th March, 1907, when he was promoted after serving 13 years in the Printing Bureau.

9. Dr. S. E. Dawson, the late King's Printer, recommended that Mr. Frigon be promoted, and certified that he had passed all the necessary examinations for promotion, and was fitted in every respect for the position. The examinations embraced the requirements set forth in the Act.

ST. JOHN RIVER CHANNEL.

Mr. CROCKET :

1. Has the Department of Public Works paid rent for any office in connection with the survey of the St. John river channel between Fredericton and Woodstock?

2. If so, where is said office situated, and what was the monthly rent paid therefor?

Mr. PUGSLEY :

1. Yes.

2 (a) In Fredericton.

(b) Ten dollars per month.

MR. ALPHONSE GERVAIS.

Mr. PAQUET :

1. How long has Alphonse Gervais been employed by the government, and what yearly salary has been paid him since his appointment?

2. What is the nature of his employment and where performed?

3. Is the government aware that the said Alphonse Gervais is said to have been condemned to pay a fine for electoral corruption?

4. If so, does the government intend to notify him of his discharge?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN :

1. Mr. Alphonse Gervais has been employed in the inland revenue service at St. Hyacinthe since April 1, 1901. His salary has been as follows : 1900-1, $300 ; 1901-2, 1902-3, 1903-4, $500 ; 1904-5, 10 months at $500 ; 2 months at $600 ; 1905-6, 1906-7, 1907-8, 1908-9, 1909-10, $600.

2. He is attached to the bonded factory survey at St. Hyacinthe, Que.

3. The department has no knowledge respecting this matter.

4. In view of answer 3, no reply to this question is necessary.

PULP WOOD EXPORTS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. To what amount in money did we export pulp wood to the United States during the fiscal years 1908-9 and 1909-10?

2. To what amount in money did we export wood pulp to the United States in 1908-9 and 1909-10?

3. To what amount in money did we export paper to the United States in 1908-9 and 1909-10?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The exports of pulp wood from Canada to the United States during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909, amounted to $4,356,-391, and during the fiscal year 1910 to $6,076,628.

2. The exports of wood pulp from Canada to the United States during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909, amounted to $4,306,-929, and during the fiscal year 1910 to $5,204,597.

3. The exports of paper from Canada to the United States during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909, amounted to $958,-870, and during the fiscal year 1910 to $1,297,052.

IMPORTS OF PAPER.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What sum of money did the importations of paper purchased in the United States amount to during the fiscal years 1908-9 and 1909-10?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The importations of paper from the United States into Canada during the fiscal years ended March 31, 1909, and 1910 were as follows:—

	1909. Value.	1910. Value.
Printing paper..	$195,580	$234,780
Ruled, bordered and coated papers; boxed papers and papeteries..	61,112	99,943
Paper, all kinds, n.o.p..	633,259	927,190
Wall paper..	154,819	206,662
Wrapping paper	52,465	58,102

ST. HYACINTHE MILITARY SCHOOL.

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. When was the Military Riding School of St. Hyacinthe built, and what was the cost of construction?

2. What has been the total cost for repairs and necessary improvements since its construction?

3. Who were the contractors for the different works, and what amounts have they respectively received?

4. Who is the caretaker of the Military Riding School of St. Hyacinthe, and what annual salary does he receive?

5. Who is supposed to do the heating of the Riding School, and what yearly salary does he receive for his work?

6. Does the government intend to pay, besides the salary of the caretaker, that of the fireman?

7. What is the annual cost for the maintenance of the riding school?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. This question appertains to the Department of Public Works.

2. $588.

3. Only one contract in connection with (2) above has been let, and that for a minor alteration in the caretaker's quarters. Amount paid to Messrs. Paquet and Godbout, $40. Other small repairs by day labour make up the total of $588.

4. D. Bouchard, $365 per annum, with free quarters, fuel and light.

5. N. Langlier, $400 per annum.

6. There is at present, in addition to the caretaker, a fireman. There is no immediate intention of making any change.

7. In 1908-9, $997.80; in 1909-10, $976.32, exclusive of salaries of caretaker and furnaceman.

BOOT CONTRACT FOR NAVAL DEPARTMENT.

Mr. PERLEY:

1. Did the Department of Naval Service call for tenders for 600 pairs of half boots for the use of seamen of the naval service, during October or November, 1910?

2. If so, what standard pattern and specifications were adopted by the department, and upon what were they based?

3. What opportunities for tendering were offered to Canadian manufacturers?

4. What tenders were received and at what prices?

5. To whom was the contract awarded, and at what figure?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. On October 25, 1910, the Department of the Naval Service called for tenders for all articles of kit and clothing to be issued to the men of the naval service under the order in council on the subject, dated 6th June, 1910. Seamen's boots are included in this list.

2 and 3. Some time before calling for these tenders the department communicated with the secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association with a view to obtaining the names of all the Canadian manufacturers of the articles required by the department. The association recommended the use of the 'Canadian Trade Index,' a book published by the Manufacturers' Association, and which is presumed to contain the names of the manufacturers in Canada, whether members of the Manufacturers' Association or not. The list of manufacturers of boots in this book contains about 100 names. Circulars were sent to all these manufacturers inclosing a copy of the specification of the boot used in the imperial navy, and stating that the Department of the Naval Service would in the near future call for tenders for 600 pairs of boots of this type; that the specification was sent as a guide to the type of boot required, but that, as Canadian methods of manufacture were different to British methods, the exact detail of specification would not be adhered to. The circular stated that a standard specification and pattern would be adopted, based on the experience of the department after a thorough trial of Canadian made boots.

The specification on the tender form read as follows:—

'Boots to be supplied under this contract shall be similar in quality to the samples exhibited at the time of tendering, and shall be made of an equal quality in all respects of Canadian or British tanned leather. The sample boot accompanying the accepted tender shall be used as a sealed pattern, and all subsequent deliveries shall conform in all respects of manufacture, material, workmanship and finish to that sample, otherwise the officers of the department shall be at liberty to reject the same.'

The advertisement calling for tenders was published in the press of all industrial centres in Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. A duplicate slip of the advertisement was forwarded to each manufacturer on the list published by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. Samples of the British boots were exhibited at Halifax, Quebec, Ottawa and Victoria, and were also forwarded to firms in other localities for their inspection. The proceedings adopted in this case are, in a general way, the same as those which were followed in obtaining tenders for other articles required by the Naval Service Department.

4 and 5. The following tenders were received: Ames-Holden, $3.50; Jas. McCready Company, $3.75, $3.50; Slater Shoe Company, $3.50, $3.65, $3.85, $3.45, $3.25, $3.25, $3.10, $3.00, $3.40, $2.95, $3.75, $2.25; John Lennox, $3.25, $3.25; Sovereign Shoe Company, $3.50; Robert Taylor, $3.50; George A. Slater, $4.00. The samples received were examined by three naval officers, who chose three boots as being the most suitable received. A further and independent examination was made by experts on boots from the Militia Department, who chose one boot as being, in

their opinion, the most suitable for our needs. This boot was one of the three chosen at the first inspection. These inspections were made without knowledge of either the makers' names or the prices of the boots. This decision was accepted by the department and the contract was placed with the Slater Shoe Company, Ltd., of Montreal, the makers of the accepted sample at the price quoted in their tender, $3.45 per pair. This boot is considered a most suitable boot, and in many respects superior to the British boot.

GOVERNMENT LAND OPTIONS IN ST. LAMBERT.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. In what month and year were options taken on lots in St. Lambert for government building?
2. How many lots were under option, and what is the name of the owner and the price of each lot?
3. What was the price paid for the lot purchased, and when was the option exercised?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 2. One option taken, dated 11th February, 1910. from Mr. Noel Marcille at $4,140 for four months.
3. 10th June, 1910.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND WINTER SERVICE.

Mr. FRASER:

1. What sort of coal has been used during the last ten years and up to the present time, in the ice breaking steamers between Prince Edward Island and the mainland?
2. From what mine or mines has this coal been procured?
3. Has this coal proved satisfactory as a steam producing coal?
4. Have any complaints as to the quality of this coal been received from the officers or engineers of these steamers, or from any of them?
5. Have any reports been received from the officers or engineers of these steamers, or from any of them, as to the quality of the coal used?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Bituminous screened coal.
2. Mines of the Intercolonial Coal Mining Company.
3. Fairly satisfactory.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. ROBB:

1. In what year was the Soulanges canal opened for navigation, and the Beauharnois canal abandoned for general navigation?
2. From the opening of the Soulanges canal until leased to McIntyre and Robert, what were the annual expenses to the government for maintenance and repairs to the Beauharnois canal?
3. Under the lease to McIntyre and Robert, what amount does the government save in repairs and maintenance?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Soulanges canal opened for navigation on May 1, 1900. Beauharnois canal abandoned for general navigation January 1, 1908.
2. Annual expense for Beauharnois canal, maintenance and repairs from opening of Soulanges canal until leased to McIntyre and Robert, average $20,160.
3. Saved in maintenance and repairs, $23,160.

INDIAN RESERVES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA RAILWAY BELT.

Mr. PERLEY:

1. With reference to the Indian reservations in the province of British Columbia outside of the twenty mile belt, has the Dominion or the province control of these lands?
2. Can an intending settler purchase these lands and obtain a patent for the same? If so, should he apply to the Dominion or the province?
3. If there is a dispute between the Dominion and the province as to jurisdiction over these lands, are there any proceedings pending either in the court or otherwise to settle the same, and how soon may a decision be expected?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Indian reserves in British Columbia, outside the railway belt, are under the control of the Department of Indian Affairs.
2. No land on an Indian reserve can be sold until after surrender by the Indians, in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Act. The right of the government of Canada to grant the lands upon such surrender is disputed by the province of British Columbia.
3. No judicial proceedings are pending, but there has been correspondence upon the subject, and the matter is under consideration.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPH STATIONS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. How many wireless telegraph stations are owned by the government of Canada, where are they located, what was the cost of each, and when were they erected?
2. How many wireless telegraph stations are operated by the Canadian government, where are they located and what is the cost of operating each?
3. How many of said stations are leased, to whom leased, the rental paid each year, and where are they located?

Mr. BRODEUR:

On motion of the hon. member for East Lambton on the 14th December, 1910, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries presented a return on the 18th January, showing how many wireless telegraph stations are owned by the government, where

located, the cost of each, and the revenue derived from each; and stating that there are no stations leased.

THE FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to say a word with reference to an answer to a question. The question was this:

Did the Finance Department, or any of its officials, the Finance Minister or any other member of the government, receive any communication, verbal or written, previous to the issue of the certificate of the Treasury Board to the Farmers' Bank, cautioning warning or suggesting an inquiry as to the standing or character of the promoters, or the proceedings by which the deposit was procured.

The answer I received is this:

The government did not receive in any form any information which afforded ground for a refusal of the deposit.

I beg leave to point out to the House that the answer given is not an answer to my question. I think I have a right to an answer to my question, then the House, as well as myself would form its own opinion as to whether it afforded ground for any interference.

Mr. FIELDING. There was some gossip in banking circles concerning the Farmers' Bank, of which we became aware. I do not see how we can take cognizance of that. There is an answer as to any representation that was made in the proper way. There was gossip abroad concerning the Farmers' Bank, I was well aware of it.

Mr. FOSTER. There must be some other way of getting an answer.

Mr. FIELDING. If I knew what the hon. gentleman wanted, I would be happy to give it to him.

BIRTHS AND DEATHS IN EACH PROVINCE OF CANADA.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for a return setting forth:

1. The number of births and deaths in each province of Canada in each calendar year from 1901 to 1910 both inclusive.
2. The excess or surplus of births over deaths in each such province during each of the said years.
3. The number of immigrants who located or settled or became domiciled in each such province during each such year?
4. The number of persons who emigrated from each such province during each such year?
5. The number of persons who removed from each province of Canada and settled or became domiciled in some other province in Canada in any such year, giving the number so removing from and the number so settling or becoming domiciled in each such province in each such year.
6. The like information with respect to the Yukon Territory and other territories and unorganized districts of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. These returns are not under the control of this parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The only way we can get them is to make application to the provinces. We have no power of our own to get them. We can only ask them as a matter of grace.

Mr. SPROULE. This is an order of the House generally with reference to something where you have to apply to the provinces, or to the Lieutenant Governor. I think there should be an address.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The address would be to His Excellency to procure the information. But I think there is no fault to find with the form of the motion.

Motion agreed to.

ABOLITION OF THE SENATE.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved:

That a humble address be presented to His Most Gracious Majesty the King as follows:—

Most Gracious Majesty:

We, Your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in parliament assembled, beg leave most respectfully to represent—

That in the year 1867 by Act of your imperial parliament commonly known as the British North America Act, the then existing provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were federally united and formed into one Dominion under the name of Canada, and the constitution of the legislative authority of such Dominion provided for and the nature of its executive government declared, and since the said Act other provinces in British North America have also been federally united to the said Dominion and now form part thereof, with representation in this House of Commons, pursuant to the provisions providing therefor in the said British North America Act and amending, and other, Acts subsequently enacted;

That by the said British North America Act the executive government and authority of and over Canada is declared to continue and be vested in Your Majesty and your heirs and successors, kings and queens of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and Your Majesty is represented in Canada by a governor general;

That by the said British North America Act there is also a council to aid and advise Your Majesty, styled the King's Privy Council for Canada, the members of which council are from time to time chosen and summoned by Your Majesty's said governor general and may be from time to time removed by the said governor general;

That by the said British North America Act the parliament of Canada consists of Your Majesty, an upper House styled the Senate and the House of Commons, but with powers not to exceed those at the passing of the said Act held and exercised by the Commons

House of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland;

That by the said British North America Act it is also provided that Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue or for imposing any tax or impost shall originate in the House of Commons and that no such Bill or vote, resolution or address for such appropriation or tax or impost shall be adopted or passed that has not been first recommended to that House by message of Your Majesty's said governor general in the session in which such Bill, vote, resolution or address is proposed;

That by the said British North America Act it is also provided that where any Bill passed by the House of Parliament is presented to Your Majesty's said governor general for Your Majesty's assent, he shall declare according to his discretion but subject to the provisions of the said Act and to Your Majesty's instructions, either that he assents thereto in Your Majesty's name, or that he withholds Your Majesty's assent, or that he reserves the Bill for the signification of Your Majesty's pleasure, and that where he assents to a Bill in Your Majesty's name if Your Majesty in Council within two years after receipt thereof by the Secretary of State thinks fit to disallow the Act such disallowance shall annul the Act, and that a Bill reserved for the signification of Your Majesty's pleasure shall not have any force unless and until within two years from the day on which it was presented to Your Majesty's said governor general for Your Majesty's assent he signifies to the Houses of Parliament or by proclamation that he has received the assent of Your Majesty in council;

That by the said British North America Act legislatures for the various provinces constituting the said Dominion of Canada are also established, each governed by a lieutenant governor appointed by Your Majesty's said Governor General in Council for five years, and whose salaries are required to be fixed and provided by the parliament of the Dominion of Canada and such provincial legislatures are empowered exclusively to make laws in relation to a large number of matters and subjects of great importance, subject to disallowance by Your Majesty's said Governor General in Council within one year, but not in any way subject to consent also by the said Senate;

That in regard to all matters and subjects not within the said exclusive power of the said provincial legislatures it is provided by the said British North America Act that all laws to be made by the said parliament of Canada must be consented to and passed by both the Senate and the House of Commons before being presented to Your Majesty's said Governor General for assent and the members constituting the said Senate are appointed for life and not subject to election or rejection by the people, and the members of the House of Commons are elected by the people every five years or at any less period at which Your Majesty's said Governor General may dissolve the parliament;

That during the forty years since the said British North America Act has been in force much dissatisfaction has been caused from time to time to Your Majesty's loyal subjects in Canada by the actions of the Senate in regard to matters dealt with by the House of Commons and the rejection of laws sought to be made by the people through their representatives in the House of Commons and passed by the House, and by reason of the heavy expense and burden of taxation placed upon the people to provide for the maintenance of that two-fold system of dealing with the making of laws by the parliament of Canada;

That in view of the many other provisions heretofore referred to for guarding against and disallowing any ill-advised or improper legislation which might by any possibility pass the said House of Commons, and of the aforesaid dissatisfaction of the people and heavy burden of expense involved and of the great advance made in education by the whole people of Canada since the passing of the said British North America Act, this House is of the opinion that the Senate is no longer required or advisable for the properly carrying on of responsible government in Canada, or safeguarding of Your Majesty's full rights and prerogatives; and that the abolition of the said Senate would greatly conduce to the welfare of the Dominion of Canada and promote the interests of the British Empire.

We therefore respectfully pray that the said British North America Act be so amended as to provide for the abolition of the said Senate.

He said: In rising again this session to discuss the question of a second chamber, and to move a resolution for a petition to His Majesty the King praying for the abolition of that chamber, I desire to say that although the motion is in exactly the same language as the one which I presented to the House last session, I think it is well to discuss it again at this session, principally because in the interim I have had so many communications from every province of Canada urging me to proceed with it until something substantial is done either by way of reform or abolition. The parties writing to me have almost invariably stated that they preferred abolition. Last session the vote upon my resolution was almost unanimously against it, I think only twenty three or four voted for it, principally because I think, of what some have seen fit to call the radical nature of the resolution. We have a history in regard to this matter ever since confederation, if any solution had been brought forward by the brightest and ablest minds that have been in parliament since confederation the probability is that I should not have felt it my duty to bring forward this resolution again and to move for the abolition of that chamber. But no solution has been found for what every one admits is an unsatisfactory state of things, except possibly the senators themselves for the time being.

Now, at the risk of wearying the House, I desire to go over the matter again, and show the exact position we are in. At the time of confederation a second chamber was established. No one at this day knows exactly why, but we are led to believe

from what we have read that the principal reason was because a second chamber had been established in other legislative bodies such as was being established for the government of Canada. In the state of civilization at that time there was a great deal more reason for a second chamber than there is to-day. Education was meagre comparatively to what it is to-day. The knowledge of how laws were made, how other countries were progressing, or retrograding, of what goes to make up prosperity or the adverse of prosperity, was possessed by a comparatively small percentage of the people. So much was that so that for some years after confederation it was a common thing that constituencies could not find within their borders a person fit to represent them in the House of Commons, and for years we had non-resident representation simply and mainly because there were not within the limits of constituencies people whom the voters in those constituencies thought sufficiently well educated and informed to represent them on the floor of the House of Commons. We had for many years non-resident representation, if I may use that expression, the House understanding that I mean by that a member representing a constituency wherein he did not reside, wherein perhaps he had no interest. That has almost entirely gone. I do not know that there is any one in this House at the present time, except perhaps the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. King), who represents a constituency in which he does not reside. There may be others, but if there are I do not know. I do not think that in the last parliament we had one, except perhaps the Prime Minister, who, I think the House will concede, may be an exceptional case. That illustrates what I mean by the position with regard to education. A second chamber, in my humble opinion was thought necessary at that time, probably more than for any other reason, because of the want of education, and ability in the people to intelligently and successfully deal with the important matters that parliament has to deal with. That being the position, I wish to say that I do not concede at all that because we had a second chamber at the time of confederation there is any reason for continuing it. I wish to emphasize the fact that at the time of confederation the conditions in this country were entirely different from what they are now. I do not concede in any way that anything is to be said against this resolution from the mere fact that the second chamber was established forty years ago. I do not believe that if our ancesters had realized at the time confederation was brought about that in a few years this country would have attained to the state of education at which it has arrived to-day they would have concluded that there should be a permanent second chamber. Then, the condition of things is entirely different. Having regard to the condition at that time they felt it was necessary to safeguard the constitution by having a second chamber not elected directly by the people. I suppose their reason was that they thought that the comparative ignorance of the ordinary voter might result in the creation of a sentiment in the country which would intimidate or frighten members of parliament into doing something that was altogether too radical, and not in the true interest of the country, un-British and ill-advised. Therefore, they sought to provide the check which the British constitution gives in the home land in the form of cooling chamber, so as to speak. Their object no doubt was, looking at the matter from the standpoint of the people of Canada, to prevent, by any popular or sudden declaration of public opinion, the adoption of a course that might bring about disaster to the country. The reason for having a second chamber in Great Britain is very different from what it is in this country. People who say there is the same necessity for a Senate in Canada as there is for a House of Lords in England are speaking without realizing what they are talking about. The House of Lords in England is the only safeguard between the Commons and the King, and if the House of Lords were not there the Commons would be able to force the King to abdicate if he did not give way whenever the elective chamber choose to ask his assent to any particular line of policy. There is no other safeguard, or bulwark, or cooling basin to put a check upon hasty legislation in Great Britain but the House of Lords. But, in this country, if the House of Commons, notwithstanding all that I have hinted at with regard to education to-day as compared with the state of education in the days when confederation was brought about, were to pass hasty legislation under which certain interests were injured, under which the rights of minorities were interfered with unfairly or unconstitutionally, or was tending in that direction, or if even without unconstitutional legislation the rights of minorities were interfered with, for the checking of which the second chamber is supposed to exist, I say, and I wish to emphasise this point, that the second chamber would be useless. By the constitution under which we live any Bill passed by this parliament is subject to disallowance whether there be a Senate or not. Whether the Senate exists or whether it does not exist, every Bill adopted by this parliament has to be passed upon under the constitution by the home authorities within two years and it can be, without any wrench to the constitution, abrogated, set aside, and, annulled as if it were just

so much waste paper. There are a great many gentlemen both in this House and out of the House—more out of the House—who do not appear to be well informed upon this point who are not aware of this fact, and as 'Hansard' is a public document that every person can obtain I think it is well that I should put upon 'Hansard' the sections of the British North America Act which I referred to in a previous debate on this subject last session, and which every one, who chooses to obtain a copy of 'Hansard,' can read for himself. Section 55 of the British North America Act under which we exist to-day as a parliament says this :

Where a Bill passed by the Houses of the parliament is presented to the Governor General for the Queen's assent, he shall declare according to his discretion, but subject to the provisions of this Act and to Her Majesty's instructions, either that he assents thereto in the Queen's name, or that he withholds the Queen's assent, or that he reserves the Bill for the signification of the Queen's pleasure.

Section 56,

Where the Governor General assents to a Bill in the Queen's name, he shall by the first convenient opportunity send an authentic copy of the Act to one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, and if the Queen in Council within two years after receipt thereof by the Secretary of State thinks fit to disallow the Act, such disallowance (with a certificate of the Secretary of State of the day on which the Act was received by him) being justified by the Governor General, by speech or message to each of the Houses of the parliament or by proclamation, shall annul the Act from and after the day of such signification.

Then section 57,

A Bill reserved for the signification of the Queen's pleasure shall not have any force unless and until within two years from the day on which it was presented to the Governor General for the Queen's assent, the Governor General signifies, by speech or message to each of the Houses of the parliament or by proclamation, that it has received the assent of the Queen in Council.

Then it says:

An entry of every such speech, message or proclamation shall be made in the Journal of the House.

I need not read that as it does not affect the sense. Under these sections, and more particularly under section 56, after a Bill has been passed by both Houses of this parliament as at present constituted, and notwithstanding that the Senate has approved of the Bill the assent of His Excellency to that Bill has no permanent effect, because the King in council in Great Britain, can within two years, if they see fit, disallow that Bill. Of course that would not often happen and if it did I would not be petitioning the King to abolish the Senate, because I would feel that there might be some need indirectly for the existence of that body. What I point out is that whatever action the Senate may take on a Bill, whether it rejects our Bill or whether it amends it or whether it forces us to concur in their amendments, after all, that Bill may be refused by the home government and the constitution of this country is in no way wrenched. It would be no reflection upon His Excellency—because his very appointment is a limited power of attorney in such matters if I may be pardoned for using the expression—if after he assented to that Bill it should be rejected by the home government. Now, supposing we had no Senate, is not what I have just indicated all the protection that is required for the various interests the Senate is supposed to protect. No Bill has ever been discussed in this House that has not found men here to point out that it infringes on vested interests, if that be the case. The members returned to this House have to recognize vested interests, and every other interest and if any of us were to advocate in this House an attack on these interests which the second chamber is supposed to guard, the chances are that we would not be re-elected. If any interests be disastrously affected by our legislation, these interests have in a sense control over members of parliament, and if a member of parliament be extreme or unreasonable on any point the chances are that he would not again be returned to the House. A man may come to this House of Commons biassed, but he hears the debates and discussions, and he gradually becomes more reasonable. He may fight for principles and point out why they should be put into practice, but the tendency is that the men who come here are educated by their fellow members, and the result is that the Commons does not pass legislation against any interests that may require protection from the second chamber. The need for a second chamber to-day is in an entirely different position from what it was in 1867. If a Bill of an extremely radical character were passed by this House—one of the kind the Senate is supposed to protect the country against—and if the Senate assented to it, would any one say that if that legislation were calculated to work havoc in this country, that the interests affected could not go to Great Britain and seek its disallowance. Surely, if it were not important and weighty enough to pursue with regard to it such a course as that provided in section 56, the interests affected could not be very much hurt. Let me give an instance of how the Senate as at present constituted may be a barrier to carrying into legislation the wishes of the people. I regret I have to refer to a personal matter and to speak of a Bill which I had a great deal to do with. For seven years I sought in this House to

have legislation passed providing for the better protection of human life at railway level crossings. In two sessions of one parliament that Bill was sent up to the Senate with the unanimous approval of the House, and at the first session of the succeeding parliament it was for the third time sent to the Senate. It had been discussed in the House and before committees for six years, champions on both sides of the question were heard, and at last this House of Commons unanimously, from the Prime Minister down to the last elected back-bencher on either side, approved of the Bill and sent it to the upper chamber. For the first two years the Senate refused to pass the Bill; in the third year they sent it back to us amended so that it did not mean what the Commons intended it should mean, the Senate providing that certain expenses should be borne by the municipalities in the discretion of the railway commission, instead of being paid by the railway companies as the House of Commons thought they should. After seven years consideration in this House and four years unanimous approval by the House, and the Senate having sent it back to us twice, the Prime Minister was obliged to stand up in this House and say: We cannot get what we want from the Senate and we shall have to take what they give us.

Is that a state of affairs which the fathers of confederation anticipated? Thirty members of the Senate voting one way overrode 16 members of the Senate plus 221 members of the House of Commons, with the result that the municipalities of the country, which might be fairly classed with the minorities, have since been obliged, in the discretion of the Railway Commission, to pay a part of the expense of protecting the level crossings against dangers which have been created by the railways by the fast running of their trains, and by their want of care in other respects. The 221 members of this House of Commons for three years voted unanimously for a certain measure as the only right way of meeting the evil, and were backed up by 16 senators, making 237 in all, representing the will of the people in this matter, and their action was nullified by the vote of 30 senators. That is not a state of affairs that ought to exist, or that it was ever expected would exist by the fathers of confederation when the Senate was created. With that illustration, I think I can leave it to the House to say that something ought to be done to make it impossible for that condition of affairs ever to happen again.

It is often said that the second chamber is required for the protection of minorities. Last session, in debating this question, I pointed out that the Senate had never, in the whole 40 odd years of its existence, been known to do the first thing to protect minorities; and if in those 40 odd years it has gone on without any attempt to do that, it is fair to say that it was not required for that purpose. The Prime Minister, in answering that part of my argument, though I do not think he really answered the integral and important part of my motion, said—I read from page 2056 of the unrevised 'Hansard' of last session:

> So one of the reasons, one of the inducements given to the smaller provinces, to lower Canada, and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, was that there should be an upper chamber as well as equality of representation, and this was for the protection of minorities. My hon. friend asked with some pertinence: What have the Senate done during the forty years that it has existed for the protection of the minorities? He answered, nothing. Sir, I am glad that my hon. friend from Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) can say that the Senate has done nothing in the forty years of its existence for the protection of minorities. But this is not to the discredit of the Senate, it is rather to the credit of the House of Commons. It means simply that the House of Commons has done nothing to endanger minorities.

Using the same sort of argument, I would say, with all deference to the Prime Minister, is it not equally plain that, if the House of Commons has so acted as not to require the Senate to protect minorities, that is a reason why no Senate was needed to protect minorities? If with so many diversities of opinion in this House, and with so many sections and callings represented in the cabinet, not once in the whole 40 years has any minority required to be protected, is that not a good reason why the Senate is not required at all?

Going on with the history of what public men have done about the Senate, let me point out that this constitution was not in existence 20 years before murmurings began to arise concerning the Senate. This murmuring increased to such an extent that 17 years ago one of the great political parties of the country, at a convention held in Ottawa in 1893, passed the following resolution in regard to it:

> The present constitution of the Senate is inconsistent with the federal principle in our system of government, and is in other respects defective, as it makes the Senate independent of the people, and uncontrolled by public opinion of the country, and should be so amended as to bring it into harmony with the principles of popular government.

Now, two things stand out prominently in that resolution. That great political party declared that the Senate was inconsistent with federal principles and that it was in other respects defective, and it pledged itself, on going into power, to remedy those defects. From that time to this there have been various agitations on this subject in the country, but the govern-

ment has not since it attained power, made any proposition which would be acceptable to any large proportion of public men towards remedying those defects.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was pointing out what seemed to me to be instances of the lack of usefulness of the Senate in making legislation in this country during the last ten years. In this connection I would point out that nearly every public man of standing in the Liberal party has, at one time or another, some of them many times, during the last ten or fifteen years, stated many objections to our present system of legislation, owing to the inefficiency or worse of the Senate. For instance two years ago Senator Sir Richard Scott, almost immediately after he had ceased to be a member of the present cabinet—and I do not know whether that fact has any significance—made one of the most emphatic utterances in condemnation of the present system of appointment to the Senate, and introduced in that chamber a motion seeking to reform it. His motion was to this effect:

That in the opinion of the Senate the time has arrived for so amending the constitution of this branch of parliament as to bring the mode of selection of senators more into harmony with public opinion.

This is a clear and distinct statement by a senator of many years' standing that he recognizes that the Senate is not at all in harmony with public opinion, and reading between the lines it is easy to understand from his language that he believed the constitution must be so amended as to make the Senate of more use to the country. Sir Richard Scott supported this motion earnestly. He suggested as a mode of appointment the election of two-thirds of the members of the Senate by the people and the appointment of one-third by the Crown, for seven years in each case. His suggestion did not meet with very much favour, in fact no suggestion for the reform of the Senate has ever met with strong support from any large number of people. One gentleman will propose one reform, another a different reform, some newspaper a third, but, practically speaking, no plan receives the support of any person except the proposer of the reform. In fact, although the large majority of the people and of the members of parliament believe that, as Sir Richard Scott says, the Senate must be reformed, no two people will agree as to what reform should be made. The Prime Minister will remember that three years ago, speaking on the motion of the present deputy Speaker (Mr. McIntyre) for the reform of the Senate, the right hon. gentleman pointed out just what I have said. He discussed seriatim all the reforms that have been suggested and decided that not one of them was acceptable. The Prime Minister has not himself suggested any method of reform. By the Liberal platform of 1893 he and his party were pledged to the reform of the Senate. The Prime Minister is a man of great ability and ingenuity who is never without means to accomplish what he thinks ought to be accomplished in the interests of this country, yet since 1896, for nearly fifteen years, the Prime Minister has had it within his power as Prime Minister to introduce some of the reforms to which he pledged himself in 1893 and on which he attained office in 1896. If the Prime Minister, holding office under that pledge, with all his ability, his vast resources of mind, and his great power, has not been able to effect a reform, it is fair and reasonable to take the position that the Senate is not working properly and in the interests of the country, that it cannot be reformed, and that it should be abolished. Therefore, I believe the concrete motion I have brought forward, which takes the form of an humble petition to His Gracious Majesty to so amend the British North America Act as to provide for the abolition of the Senate, is the only sensible, practical, reasonable action for this House to take under the circumstances. To assume otherwise is to assume that while the Prime Minister with the vast majority he has had since 1896, with all his power, with all his ability having been unable to effect a reform, some of us can do what he cannot do, an assumption which is ridiculous.

In view of all these circumstances one must come to the conclusion that the only sensible, practical and reasonable thing to do is to petition the imperial parliament to provide for the abolition of the Senate as an entirely unnecessary body.

Other prominent members of the Liberal party vigorously followed up the pledge contained in the platform of 1895. Sir Richard Cartwright, another member of the Senate, was one of the most emphatic speakers on this question. He has been, from the beginning, a member of the present administration. He was one of the leading Liberals of the country in 1893, and was present at that convention. When this plank was made in the party platform, he expected—and, as it turned out, rightly expected—to be a member of the cabinet if his party attained power. He sat for years in this House as a member of the government and deskmate of the Prime Minister, and it is only a few years ago that he was translated to the upper chamber, where he sits still as a member of the

government. This hon. gentleman, in 1896, following up what he understood to be the opinion of the Liberal party—and you cannot blame me if I think the same as he did—that the Senate should be abolished, and speaking in Massey Hall, Toronto, dealt with this question of the Senate. Remember, he had had three years since 1893 in which to thoroughly consider and understand what the platform of 1893 meant. And I have his words before me. I put them on 'Hansard' last year, but it will do no harm to refresh the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite on this subject. He said:—

> The Senate was a millstone around the neck of the Canadian people which he prayed that Providence would soon remove.

If he is still praying, the locality from which he offers his prayers, I should think, would prevent them from doing much good. I doubt if his prayers go through the roof, for he occupies a place in the very institution for the abolition of which he was praying in 1896. Speaking seriously to the people on the eve of a general election, speaking as right-hand man and prospective colleague of the leader whom he wished to see placed in power, trying to convince the people that his party should be put in power, he declared the Senate to be a millstone around the neck of the Canadian people, which he prayed that Providence would soon remove. How he was ever able to take a seat in the Senate after that I do not know, but since he has been in the Senate I have not heard of him offering up that prayer. If there was cause in 1896, why this august body, the Senate, should be removed, in the opinion of Sir Richard Cartwright and of the present Prime Minister, what has happened since then to justify a change of their opinion?

Now, the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) may not have intended to say quite what he did say in answer to me when I spoke on this subject last session. What he said will be found at page 2054 of 'Hansard.' He spoke in part as follows:—

> It may be that the present action of the Senate is not satisfactory to my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster). I can remember when the action of the Senate as it existed twenty years ago was not very satisfactory to me, for instance. My scruples are not the same to-day as they were then, and it may be that the time will come when my hon. friend will change his views on this point, and, the composition of the Senate being different, his objection may be removed. But he says that, as no satisfactory reform of the Senate is suggested, there is a general opinion that the condition of the Senate at the present time is not satisfactory and that all heartily desire a change. I agree that there has been a strong suggestion made at different times and in different quarters that we should have a reform of the Senate.

What does that mean? I can only take one meaning from it, and that is that when the majority of members of the Senate were of a different stripe from the right hon. gentleman it was a bad Senate, but since, by the effluxion of time and other causes, a majority of the Senate is now made up of his friends, and largely of his own appointees, his objection is removed. I hope that was not his meaning, because it would be no answer to my argument. It is such an argument as no independent-minded man would consider for a moment. But there has been no change in the Senate except in the political complexion of the majority. I regret if I have taken the wrong meaning from what the right hon. gentleman said; if I am wrong, I hope he will put me right. But I am forced to the conclusion that the reason why the opinion of the right hon. gentleman has changed in the last twenty years is that the political complexion of the Senate to-day is different from what it was twenty years ago. I can assure the right hon. gentleman that my grievance against the Senate is not merely that the political complexion of the Senate does not please me. My objection to them is that very often they do nothing to help the country to secure good legislation, and when they do wake up, they wake up at the wrong time, obstruct good legislation passed by this House, and so do mischief.

There was another hon. gentleman who, in his lifetime was very highly respected, now gone to his reward—Sir Oliver Mowat. He was everywhere respected for his ability as a public man. He also joined the cabinet of the right hon. Prime Minister, becoming his Minister of Justice. In 1896 he was active in trying to get the present Prime Minister placed in power, and he, like others, spoke on the subject of the Senate. I placed one of his remarks on 'Hansard' last year, but it will do no harm to repeat it and so remind hon. members of what was said. It will be found at page 2042 of 'Hansard' of last year:

> We are agreed as to the necessity of a fundamental reform of the Senate, if, for any reason, it must or should be retained.

The pith of that sentence—yes, and its sting—are in the last clause, 'if, for any reason, it must or should be retained.' It is quite clear that Sir Oliver Mowat thought that there was no need of it at all. Sir Oliver Mowat thought there was no need of it at all, at most he would compromise on a reform of the Senate, and he took care to say: We are all agreed. That is, all the leading members of his party who were going to form a cabinet after they got into power, as they did in 1896, were agreed that something must be done. Now

we must assume in all fairness to this government that they have tried their best since 1896 to carry out that pledge and to reform the Senate. We have a right to assume that they have striven night and day to devise some way by which they could reform that Senate. Now this government must be intending to carry out those pledges, and in all fairness to them we must assume that they have ever since been endeavouring to find some solution to this problem. They have been unable to do so. Then in the name of common sense, in the name of everything that is reasonable, is it not time that a petition was sent to His Gracious Majesty asking him either to remove the Senate, or to reform it in the interest of this country?

Now, some people say there are large matters dealt with in the Senate, and we never know that one of these large matters might come up in regard to which the Senate might act as a cooling basin, to allow parliament and the country to give further consideration to the matter, in short to act as a check on hasty legislation that might be indulged in by this chamber. But look at the province of Ontario—no Senate, no second chamber, no trouble, but dealing with a great many important matters that come right home to the people, matters like direct taxation which the people feel instantly. Now, the province of Ontario has not had a second chamber for years and years, it was abolished almost directly after confederation, and no one ever said that the legislature of Ontario passes hasty legislation, or that the people are not satisfied with it. I believe the only provinces in the Dominion that still technically continue their second chambers are Quebec and Nova Scotia, but so little work have they ever done that scarcely any one realizes that there is a second chamber in those provinces. So I say that in view of all the important matters that are dealt with by the provincial legislatures with a single chamber, we are justified in concluding that if those legislatures do not need a second chamber neither does this parliament. Why? If it were a matter of sufficient importance, as I have already pointed out, any Bill could be delayed by the home government, and there would not need to be any wrench to the constitution.

There has been another suggestion for reform which the Prime Minister says he does not approve and that is appointments by the provincial legislatures. I do not think a Senate appointed by the provincial legislatures would work satisfactorily. and I will tell you why. Senators thus appointed would be swayed by purely local influences, they would be provincial in their ideas, and partial to the provinces that appointed them. If any legislation bore rather harder on one province than upon another, you would find the senators from that particular province obstructing that legislation, believing that in so doing they were carrying out the will of the province that appointed them. We would find no independence in a body thus appointed. Let me give you another illustration to show how this so-called independent Senate is a broken reed upon which we cannot rely. Here is a case that might happen any day. The government might bring down a Bill which was unpopular. Supposing, for instance, that last session the Canadian Senate had seen fit to oppose the government Bill creating a Canadian Navy on the ground that it was unconstitutional. Supposing after the government's majority in this House had voted the Bill through, the Senate had rejected it, and sent that Bill back here. This government has power to appoint senators by its own inherent power, and we all know that whatever government is in power their tendency is to appoint senators of that particular stripe. Does any one suppose that that institution, appointed by the party in power for purely political reasons, is going to resist their masters who appointed them, and would declare their independence of the government that placed any Bill before them? Where would be your responsible government under such circumstances?

Now, I can well understand that any one who was determined on separation from Great Britain might desire that the Senate should continue to exist. But I could not understand an imperialist holding such an idea, because if a man is an imperialist he feels absolutely safe in the fact that the home government would, in any case where vested interests were interfered with, or injustice was being done, interpose its veto within the two years' prescribed by the constitution. But I could understand that a man having in view separation from Great Britain would not wish to see the Senate abolished, because if the country is going to separate from Great Britain then he would want a second chamber here to keep us right instead of the very thing which the imperialist would desire, a right to appeal to the home government under the circumstances I have mentioned. But any one who does not wish a separation from Great Britain might suppose there was no need of a second chamber.

Now, I wish to put a quotation or two on the 'Hansard' to show what the newspapers are saying about this matter. Take, for instance, the Toronto 'Star,' a paper that is not looking for opportunities to find fault with the present administration. In fact, I think I can go further and say that

it is a very faithful supporter of the government to-day. On January 4, 1909, the Toronto 'Star' said:—

As the matter now stands the Senate is simply an addition to the patronage of the government.

That is the statement of a paper supporting this government.

Patronage in the Civil Service we have learned to endure through custom, but surely it is unwise to extend the system of patronage to the appointment of those who make the laws of the land. Responsible government means the responsibility of the government to parliament, but who can speak seriously of the responsibility of a government to a portion of parliament appointed by the government itself?

Exactly, if I may interpolate, this is the very point that I was endeavouring to make to-night of a Bill going to the Senate sent up by a majority of this House, and the Senate rejecting it to help out the government. The 'Star' goes on:—

The plan laid before the Senate by the Hon. Sir R. W. Scott is good in so far as it proposes to substitute election for appointment. An elected Senate, dealing independently with the measures sent up by the House of Commons, including government measures, might occasionally serve a good purpose. It is doubtful whether such a body could work in harmony with a system which requires that the government of the day shall have a parliamentary majority for the support of its measures, but if it were found unworkable it would probably be a half-way house on the road to abolition, which to many seems to be the logical solution of the problem.

I may not be in very good company with the 'Star' but I call it as a witness. We find the 'Star' supporting this government strenuously since it came into power. I do not know whether this paper was in existence before the government came into power, but I see that it has been thriving very well since the government has been in power. It says that practical abolition is the logical solution, but that until you get abolition you had better have an elected body, a half way house to the final consummation so devoutly wished for. The 'Star' on November 16, 1909, said this:—

Against the Senate we wish to register several objections. The least of these is that it is a feeble echo of the party in power in the Commons. When the Senate does nothing but ratify the will of the Commons, we see it at its best, for we are then having representative government. The will of the elected parliament is not being frustrated by another body, whose members are chosen for reasons the people know nothing about, and which no amount of study can enable them to understand. At such a time the Senate is only unnecessary, and nothing worse.

Yet we must qualify the statement, for in that case it is even worse than unnecessary and worse than being a profitless expense, because no member of parliament knows just how soon a vacancy in the Senate may occur, and it is not uncommon to find representatives of the people forfeiting their popularity at the polls confident of reaching that upper chamber where no poll is long enough to reach them.

At another time the Senate is not the feeble echo of the Commons. We submit that it is seen at its worst when it resists the will of the Commons, or undertakes to originate legislation. In that case it weakens popular government, impedes, and frustates it. Why should the people support an appointed House to resist and baffle the purposes of an elected one?

Then I will refer once more to the 'Star,' bringing it down to November 30, 1909. At the end of a long article, all of which I need not trouble the House by reading, we find this conclusion:—

But the fact that the Canadian Senate does not go to such lengths as the British House of Lords does not make it a desirable part of our constitution. If birth ought not to make a legislator, neither should a legislator be appointed by the government, which ought to be checked and controlled by the legislative body. It is the tendency of all bodies not elected by the people to become reactionary. The Senate of the United States is in this respect not much better than the British House of Lords. All appointed bodies, freed from the wholesome influence of public control, tend to lose touch with the people, and to voice the opinions and sentiments of privileged classes.

I will give a quotation in rather terse language from a paper for which, if I may be pardoned for saying so, I have more respect, and that is the Toronto 'Mail and Empire.' The Toronto 'Mail and Empire,' writing about this matter on the 5th January, 1910, said this:—

Canadians are being incited by several papers to indignation against the House of Lords as a political institution. Like other human works, the House of Lords is full of imperfections, but candour compels us to admit that it is both an abler and a more conscientious legislative body than the Senate of Canada or the Senate of the United States. In practice, also, it is more democratic than either of these chambers.

Then, a very short quotation from the Goderich 'Signal,' and a comment from the Hamilton 'Spectator' upon it:—

The Goderich 'Signal' shouts 'No quarter for the Canadian Senate,' but would'nt 'no quarters' be a quicker way of getting rid of that body?

These are terse, and, it may be, somewhat flippant comments upon the Senate, but you may see what they illustrate. Here is the Goderich 'Signal' saying that there should be 'no quarter for the Canadian Senate.' It means that the Senate is abso-

lutely no use in the opinion of the Goderich 'Signal.' Then the Hamilton 'Spectator' quotes that on January 24, 1910, and says—and I agree with the 'Spectator—that 'no quarters' would be a quicker way of getting rid of that body; that is to say, furnish no place for them to meet, do not summon them to attend, and let them have their appointments for life. What the 'Spectator' means is to leave them so that they do not meddle with the popular chamber by interfering with legislation and by obstructing the progress of the country as they are apt to do and have done in the past. The 'Spectator' means to say: Do not summon them to Ottawa, do not place before them something to enable them to make pretense that they are legislating; let them live out their lives; let them live as long as they possibly can. We hope that they may live for ever, and I do not think that the country would object to continuing their indemnity but let them not meddle and let them work themselves out, so that, without waiting very long for it, we would have the consummation that is here desired and there would be no more trouble about it. The Toronto 'Globe,' with all its loyal support of this government, says this about the Senate, writing on January 10, 1911:—

It is to be hoped there is no basis of truth for the statement in the opposition press that the total membership of the Senate is to be 'largely' increased. The Senate is too large already. Reform in the direction of abolishing life senatorships and reducing the membership is long overdue.

There are many such suggestions in favour of the abolition of the Senate. Going through newspapers of different kinds and on different sides of politics you find many arguments and these arguments are well known to the Prime Minister, to the cabinet and to those who could, with the force they have behind them, and even without forcing their views through, but by argument and reasoning, find some solution if there is any solution to be found with regard to the Senate. They could find some means of reforming it. But, the time having gone by for any suggested reformation, I have come to the conclusion that the only successful and practical thing to do is to appeal to His Most Gracious Majesty the King to grant us some means for the abolition of it. Before concluding I ought to put on record some citations from a book which I have had the opportunity of perusing since I spoke upon this question last year. This is a new work upon the subject published last year in England, written by Prof. Harold W. V. Temperley, in London, and entitled 'Senates and upper chambers':—

I read this book with a good deal of care and I think it my duty to put on record certain of the opinions it contains, written by a British subject and a friendly critic of Canada. At page 43 the author says:

Practical experience of the difficulty of constituting upper chambers in the Australasian colonies even induced Earl Grey himself to modify his bicameral views (?). He declared their danger to lie in the fact that the division of the legislature into two branches withdrew some of the most able and intelligent men from the lower chamber 'in a community not numerous enough to furnish more than a few persons qualified for such duties.' Even if it did not do this the upper chamber might be composed of mere party men without ability, in which case it must become discredited and weak. He was therefore led into a practical advocacy of single chambers for the colonies (8).

I now consider it to be very doubtful, at least, whether the single legislature (chamber) ought not under any circumstances to be preferred.

This is written in 1910. I quote from page 46:

Since the granting of responsible government the Canadian colonies have never shown much enthusiasm for their upper chambers, which have been abolished in four of the provinces. In the beginning the Australasian colonies adopted two chambers with unanimity, but subsequent experience qualified their enthusiasm. In our third group, the South African colonies, the attachment to the bicameral system has, from the first, been singularly lukewarm. Cape Colony adopted two chambers in the early fifties, and appears to have retained them without much protest after the introduction of responsible government (1872). But the Cape upper chamber, being elective, threatened to challenge the supremacy of the lower house. Its example and claims were not encouraging, and they seem to have impressed the other colonies in South Africa. When Natal petitioned for responsible government she made a determined effort to get rid of an upper chamber altogether, and only yielded to the strong opinion of the Home government in the matter (1893). It is quite clear that the upper chambers in the Transvaal and Orange River colony are only temporary ones in their present character, and it is by no means certain that it was not intended that they should be abolished altogether in the future. As for the federal Senate of South Africa the constitution gives it no special protection after ten years; and 'furthermore (this is an open secret) there was a strong party in the convention in favour of doing without it altogether.' The feeling here shown is more significant than any of the other instances adduced. Whatever may have been thought of single-chamber government in a unitary state, it had always been previously considered that an upper chamber was indispensable for a federal state. If the collective wisdom of South Africa could for a moment seriously contemplate doing without one in the federal constitution, it is quite evident that it absolutely condemns the bicameral system for unitary states, and in this judgment we see the severest criticism that the two-chamber system has hitherto received.

But in any case the general testimony of our other colonies to the worth of the bicameral system must be regarded as a somewhat ungracious one. Nowhere is the upper chamber really imposing in the unitary colonies, in few is it actually powerful, in many it is regarded as a rather tedious relic of a by-gone age. In Canada and South Africa, certainly, it is looked upon as an ancestral relative, whose death would not cause any particular grief to the colonies in question, though they do not care to terminate his existence by speedier means. The Home government stands by acting the part of the family doctor, bidding the eager heirs to have patience, and meanwhile doing its best to keep the aged patient alive by cordials and by encouragement.

Again at page 141 this learned author says:

Whatever the theory, which gave birth to the bicameral system, the working out of that theory has been almost directly contrary to the ideals of its founders. The old idea certainly was that the Upper Chamber should be a 'checking' Chamber, and should in certain cases possess an absolute veto on the will of the people. The progress of democracy has transformed all that, and this idea now prevails only in the state legislatures of America. There it must indeed be admitted that the Upper Chamber may still be a real checking Chamber, but it is only powerful because democracy has rivetted fetters in itself. The election of state senators and popular representatives on the same tenure, the presence of corruption in the Upper Chamber and of lethargy among the electors has tended in practice to a maintenance of old conditions of which nobody in America really approves. But wherever democracy is progressive, wherever the people become more united and better educated, there the idea of a checking Chamber disappears.

Again at page 224 the author says:

In theory, the Senate of Canada possesses equal powers of legislation with those of the Lower House, except that it cannot originate money Bills. It has, however, full power either to amend or to reject them. In practice, its nominee Senate has not proved very important or effective, largely because it has always been the tool of a party. By 1873 it had been filled with the nominees of the Conservative party, and since then it has been refilled according to the views of the party installed in office. A Liberal member was once appointed by the Conservative premier, Sir John Macdonald, but the present Liberal premier, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, has never departed from the strict party rule. Since it is so obviously the creature of party, such a body cannot evidently have much claim on the reverence of the country. The fact that its members are appointed for life might tend to produce some difficulty when the opposing party gets into office, but the balance is gradually redressed as vacancies appear. None the less, if the present Liberal party had only had a short spell of office, their legislation might have been interfered with. In 1873, when the Liberal party was in power for two years, the Conservative Senate vetoed several measures and provoked considerable complaint at the time from the ministry, though McKenzie subsequently acknowledged that the Senate had used its power to suspend rash and hasty legislation, rather than to check genuinely popular or national measures. Since then their opposition has been more guarded, but a popular agitation against the Senate has been growing, and a desire for its abolition is frequently expressed. No methods of adjustment between the two chambers, other than those by conference or committee, have yet been used. By the constitution, however, it is provided that 'if at any time, on the recommendation of the Governor in Council, the King thinks fit to direct that three or six members be added to the Senate, the Governor in Council may, by summons to three or six qualified persons, as the case may be, representing the three divisions of Canada, add to the Senate accordingly.' In other words, a limited creation of life members for the purpose of 'swamping' can be made. A 'swamping' procedure, when exercised, has everywhere tended to reduce the nominee Senate to impotence, and in Canada this actual result has been attained without this stretch of prerogative. It is difficult to resist Goldwin Smith's conclusion that the Canadian Senate is as nearly a cipher as it is possible for an assembly legally invested with large powers to be. At any rate, the prestige attaching to its federal character has been unable to save the Canadian Senate from that curse of impotence and sterility which seems to settle over all nominee upper chambers in purely unitary states.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am about to conclude; in view of these opinions expressed by a not unfriendly critic writing last year in London, England, and in view again of the fact that for 14 years this government has made no effort to reform what has been an unsatisfactory state of affairs with regard to the Senate of this country, I have the temerity to move an humble address to His Majesty in the form of the motion placed in your hands.

Mr. A. McCALL (Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a few remarks on the question before the House, but I am not vain enough to think that I can suggest a remedy for the condition of things which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has placed before us. In his address the hon. gentleman stated that the Prime Minister was unable to find a scheme for the reform of the Senate which met with his approval, out of the many that had been proposed. If I should have the good fortune to offer a means of reform that will meet with the approval of the right hon. gentleman then I shall have spoken to some purpose; at all events I shall make the attempt. I must say that among business men, thoughtful men who are anxious for the progress and development of this country, I have not found any strong sentiment in favour of the total abolition of the Senate. The constitutional difficulties in the way of such a proposal are of

course great. The question of how far a second chamber can steady legislation and can shape it in a proper course to the advantage of the country, is a large one. I think, Sir, that for the purpose of this discussion we must assume that the Senate will continue and that therefore we may direct our attention to some practical plan of reform which will bring the second chamber more in touch with our people and allot to it a more active participation in our legislation. I believe that I voice the opinion of this House when I say that it is desirable that both legislative bodies be kept well in front with the march of thought in the country, and should fairly express and give effect to the best views of the people of Canada. It may be said as an objection to a second chamber that it may at some period be composed entirely of members of one political school of thought. We on this side of the House trust that that will not happen; but our best hopes may be blasted, and we may see the Senate composed of gentlemen only in sympathy with the dominant party. I believe it is a theory that when a gentleman enters the second chamber he leaves partisanship aside; but I can scarcely hope, from my limited knowledge of those gentlemen, that that will ever be realized. I will even say that should the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. George Taylor) be appointed to the Senate, as we all trust he will be in due time, I doubt if he would wholly forget the battles he fought in the country and in this House, and would not occasionally, when the party spirit ran high, be out for a little blood. It may be, as the hon. member for Lincoln has said, that the fact that the senators are appointed for life makes them indifferent to the questions which affect the people who are out in the struggle. I believe that is the case.

Summing up the various objections to the Senate, perhaps the strongest that can be urged against it is the life appointment. Old age and bodily weakness comes to all of us; but I think it strikes the average man that there is something peculiarly grotesque in a body of men perhaps one-fourth or more of whom are wholly unfit to discharge legislative duties. It is a condition that I believe the country would rather not have. Understand, I am saying nothing by way of disrespect of the very able gentlemen who form the Senate. However, it is hardly in line with our democratic thought that there should be placemen, men appointed to draw emoluments when they have become unable to discharge the duties of the positions to which they are appointed. I believe that is after all the strongest objection that exists in the minds of public men. If a plan could be devised that would bring the Senate into more activity, that would secure the appointment of men, not because they have been unsuccessful politicians or because they have contested constituencies and lost, or because they have helped the party in its hour of need, but because they possessed special knowledge of some of the great problems that confront this Canada of ours, we would have a better Senate. We have great problems. Our public affairs become more complex every year. I remember when the tariff question was simply a question of high tariff or low tariff, of 17½ per cent or 28 per cent. Now we have every possible shade of tariff—the minimum, the maximum, the preferential, and the favoured nation, and all that sort of thing. A member of this House may come here honestly desirous of studying tariff questions so that he can speak intelligently upon them, and he will spend one or two sessions before he gets the technical knowledge necessary. The same is true of the transportation question, the question of the conservation of our natural resources, and even the greater question of how we shall secure the proper diffusion of wealth and opportunity among all our people and the proper development of our country. All these questions call for men of big brain and big heart, and we ought to have them in one or the other of the governing bodies of this country. In saying this I am not reflecting on the ability of the members of this House; but I make the appeal to hon. gentlemen if it is not possible that men with a larger outlook, a greater viewpoint, could be added to the debating and legislative ability of the Senate. I assume that the average legislative life of a member of the Senate is eighteen years; I think it will be fully that, though I have not made the exact computation. If gentlemen were appointed to the Senate for six years instead of for life, there would be three appointments where there is now one. Six years is a fairly long term, and it would be a sufficient reward to a gentleman appointed for party services. That would give three times the number of appointments. I am dismissing from this discussion the question of electing senators by the provincial legislatures. The recent events in the election of senators in the United States have been, I am sure, an object lesson which should satisfy the people of this country for all time to come. I also dismiss the plan of electing senators by large districts. The burden of discussion and the expense necessary for such elections make that plan unworkable, and under it we would not perhaps secure any better men. The only plan, then, that can be considered is the present one, of appointment, with the change I propose of having three appointments where now there is one. The first appointment might be made, as it has been in the past, by the ministry of the day to reward a faithful supporter

who has done good work in this House and in the country; but to preserve somewhat the balance of power, to prevent the Senate becoming wholly partisan, and to enable the minority to become represented, the next appointment might be made by the hon. leader of the opposition. That makes two of the three appointments. The third appointment then is in the hands of the Prime Minister. Would it be possible that there could be an understanding, a convention or unwritten agreement between the parties, and the great papers representing the parties should agree, that in making the third appointment the Prime Minister should select men who are bulking large in the public service of the country, prominent bankers, prominent newspaper writers, or teachers in our great colleges or railway managers. This country has produced a great many such men, we are bringing them forward all the time, and I believe that men could be got who have been successful in their careers, who would take such an appointment for the honour, not for the emolument. Such men would be of great service to the country and their appointment would have the effect of making the Senate a continuing body of men of ability. Then the problems that are troubling us now, and we must always have such problems, could be dealt with by that body with plenty of time, without partisanship, and in that way we could get the best solution of such questions that could possibly be obtained. There may be some difficulty in working out the plan I have suggested, but I believe that it is worthy of some thought. Such men can be obtained and they would bring to the service of the country the special qualities that are needed.

I have expressed my thought on this matter with some hesitation because I realize how great are the questions with which we have to deal. The only solution that could be accepted would be one that could be brought without disturbing the constitution and without taking an appeal to the King as is proposed in the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford). Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) should persist in his resolution as he does. I know that my hon. friend is very persistent in his views, but it seems to me that three times hand running in three different sessions is rather overdoing it. My hon. friend from Lincoln is generally a strong supporter or defender of established rights, but in this case he is trying to upset entirely not only established rights, but a solemn agreement. As I understand it, the Senate of Canada was established at the time of confederation. It was established largely with a view of protecting as much as possible the interests of the smaller provinces. You know that there is a tendency throughout the world to legislate on the principle that might is right. Therefore, I do not blame the smaller provinces for putting in the agreement of confederation some clauses by which their rights might be protected. When my hon. friend moves a resolution that this House should appeal to the King in Council or to the imperial parliament to abolish the Senate he apparently does not take into consideration that he could not possibly do that without the consent of these smaller provinces, and of the Senate itself, unless he absolutely overpowers them, and goes over their heads. I am quite sure that even my hon. friend would not ask us to break a solemn pledge even if we have the power. Therefore, the only way that the Senate can be either abolished or reformed, so far as I can understand, is to get the consent of the Senate itself and of all the provinces before we do anything in the matter, unless we adopt the theory that might is right and override them by appealing to the Crown. The smaller provinces, as I understand it, will insist on the protection that has been provided in the constitution of our country, in the Act of Confederation. My hon. friend says that in Ontario they have but a single House. That is quite true. He also says that no wrong or hurried legislation could be passed through this House without being objected to by some members. I quite believe that might be true, but at the same time the majority would govern. I had the honour of replying to my hon. friend on this question once before, and I then said that so far as I knew the Senate or a second chamber was of advantage to this country and was absolutely necessary to prevent hasty legislation. No matter how that second chamber may be established, I still think a second chamber is absolutely necessary to prevent hasty or undigested legislation or legislation that has not been sufficiently considered before being passed. I have no brief to defend the present Senate, but I believe, as I said once before, that if it is going to be appointed just as capable men can be appointed from the ranks of the party in power as from the ranks of the party in opposition. If there was a vacancy in the Senate now, I am free to confess that I think the party in power should have the right to pick out, and that they can select as good men from their own ranks as they possibly could from the ranks of the opposition, and I am perfectly willing that the nomination should be made in that way. I have no particular fault to find with the present Senate. I have been here but a short time, but I know that a number of very useful Bills have been originated in the Senate, and that

some very capable amendments have been made to Bills that went up from this House. These amendments were perfectly right, and no fault was found with them by this House, which adopted them in most cases without discussion. That shows that the Senate are capable. I do not believe that even my hon. friend would venture to say that the individual members of the Senate are not absolutely capable.

I was much taken with the speech of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. McCall) because I think he spoke earnestly and spoke his mind. He made some very excellent suggestions. I do not agree that the senators should be appointed for only six years; if you are going to continue to nominate, I think the term should certainly be longer than that. I think the term should certainly be longer than six years. As to the suggestion of my hon. friend from Lincoln that the Senate should be abolished, I think, with all due deference to the hon. gentleman, that if he really wishes to write his name upon the pages of history he should apply the time and patience he used in preparing speeches in support of Senate abolition to the discovery of means of reforming the Senate if it needs reform. Personally, I do not say that the present form of the Senate should be particularly changed. If that body is to be reformed, it certainly should be, in my judgment, on democratic lines, by election in some form. My suggestion would be that a certain number of senators be elected at large for each province, or, if not elected at large, that the senatorial districts be larger—perhaps twice or three times more extensive—than the constituency of a member of the House of Commons.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) says that he introduced a railway measure that was voted for by 220 members of this House and by 16 members of the Senate, but that 20 members of the Senate threw out that Bill. I remember the Bill he speaks of, but, unfortunately for me, I was so green that I did not know it was going through the House until it was passed. Personally, I was opposed to the Bill, and would have voted against it if I had had sense enough to know that it was going through the House. I do not know that any other members were in the same position, but I know that there were many who were not in favour of the Bill. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that, perhaps, the Senate did not do so badly in that case.

Mr. LANCASTER. What I said was that the House passed the Bill unanimously three times. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Nesbitt) was in his seat and did not raise his voice against it.

Mr. NESBITT. And I have told the hon. gentleman why, and I am quite frank in my acknowledgment. The hon. gentleman said also something to the effect that those who were in favour of abolishing the Senate were imperialists, or that the imperialists need not be afraid to abolish the Senate because Great Britain would look after our interests, but that those who were in favour of separation from Great Britain—I think that was the way he put it—would oppose the abolition of the Senate.

Mr. LANCASTER. I said they might be in favour of it possibly.

Mr. NESBITT. I consider that a very wonderful thought on the part of the hon. gentleman. I think it was a great draught on his powers of imagination; I confess that it was too much for me; I could not follow it. As to the usefulness of the Senate and our need to have our legislation checked, let me once more say that I am aware that the present Senate has introduced and sent to this chamber valuable legislation and that they have made useful amendments in the Bills sent to them from this House. As to the present personnel of the Senate, so far as I know, the Senators are as capable, man for man, as members of this House. In one thing I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster), and that is that some of the Senators have attained too great an age to take a useful part in the work of legislation. But it is extremely difficult to fix an age limit, because some men at seventy are better than they were at fifty, some men of seventy-five, with matured minds and wide experience, are better for the work of legislation than other men at sixty-five or less. Therefore, I could not advocate the age limit for the Senate.

I do not think my hon. friend can expect many members of this House to vote for his resolution. Certainly the idea of abolishing the Senate is repugnant to me. I would assist in any way I could a reasonable measure of reform of the Senate, and I believe that the best reform would be by a system of election.

Mr. G. E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon). My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has spoken very strongly in favour of the abolition of the Senate. Perhaps, as a younger man, I would have agreed with him; but I must say that my experience in Ottawa has led me to see that a second chamber is a very useful body. I think that any person who has had experience with our Railway Committee, for instance, would come to the conclusion that he would rather have a measure for which he wished deliberate thought considered in the Senate than in our own House. We know, too, that measures which are very useful indeed are introduced in the Senate, and, after mature consideration,

are brought before this House, and that the work of this House is relieved to a very great degree. The reason why we have not had any considerable agitation concerning the Senate, either for its abolition or reform, lies, I think, in the fact that there has been no conflict between the two Houses.

My hon. friend from Lincoln referred to the resolution which was passed by the Liberal convention of 1893. There had been two events which brought to the mind of the Liberal party, at any rate, the advisability of a change in the Senate. Questions had arisen in the House of Commons involving the rights of minorities. In 1882 a monstrous gerrymander Bill was passed by the government of the day, under which the rights of the Liberal minority were taken away, and if ever there was a time calling for the action of the Senate on behalf of a minority it was then, but that opportunity they ignored. On a later occasion, in 1885, the Conservative government introduced a Franchise Act which was framed with the idea of disfranchising a great portion of the Liberal electorate, and it was only by the strenuous fighting of the very able opposition of that day that the designs of the Conservative government were frustrated. I think it was these two instances in which the Senate had not shown themselves to be the protectors of minorities, that led the Liberal party of that day to declare in favour of Senate reform. There has been no agitation in the Conservative party for a reform of the Senate. I am very glad indeed to be able to congratulate the Conservative party that there is a government in power which has never endeavoured to pass measures in this House which would deprive the Conservative party of their rights, and they have never had occasion to complain of the Senate that that body was not according them full protection. I think in the two instances I have given, you find the reasons why the Liberal party of 1893 were strongly in favour of Senate reform. I have said that the reason there is no agitation to-day is because there is no conflict. It lies further in the fact that this is a democratic body. My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) spoke of making the Senate an elective body, that is to say, a democratic body, by giving it co-equal power with this House of Commons. I think, Sir, that would be a mistake. I think it would be a mistake to create another body with co-equal authority from the people with this House of Commons, because to that degree it would diminish the power and authority of the House of Commons. The security which we have in Canada to-day for sound legislation lies in the fact that the Senate agrees with the House of Commons. For that reason I think it is desirable that the power of appointment should continue to continue to reside in the government of the day.

I agree with my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. McCall) in his suggestion that the change be made in the direction of term appointments, and he suggested a period of six years. For myself I would prefer a longer period, but that is a matter of detail which could be settled later on. I think there are many reasons why term appointments would be preferable to life appointments as they now exist. My hon. friend from Norfolk referred to one fact that should be borne in mind, namely, that those who go into the Senate and remain there for a long time are not at their best in attending to whatever duties are laid upon them. After their term of appointment has expired the government of the day would be justified in telling them that there were younger men who could take their places. In many instances no doubt that would not be necessary, because their friends would advise them not to seek their seats again. My hon. friend from Norfolk suggested a way in which the Senate should be appointed in future; he suggested that the leader of the opposition should be called into council, and that representatives of the press should also be consulted. Those are matters which I need not enter into, those are things which could be worked out by the Premier himself if he thought such a plan desirable. I do think however that it is altogether desirable in the interest of this country that the present life term of senators should be abolished for the future. When a new government come into power the Senate would be brought into correspondence with this chamber in a short time by the method of term appointments. This suggestion which has been made by my hon. friend from Norfolk has exceptional merit in the fact that it is one which would secure, not only the approval of this House, but of the Senate itself. There are many schemes proposed, some of which are impracticable and fanciful, and very few of which would carry in this House. There are a number on both sides of the House who look forward to a seat in the Senate at some time in the future. Fortunately in this country we have government by the government, and I think if the government took hold of this question and asked this House to carry through such a measure, ensuring the present senators the tenure of their seats during their lifetime, there would be no difficulty in passing such a measure in both the House of Commons and the Senate. Some might say that the suggestion does not go far enough. I say let us go that far at least. I hope the government will bring in a Bill to carry out the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Norfolk.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the third time and the third year that my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has introduced a resolution to abolish the Senate. This is the third time that he has endeavoured to convince the House that it would be advisable, in the public interest, that we should depart from the principle laid down in the constitutional Act, and lay aside altogether one of the pillars of the state, which were erected by those whom he properly describes as the fathers of confederation. The persistency of my hon. friend in face of adverse results shows that his motives are sincere, and the earnestness with which he has pursued his design commands our respect. At the same time, I may be permitted to observe to my hon. friend that he has approached this question, not from the point of view of any principle, but on the ground that the Senate as at present constituted has not reached that standard of excellence which we had a right to expect from it. That is a view which may be controverted, but I do not here and now enter into any controversy with him upon the point. The question which he has presented to the House and the manner in which he has presented it resolve themselves simply into this proposition: Is it, or is it not, advisable that the whole legislative authority and power of the country should be reposed in one single chamber, as he suggests; or rather shall continue to be divided under the bicameral system which we have had since confederation? If, in answer to that question, we look to the experience of the world at large, there can be but one conclusion, and that conclusion must be adverse to the policy laid down by my hon. friend. I believe that in this he will agree with me—I speak under correction—but I think that what I am going to say is absolutely correct, that I do not know of any country at the present time blessed with sovereign and constitutional power in which is not to be found the bicameral system. I do not know of any civilized country at this moment where they have the legislative powers concentrated in one single body. So far as my information goes, and I think my information is absolutely correct, there is no country that I can think of, at all events, in which they have not the legislative power divided between two bodies. Let me go further, and ask my hon. friend what he understands to be at present the issue in England. Not, perhaps, in the absolute form in which my hon. friend has presented it, but at all events the question is not at present one between two different sets of views—that is to say, the retention or total abolition of the second chamber. I am not aware, nor do I believe that at this moment the total abolition of the second chamber, as the hon. gentleman proposes, is the issue, but what has been proposed is that they shall so check the veto power of the second chamber as to make it of no use and to put an end to it. That is the proposition which is now before the British people, and unless I mistake my hon. friend altogether, I believe that if he were an English elector he would not propose that Great Britain should put an end to the second chamber.

Mr. LANCASTER. I certainly would not. I understand the distinction. There they have no other cooling basin than the House of Lords. Here we have the Imperial parliament, to which we can appeal, and we do not need a Senate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand my hon. friend then to say that it is advisable that the legislative power should have a check. He is not proposing that we should have a legislative body altogether without any check. I agree with him in that. So far as we can see it would not be wise that we should have a legislative body absolutely without any check at all. But, he thinks we have a check in this country under our constitution by the power of disallowance. May I be permitted to suggest to my hon. friend that the remedy which he proposes would be far worse than no check at all. The remedy which he proposes of disallowance, if it were exercised at all, would lead to confusion, and even worse than confusion, and to very serious results indeed. I doubt very much that, if the power of disallowance which is now, under our constitution, vested in the British parliament, had been exercised in the way which my hon. friend suggests, the relations between the mother country and this country would have been as cordial as they are at the present time. We in this government also have the power of disallowance over the province of Ontario where they do not have a second chamber. Is my hon. friend prepared to take the stand that he would advise, as a check upon the province of Ontario, disallowance by this government of the legislation of the province of Ontario? Why, Sir, if we were to apply that remedy, which my hon. friend says ought to be applied to Canada by Great Britain, if we were to apply that check over the legislature of Ontario, my hon. friend would be the first man to protest against the superior power of this government being exercised to set aside the will of the people of Ontario as expressed in their legislature. A few years ago the legislature of Ontario passed an Act which, in my judgment, was very unsound legislation, in the judgment of many others not only on this side but, I believe, on the other side of the House was very unsound legislation. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) when

urged to disallow such legislation, would not do so. Why? Because he agreed with the legislation? Far from it; he disagreed with it altogether. He stated that it was a most infamous Act, that it was a direct violation of the rights of private ownership, but he said: I will not advise this government to exercise the power with which they are vested under the constitution to substitute our own wisdom for the will of the people of Ontario as expressed by their legislature. He went further and said that if it pleases the people of Ontario in their legislature to confiscate private property, if they are prepared to do so by their legislation, the remedy is in the people of Ontario and not in this government. If the Minister of Justice had advised the government to take the course which my hon. friend has suggested in his speech and to disallow that legislation of the province of Ontario I am much mistaken if my hon. friend the member for Lincoln would not have been one of the first, if not the very first, to rise and protest against the tyranny of the government in thus interfering with the sovereign power of one of the provinces constituting this confederation. Let me apply this same reasoning to the will of the people of Canada as expressed in this House. Suppose we pass a Bill in this House by a narrow majority, if you will, or by a large majority, one of those Bills upon some of those questions which in this country unfortunately at times have aroused a great deal of popular passion and prejudice, and if there were no Senate to check the legislation of this House, and the imperial government were to try to disallow this legislation and substitute their own view of what was right for our own view of what was right, does my hon. friend believe that this would be conducive to the good-will which we expect to endure for ever between the people of Canada and the people of Great Britain? If my hon. friend wanted to plant seeds of discord, and to bring about the dissolution of the ties which bind us to Great Britain, the remedy which he suggests would be the very remedy that would produce that result.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the right hon. gentleman tell me the reason for placing that section in the constitution? It is not there for waste paper.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not there for waste paper, but I do not believe it has been placed there for any such purpose as my hon. friend has suggested. It was not placed there in order to review our legislation, but simply for extreme cases where this parliament might do something which, in the view of Great Britain, would be injurious to the relations existing between this country and Great Britain. We have exercised our power only occasionally. Since we have been in office we have never disallowed any legislation except that which we thought interfered with the policy of this government, and the interests of the empire at large. The only legislation which we have disallowed, except in some instances where some legislature had clearly gone beyond the sphere of its jurisdiction, has been the immigration legislation of British Columbia. We did that, because we thought that the legislation of British Columbia in respect to Japanese immigrants would entangle us in difficulties from an imperial point of view. That was the only reason why we did it, and it is for some such purpose that the Sovereign power of Great Britain has been maintained in the constitution. But, Sir, was it ever contemplated by Sir John Macdonald, or Sir George Brown or any of the fathers of confederation, that the parliament of Great Britain should have the right in matters of legislation to substitute their wisdom for ours and that they should be able to say: The parliament of Canada has passed legislation on this or that subject which we think to be wrong, and therefore, we shall disallow it. If anything of that kind were attempted long e'er this there would have been strong protest. However, the government of Great Britain have never attempted anything of the kind except on one or two occasions, when the disallowance of our legislation was immediately followed by strong protest from the government and the people of Canada. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster), who I am sure is in earnest in this matter will consider it carefully, I believe he will come to the conclusion that what he proposes would not only be no remedy at all, but that it would prove an element of discord in the happy relations which now exist between us and Great Britain. If there is one thing more certain than another it is that when we obtained responsible government it was with the view that the legislature of this country should be responsible to the people of this country and to nobody else. It was never intended that with respect to the subjects which were entrusted to us by the Act of confederation the Canadian parliament should be responsible to the people of Great Britain and not to the people of Canada. Any departure from that principle would be a thing to be deprecated. Now, Sir, if the considerations which I have presented to my hon. friend be correct, he will I think agree with me that his remedy cannot be accepted. If we must have a check over the legislation passed by the House of Commons, this check is not to be found in Great Britain, but within the purview of our constitution, and consequently in a second chamber. I am rather sorry that the hon. gentleman (Mr.

Lancaster) instead of moving such a drastic resolution, did not follow the example of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. McCall), and give us the benefit of some suggestions as to reform of the Senate. I think we are all, on both sides of the House agreed, at the present time, that the constitution of the Senate is susceptible of amendment. Nobody pretends that it is not. But, there was a time when the views of gentlemen supporting the Conservative party were not so decided on the question as they appear to be at this moment. There was a time when they thought the Senate was perfect. Not long after the present government came into office, I remember that Sir Charles Tupper sitting opposite me said: Thank God we have a Senate. That was the occasion when the Senate rejected our proposed railway to the Yukon, and which had it been adopted would I believe have been one of the most useful pieces of legislation ever put on the statute-books.

Mr. FOSTER. And on that occasion, many of your own friends, if not yourself, also thanked God there was a Senate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It certainly was not on that occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes it was.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On that occasion it was Sir Charles Tupper who thanked God there was a Senate.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a very good story and fairly well authenticated which said, that a very good friend of the Prime Minister, on the night of the passage of that Bill through the commons or on the eve of the vote which was to take place in the Senate went home and it is said spent many hours at his bedside praying God to put into the minds of the senators the will to defeat that iniquitous Bill which he himself had voted for in the Commons.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a legend, and cannot have foundation in fact. If ever there was a mistake committed by the Senate of Canada it was when they rejected that Bill, which had it been passed would have afforded Canada access to the Yukon which we have not now except by passing through American territory. In all earnestness I repeat, that if ever there was a mistake committed by the Canadian Senate it was on that occasion. And what did they reject the Bill for? They rejected it because it was supposed at that time that the Yukon was covered with gold, and that we were paying an enormous price for the railway ; whereas it has turned out that had the bargain been made the railway would have been built on the best terms obtainable, and better terms than ever again will be obtained. Had my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) suggested some plan to reform the Senate I would have thanked him. The hon. gentleman told us that in 1896 he was in favour of the Senate, but that he has changed his mind. Well, he is not the only man on the opposite side of the House who has changed his mind, because many of these gentlemen opposite who were against the reform of the Senate before 1896 are in favour of that idea now. However, the difficulty has always been to discover a proper method of reform. It is a question which is open to argument, and speaking for myself personally I am open to conviction upon this point. I am ready to receive any valuable, practical suggestion which may come from either side of the House, but we must all admit that for the last 14 years we have not received any suggestion, which in our opinion leads to a proper reform of the Senate. And, what should be a proper reform of the Senate. First of all, objection was taken to life appointment, and there is a good deal in that objection. For my part, I would rather favour an appointment for a limited time, not six years as was suggested by my hon. friend from Norfolk, because I think that term would be altogether too short, but for 12 or 15 years. That would suit me, and if any such suggestion were made I would be ready to consider it. Now, by whom should the appointments to the Senate be made ; should they be nominative or elective? So far as I can see there is no one within the reach of my voice who would favour an elective Senate. We think we have elections enough at the present time, and I have not heard any one to suggest that the senators should be elected by the people. That being so what is the next plan? It has been suggested that the senators should be elected by the local legislatures, and I am free to confess that in my earlier days when my hair was not so white as now, I would have favoured that reform myself. It must be admitted that in the early years of the American republic the Senate of the United States reached a point of excellence which has hardly ever been surpassed in any other country in the world. But, it must be admitted that of late years especially, the appointment of senators by the different states has not worked so satisfactorily as it did in the earlier years of the republic. I would not be prepared to say for all that, that I would be against the appointment by the local legislatures although my enthusiasm in that respect is not as great as it was in my younger days. But, if it were proposed to elect a certain proportion of the Senate by the local legislatures and that we should retain the appointment of another portion in our own hands, perhaps we might find there a proper measure of reform. At all events, the one thing to be kept in mind in any reform of the Senate is, that the different sections of public opinion should be represented on the floor

of the Senate. It may be said, and I have heard it said : Why does not the government itself select senators from the different political parties. Well, I have only to say that the government is composed of men who are very human, and I do not know that whether the appointments were made by a Conservative or a Liberal government they differed very much in degree as to the mode of selection. It will, of course, always be very difficult to have the different classes of the community properly represented if the nominating power is not centered in one body, but in different bodies. We would have that if a part of the electors of the Senate were to be appointed by the local legislatures or some such body. In saying this I am not expressing convictions which are deliberate and final ; but I say that these are all matters for consideration. My hon. friend from Lincoln seemed to be strongly in favour of that point of view ; and when he favours us next year with the same subject, he may possibly present us with a scheme of reform, rather than a proposal for the total abolition of the Senate. As my hon. friend knows in advance what will be the result if he presses his motion now, and as he has elicited the opinion of the House, perhaps he will agree to withdraw it. If not, we shall have to divide the House upon it.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, as I understand, there is to be a vote taken on this question. I give that as my reason for making a few observations upon it. Ever since my entrance into this chamber I have watched somewhat closely the history of our own Senate, and have read something of the history of second chambers in other countries. From time to time there has been agitation amongst the electors, in my riding as well as in others, for the abolition of the Senate—by some on the ground that it was too expensive, by others on the ground that it was unnecessary to have a chamber corrective of the House of Commons, and by others upon the ground that the senators, instead of acting as non-partisan, have been in the habit of acting as partisans, and that this would be found to be the case no matter which political party was in power. Therefore, taking an interest in the question, I have watched the career and history of the Senate very closely, and have also read the history of second chambers in other countries, and I agree with the right hon. the Prime Minister that there is no civilized country that I am aware of which has constitutional government that has not a second chamber. If we are to learn from history and experience—and I respectfully submit that these are the most reliable educative sources that we can possibly have—there is only one conclusion with regard to this question that we can reach, that is, that it would not be wise to be without a second chamber. I think that applies just as strongly to Canada, where we profess to have typical constitutional government, as it does to England, the mother of parliaments, or to Germany, or to the United States, or to other countries.

The hon. member for Lincoln said that at confederation, when we established the second chamber, the conditions were different from what they are now, and the people did not know as much about government and governments, and that was the reason we had a second chamber. Well, I do not think so. At that time men were elected to the Senate just as members of the House of Commons are elected to-day, only they represented larger constituencies. In my own district, one of the first elections I ever took part in was that in which one of the candidates for the Senate, Sir David L. Macpherson, ran for the Brock and Saugeen division, which included three counties. But what did we find? For the county of Grey there were three members in this House, for the county of Bruce three members, and for the county of Simcoe two or three members. Yet we found that the senator who represented the larger district composed of these three counties was deliberately antagonized in legislation by the members elected to the Commons for the same counties by the same class of people. It seemed to me that that was not a healthy system, and I think so still. While it might be admissible to elect a limited number to the Senate, I do not think it is a sound principle to have the same electorate elect men to the Senate and also to the Commons, and have them antagonizing each other just as the two political parties do in this House. Then it occurred to me that a limited number of senators ought to be appointed by the provincial legislatures, and I still hold to that idea. Perhaps I was influenced in it by the system that prevails in the United States. I agree with the right hon. the First Minister that in the early history of the United States it was generally conceded that the Senate was a very useful and important body, but it seems to me, as it does to a great many others in this country, that their system has rather degenerated of late years, and might, in the interest of the country, be reformed in some direction as well as our own.

Now, the first question we should settle in our own minds is this: Is or is not a second chamber desirable? I think most readers of the history of constitutional government in other countries will agree with me that it is desirable. If that be so, what should we do if ours is not fulfilling the indications of what a second chamber

should be? We should apply ourselves to the task of bringing that chamber into harmony with the needs of constitutional government. Do we pretend to say it is an impossible task? The man who admits that acknowledges weakness on his part, no man should lie down and say that anything is impossible that can be accomplished in any other part of the world. Most things that at first sight look to us impossible have been solved in different ages of the world by intelligent men who have sincerely and honestly applied themselves to the task with continuity of purpose, with patience, pluck and perseverance. If we thus apply ourselves to the task of reforming the Senate, that problem will be solved. The present government promised reform, there is no doubt about that, they do not deny it.

Mr. LANCASTER. How far have they got in 14 years?

Mr. SPROULE. They have not succeeded and even if they stayed here for 50 years without succeeding that would not be an argument that others could not accomplish a reform. Many governments have failed in the attempt to do things which their successors have succeeded in doing. We should apply ourselves to the task of reforming the Senate and bringing it into harmony with the needs of the country rather than abolish it.

The hon. member defends his argument for its abolition by citing the fact that Ontario has only one chamber, and he asks who is dissatisfied with the legislation in Ontario. I say that during the 33 years that the Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat and his friends were in power, had there been a second chamber very much of the pernicious legislation that was put on the statute-books of that province, to its detriment and destruction, and to the injury of its people, would not have been in operation to-day. There is no doubt of it whatever in my mind. Because it is going on smoothly now and seems to fulfil the indications of the situation——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE—according to our honest judgment, whether it be right or wrong. That is not saying that we should always have a second chamber, because for a few years, we think they have done right——

Mr. McCRANEY. Does the hon. gentleman think there should be a second chamber now in Ontario?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not debating that because I would have to travel into a wider field, I am only answering the argument of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) which, to my mind, was very weak. That hon. gentleman says we have a corrective power in the veto, and there is no need of a second chamber. As the First Minister said, what Bills do we veto that come up from the provinces? We veto, with one exception, and even that is not exclusive, such Bills as are passed by provincial parliaments outside or partially outside of their jurisdiction. That is the only legislation the federal parliament dare veto. Would they dare to veto a provincial Bill wholly within the rights of the province? I do not think so, because if they did, the result would be that they might raise such a storm as would cause almost an insurrection or something equally as bad. It was said that we vetoed the British Columbia Bill regarding immigration. It must be remembered that immigration is one of the subjects with which we have to deal, and although there was another question involved in that subject, outside of the fact that Japan is a friendly ally with England, and we could not afford to shut out the Japanese from Canada as a matter of policy, we could have vetoed that Bill on the ground that this parliament had the right to deal with immigration. It would not be wise to depend on the veto power, for if it were exercised we would very soon be in conflict with England, we would soon find cause to blame England for interfering with what we regarded as our proper and legitimate rights. For these reasons I am opposed to this resolution. I have always been in favour of a second chamber, and unless conditions in the future are very different from what has transpired in the past in the parliament of this country I shall continue to hold that view. I think that one of the defects in the second chamber has been that too many appointments have been made from certain classes. For instance, there are a great many men in that chamber connected with banks, with loan companies, with financial corporations, and great institutions of that kind, and some with manufacturing corporations. I have not objected to that with regard to the latter because I do not think their proportion is too numerous. I have said that when we send up Bills containing very proper and wise provisions either to restrain or control these corporations, we never succeed in getting them through the second chamber. Why? Because too many presidents of banks, too many men connected with loan companies, insurance companies or other financial corporations or railway corporations, are in the Senate, and they can always influence the Senate to the extent of preventing our Bills from passing. But that can all be remedied by a proper selection. It is not at all an impossible task, in fact to my mind it would be a very easy task. Therefore we need

not urge that as a reason for the abolition of the Senate.

For these reasons I am prepared to vote against the motion. For friendly reasons, I would like to support my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), because we agree in nearly everything with which we are associated in parliamentary life, we seem to think very much alike on many lines; but this is one of the things on which I disagree with him, and I do so because of my honest conviction that the day has not come when this government could or when we should wisely dispense with the second chamber in the parliament of Canada.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). The question of second chamber reform is up for discussion in the mother country of Great Britain. It is also up in the adjoining republic of the United States. It is up even here in Canada in a way because the Senate of the parliament of Canada has recently been discussing how it could become a more useful body. I think that a case has been made out here to-night not for the abolition of the Senate, but for its reform. I believe that if something is not done in the way of reform of the Senate there will be a wider agitation in the country for its abolition, because to my mind a Senate appointment for life is an anomaly and will not meet with the approval of the people. A Senate that is constituted almost entirely of one party is an anomaly and is contrary to democratic ideas. Therefore, after the confession the Prime Minister has made to-night, I think it is incumbent upon him to deal with this question. And certainly there have been suggested in the House to-night at least two valuable reforms. One is that the life term for senators should cease immediately, or, at least, as soon as we could get sanction for it, probably with the consent of the Senate. And the second is that the senatorial term should be limited,—I would suggest that the limit be six years with, perhaps, eligibility for re-election. I think also that some senators should be elected by the legislatures and some appointed by the government. But the thing is to deal with the matter. We have been promised this for years. The government have assumed the responsibility of supplying the leadership necessary to put into law what seems to be public opinion, and it can hardly be doubted that public opinion is in favour of some kind of reform of the Senate. The Senate has confessed that they themselves would like to see improvement. The second chamber in England is ready for extensive reform, and that question is now being threshed out there. And, in view of the fact that the government will probably propose, within the next year or two a large increase in the Senate by the addition of new members to represent the West, it is clear that that proposal when made should be accompanied by some proposal for Senate reform. The address of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. McCall) I think commended itself to every member of the House. The change he proposes is not a sweeping change but is in the direction of making the Senate more representative, taking away its one-sided character and fitting it to do better work. The Senate say they wish to do more and better work. And the quantity of legislation now presented in parliament is so vast and the subjects considered so numerous that there should be a better division of labour between the two Houses. My contention is that reform of the Senate is long past due, and some kind of reform should come almost immediately, and certainly in connection with the increase in the Senate of which we hear rumours, rumours that, I believe, have good foundation.

As to the suggestion of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the interests have too large a representation in the Senate, I quite agree with that opinion. When did this democratic government ever propose, for instance, to put a representative of labour in the Senate? In England, there is representation of the labour interests. And I should say that the farming interest is not sufficiently represented in the Senate.

Mr. SPROULE. And where are our universities?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I do not claim super-excellence for the universities, or that they should be represented over other portions of the community, but the working interest and the farming interests should be better represented in the Senate. In the old days we heard a good deal more about representation of the farmers in the Senate than we do to-day. The only men who seem to be considered as candidates for the Senate are those who have served in this House and those identified with the interests. I do not believe in members of this House going to the upper chamber. Reasons may be given for the occasional exception. Or, perhaps, there might be something in the idea that members who have served in certain capacities in this House should ex officio become members of the Senate. But the wholesale appointment of members of this House to the Senate as now carried on does not tend to promote the independence of this House, and it involves a wrong exercise of political patronage which has often been condemned by hon. members opposite. I have been reading an English review which says that, if the upper chamber is not representative and is not equal quality with the other, a gramophone would do for the other House. And that

is what people will be saying—that a gramophone or a rubber stamp would do for a Senate. But the Senate can be made a useful body. The best men in the country should be in it. They should frame Bills and make necessary investigations. The House of Lords in England is a useful body in that respect, and has, time and again, justified its existence by what it has accomplished in this way. I would like to see a reformed second chamber in Canada, taking a larger share of the work of legislation. And the Prime Minister, as I have said, should take this matter up. He said last year in answer to the arguments that I brought forward: What would you do? My answer is: if the Prime Minister is not prepared to assume responsibility, let him make way for those who are. I believe he blocks the way. He says he has a mandate—and so he has—to carry on the government. But he has given a pledge to do this work, for his party pledged themselves to reform the Senate. When is the fruit of that promise to appear? It seems further away than ever.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps that fig tree is barren.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Perhaps it is. But I will not go so far as to say that, for while there is life there is hope. If the Prime Minister will assume his proper responsibility and propose reform at least in connection with the proposal for an increase of the Senate membership, if that is to come, I think he will have the commendation of the country.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). One word by way of explanation; I think I was the first member of this House to introduce a resolution in favour of the abolition of the Senate. If the present resolution comes to a vote, I shall vote with the mover of the resolution, although I do not agree with all the arguments he has advanced. While I introduced such a resolution some years ago, I am quite ready to say to-day that I do not believe there is that popular and widespread demand in the country for the abolition of the Senate that I had supposed existed. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has said that a movement for the abolition of the Senate would carry to-day by popular vote. It is probable that such would be the pronouncement of the Canadian people, but I believe that would be largely because of the appeal to the public on the ground of dollars and cents, the money cost of maintaining the Senate. I would not like to see the Senate abolished for such a reason; I do not think at all that it would be a sufficient reason for doing away with the upper chamber. One of the great reasons why I would like to see the upper House done away with would be that there are among the senators to-day men who are quite capable of representing constituencies in this House and who would be in this House were they not in the Senate. I believe that men of ability and of business and legislative experience would be of more value to the country in the House of Commons than they are or can be in the Senate. Further, I think there is at least a danger that an upper House composed as it must sometimes be under the present system of men, a very large majority of whom are upon one side of the political line, may prove an obstruction to legislation. A third reason why I would like to see the upper chamber done away with, and that is by all means the least of the three reasons, is the money cost of maintaining the Senate. As to reforming the Senate, it has always seemed to me, and I have paid a great deal of attention to every method of reform, or any suggestion of reform which I have heard advanced by any person, either in this House, or in books that I have read, that no method I have heard suggested, yet seems to me likely to afford any improvement. I believe the Senate as we have it to-day is better than it would be under any system of suggested reform. However, what we have before us now is not a suggestion of reform, but simply a resolution to abolish.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not suppose I can throw any bright light on this matter. But as an old parliamentarian, and now for some time in public life, I have my views with reference to the matter. Two things seem apparent in this recurring discussion year after year. One is that my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), whose spirit of combat always rises as difficulties present themselves, will never be wanting in an incentive for his attacks upon the Senate in the line of abolition. The task will always be there, and my hon. friend will always have an obstacle quite sufficient to call forth all his better powers in his attempt to abolish the Senate. The other fact equally apparent is that it gives a yearly opportunity for the leader of the government to express how open he is to conviction—open at both sides, it seems to me, open for any conviction or any suggestion to come in, and equally open to let it fly out into the air. Now, my right hon. friend commenced with saying that the Senate was one of the great pillars of the state. I agree with him in that respect that the Senate theoretically is one of the great pillars of the state. But these pillars of state may become pretty dilapidated, and on the other hand so strong in sustaining power as to arouse our admiration and enthusiasm when one contemplates them. As an architect looking from his point of view upon

these great pillars of state, one, two or three of them, as may be, I wonder that the feeling does not grow strong within him to repair the damages occasionally and keep these pillars of state up to at least their former greatness, and if possible to idealize them a little, and make them more worthy of the times. He is urged to do that.

My right hon. friend had some fun with members on this side because of their change of views. A number of years ago, he informs the House, the Tories had every confidence in the Senate, but at present they seem to have had a change of view. My right hon. friend is open to the same sort of rejoinder. It is not more than fifteen or sixteen years ago that my right hon. friend had very strong views with reference to the Senate. At that time he believed that it ought to be either ended or mended, and he inclined to the idea of immediate emendation. But fourteen years have passed by, and my right hon. friend has yet to make his first motion towards carrying out that pledge of the Liberal party, which was well understood in this country to be a pledge to reform the Senate so as to bring it more into accord with the conditions of the present time.

There is no need of speaking about that matter of the Yukon railway, but it might be as well to remind my right hon. friend that although the scheme was thrown out in the Senate there came a time not long after when my right hon. friend, if he had thought this measure was so necessary to the development of this country and the opening up of the Yukon, could have carried that proposition with the Senate in his own favour. But my right hon. friend says now that is too late. Why? Because then it was believed that all the country was filled with gold, afterwards it turned out there was no gold there at all. Surely my right hon. friend would not be guided by a number of men who wanted to build a railway and give him a gold brick. So I do not think my right hon. friend was very happy in that allusion.

For my own part I am not able, I am sorry to say, to support my hon. friend from Lincoln in his motion for the abolition of the Senate. For the present at least I think a second chamber is here to stay, provided it be fairly constituted. I agree a good deal with my hon. friend from York, who said that unless something is done to make the Senate more effective and to bring it more in accord with the conditions of the time, the sentiment for abolition will grow, and it may grow very speedily. I think it is a pity that that conviction should be allowed to spread amongst the people, and I am not sure but that my right hon. friend is responsible therefore in not carrying out his pledges so far as we can see by one single effort to reform the Senate. He has contributed to the adverse feeling that is growing in this country against the continuation of the Senate on the present conditions. Each year that passes the confidence and respect of the public in the Senate does not grow stronger, but on the other hand I think becomes weaker and the problem therefore will become more difficult to solve. I do not believe on the other hand that the patronage system is the proper system upon which to base the second great pillar of state. It is not only absurd but absolutely demoralizing to public life to have the 87 or 88 appointments to the Senate of the country absolutely in the hands of one man, the leader of the government, or of the party for the time being. The principle involved is this, that you simply make the Senate a clearing house for party exigencies, you simply make the Senate an extension of the patronage system. It enables you to say to a recalcitrant member; to the man whom you want to do something for you in political life, or for your party or to any one of these men in a hundred different exigencies that come up: There is a place in the Senate for you, if you do thus and so. Gentlemen like the leader of the present government would not approach a man in that blunt way, but there are methods by which this intimation can be made which are just as effective as if it were made in the language I have just used. But, is it not a tremendous absurdity to put into the hands of one man in the working of the concurrent branch of the legislature that appointive power? It is absurd. It is not only absurd but it is demoralizing from the very root up. It is demoralizing to the most straight and honest hearted politician that comes into the leadership of a party, the temptation is too great to be withstood. A man absolutely bends to it sooner or later and ends up by using it to its greatest possibilities. There never was a period in this country when it was being used to its greatest possibilities more than to-day. But my position is exactly the same whether it be used by one party in power or by the other. It is an absurd, unconstitutional business to take a great trust like that and to make it simply a piece of machinery and enginery for party warfare, and I do not care by whom or by what party it is being carried on. That it is demoralizing does not need any argument from me.

Well, now, are there no methods by which the present condition of things could be altered and made better? What are they? I think that rather than face the question of abolition or otherwise, the drift of opinion in this House is as to what methods may be adopted towards bettering the present situation. That was a very good argument, a very fine argument, that the Prime Minister used against our looking

to Great Britain, to the prerogative of the Crown, as a check on the legislation of this House. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) that it is either desirable or sufficient or that it ever could be practically carried out. Two things are against its being carried out. The self-governing responsible parliament here would not put up with it. But there is an equally good reason that the King, or the users of the prerogative, would be very shy indeed in using it, so that on one side or the other it would fail in having its effect. Yet, I believe we ought to have a check, and it seems to me the only check we can have is one constituted for ourselves and by ourselves. But, I do not look upon the Senate as being simply a body which is to check and revise legislation, for that is largely clerks' work. It is work which can be done with discrimination or otherwise, but it is not a work which requires the highest powers of men and it is not the only or the best work by any means that a Senate could engage in. They are not only to be a check and a supervision upon hasty legislation coming from this House, but we should look forward to a Senate, and we should have a Senate which should become a vital, concurrent part of the legislative machinery of this country, and be able in many respects to give points to the House of Commons, and to do a work in the legislative work of the country which the House of Commons cannot do. Are we deteriorating in the House of Commons, or are we not? It is not for me to judge of that, each will have his impressions who has had an experience of a longer or shorter time in this House. But, whether we are deteriorating or not this fact seems to me to be true that we spend an enormous deal of time in the House of Commons doing work which is not the best work that we might do. That arises from the fact that party passion and party spirit are at their strongest in the House of Commons that they consequently impose upon us or they seemed to impose upon us the using of a vast deal of time in what does not result in very much good or very much in the way of actual legislation. Now, my idea is that in the Senate you could have a body out of which would be taken the strongly combative partisan and party spirit, which would cultivate a more reasonable frame of mind, which would breathe an atmosphere which was not surcharged with party rancours and party strifes, which would rise above these more petty things, for in reality they are petty, and trivial, and which could devote its time, in that higher, broader and more reasonable atmosphere, to the weightier matters of legislation, of examination, and to the hundred and one lines upon which legislative initiative and afterwards enactment could be made to run. I think that could be brought about. I do not see in the Senate to-day, nor have I seen in any day, the same spirit of partisanship as is developed in this House. Whether they be appointed by Tory or Grit the party passions are cooled in the upper House, and they never go to the extent of the wasting of time, and the bickering that they do in the popular branch in the House of Commons. How are you to get that Senate? I have stated that in so far as I am concerned I would absolutely cut out the appointive power for patronage purposes. It is a vicious principle, it cannot be defended on constitutional grounds, and I would cut that out entirely. How then would you get your Senate? The Prime Minister said that he did not know of any person who believed in an elective Senate. He sits every day in Council alongside of a very noted and distinguished colleague of his who is absolutely in favour of an elective Senate—the right hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, Minister of Trade and Commerce. The idea that something ought to be done is fully recognized in the Senate itself, and within the last four years they have had very exhaustive and very instructive discussions as to how the Senate could be made better. This discussion was contributed to by Sir Richard Cartwright, and I am free to say that with many of his views I agree in so far as my experience goes. I am in favour then of cutting out the appointive power for patronage purposes. That does not say that I would cut out the appointive power entirely. I would keep the appointive power, and in looking around I cannot find any source for the application of that power other than the government of the country for the time being.

But, I would restrict the appointive power by two things: The number to be appointed should be small and the basis of appointment should be such as would make the Prime Minister ashamed to make it for considerations of party patronage. Under the conditions he would be bound to the country and bound to his own respect, and honour to make these appointments on the basis which had been assigned. I would give the government of the country the appointment of twelve or fifteen of the senators, but these appointments should be for distinguished service, not patronage appointments at all. Much has been said to-night about the interests being represented in the upper House. There are interests and interests to be represented. You may have bankers in the upper House, and you may have no acknowledged banking authority or expert. A recognized banking authority and expert known in our own country, and better still known the broad world over and

distinguished in that way, would be an acquisition to the upper House which would give it not only dignity, but would give it working power as well. The agricultural interest, it is said, should be represented. So it should, but the agricultural interest which I would have represented would be that expert knowledge of agriculture which makes a man an acknowledged authority in the country. The same with reference to forestry, the same with reference to the fisheries, the same with reference to science, and the same with reference to our universities.

Mr. MARTIN (St. Marys). How about labour?

Mr. FOSTER. There are labour men and labour men. If I were the appointing power I would be the last man to appoint one who was always prating about how much of a labour man he was. I would hunt through this country for the most distinguished and ablest representative of labour ideas in their broader and better forms, and I would put him in the upper House as the representative of labour. So in all these great lines, I would make the appointive power restricted by and based upon representation of distinguished services in these great interests. I will tell you one reason why I would do it. Such men cannot get into the legislature and cannot get into the Senate along the general line of election from the primaries up. They would not attempt it in the first place, and in 99 cases out of 100 they would be defeated if they did attempt it. Their whole training and conception of life makes them revolt against the processes by which it seems, almost alone, a man can work his way up into the legislature of modern countries. For that reason they might be all the more useful, but for that reason I would make their accession to our parliament, through appointment. I have in my mind's eye today, and so has my right hon. friend, men in all these great walks of life who would be an honour to the Senate of Canada, and who would be of vital help to us. Every once in a while we want expert help. We need it in this House, and we get it sometimes. But to have men such as I could name, in all these different spheres, in our legislative halls in the upper House, at the command of the country—and they would willingly give their services—would be a great thing for Canada; to my mind it would be an inestimable blessing. As for the rest of the Senate I would make it all absolutely elective. We talk of our trust of the democracy, and that we are democrats; then let us trust the democracy. The democracy may not always go right, but in 99 cases out of 100 they are as apt to go right as the Prime Minister of Canada; they would not make many more mistakes than he makes. But in order to elect them I would not go to the legislative assemblies. I would not like to bedevil the legislative assemblies by putting that strife and contention in their midst. They have had a long experience of that in the United States, and human nature is human nature on both sides of the line, and we know in what extremes human nature has shown its bad features in the election of senators in the United States. To-day the revulsion of feeling is absolute against that method of election; to-day the majority of the states of the union have travelled so far that it is only required to get a few more states in line when they will have their convention, and when they will substitute the election of senators by the people for election by the legislatures. That is a bitter experience which we may very well profit from. It is no use arguing the question why the prize of a senatorship thrown into a legislative assembly may lead to demoralization, and to consequences which we would all deplore. I did at one time think that was the best way; I do not now. I would trust the people to do it, and I would have the senators elected by larger constituencies, and I would have it so arranged that there should be proportionate representation. What in the world is the reason why—and taking the two great political parties in this country the whole country is about evenly divided—what in the world is the reason why we should come to the condition that one political party has nearly all the representatives in the Senate. And, if the bad judgment of the people keeps this government in power very much longer, and if nature makes its demands in the future as in the past, it will not be very long before under the policy pursued conscientiously—no, but pursued continuously—by the Prime Minister, there will not be a single representative of the Liberal Conservative party in the Senate. That alone, Sir, will disgust people; that alone serves to make the unfairness of the thing so apparent that it takes away from the influence of the Senate, and inclines men's minds to a desire to get rid of it if it cannot be reformed. So that, in the scheme for election by methods which are well known and easily tried, I would put into that Senate on the elective basis—representing very large constituencies so as to prevent to the utmost any fear of wrong means being employed, and very large constituencies would counteract that to a large extent—I would put into that Senate always a possible majority in favour of the government in power while at the same time guarding against these great disparities which discourage one-half of our people, and keep from its proper outlet and influence the energies of nearly one-half of our people in the legis-

lative work of the upper House. Just as it would be to my mind a calamity to keep any one great party too long out of power, because it stunts legislation, and at the same time prevents new recuperative power having its full effect in legislation to the benefit of the country, just so it is deplorable that in the upper House you should have the condition of things I have described. We would in this way I think, have a House in which the parties shall be proportionately represented, in a calmer atmosphere, coming up fresh from the people at least every seven or ten years, and I would not make the period more than ten years or less than seven years.

That would give constant rejuvenation to the Senate. In a country where changes take place with enormous rapidity, where conditions at a given time are totally different in many respects from the conditions five years previous, it would bring into touch with those changing conditions and the newer currents of life, the body in the upper House, and make it vital and strong. These are in part my views. They are not original in any respect. I listened with delight to my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. McCall), in the short, terse, clear presentation of just sensible ideas for this House, and I think they might well be taken into consideration by virtue of their own wisdom and their spirit as well. I do not want to move an amendment against my hon. friend from Lincoln. I want him to have that vote squarely, to see how many will stand by him here. But if I had the power of moving an amendment, I would move one like this, and I hand it out as a suggestion to my right hon. friend. It is a business arrangement. Here is the upper House talking about methods of improving the Senate, and ministers of the Crown there say it must be improved or dire consequences will follow—men in perfect unity with my right hon. friend. Out in the country the strongest organs of public opinion on the side of my right hon. friend are almost daily calling for something to be done. Here is one. The 'Free Press' said not long ago:

> The recent deaths of Sir George Drummond and Hon. G. B. Baker reduce the Conservative strength in the Senate to twenty members out of eighty-seven.
>
> Since the Liberals came to power, not quite fourteen years ago, fifty Conservative senators have died and have been replaced by Liberal successors.
>
> The Conservative minority, attenuated though it is, is larger than the Liberal representation in the Senate in 1896, when the Liberals came into office.
>
> There were then only seven Liberal members of the Senate, and of these there were three whose Liberalism was nominal.
>
> The Conservative twenty will doubtless diminish; and if the death rate of the past few years keeps up, it will not take many years to wipe out the minority.
>
> That would reduce our method of selecting a second chamber to an absurdity, and might result in an attempt to bring about reform.
>
> A second chamber is without doubt a necessity in any country made up as Canada is, of a federation of the provinces; but there are good grounds for thinking that our system of determining and maintaining a second chamber is about the worst known, at least to the Anglo-Saxon world.

I could quote others equally strong from equally strong organs of public opinion representing the political faith of my right hon. friend; but there is no use in taking up the time. Then, it seems to me that something ought to be done. My right hon. friend acknowledges that something ought to be done. In a letter sent by him to the Hon. James Young not long ago, in which he asked that gentleman, who was pressing upon him the necessity of carrying out the pledge that was made so strongly and so definitely by the Liberal party in 1893, to give him his opinion, these are the words used by my right hon. friend:

> Would you be kind enough to send me a synopsis of the Senate reform which you think should be adopted?
>
> Two aspects of the question have to be considered.
>
> First, the mode of appointment. Should it be an election directly by the people, or by any other body, or by some other mode of appointment other than the one now existing?
>
> Second, should the appointment be for life or for a term of years?

The whole difficulty rests in these two questions; are they insoluble? They do not appear to me to be so; but the Prime Minister for fourteen years has not attempted to solve them. For about half of that time he was declaring that that was a pledge and that it would be fulfilled, all others have been fulfilled—which might admit of some argument. But for the last seven years he has not gone even that far; he has only said, I am open to conviction, I want suggestions, but I do not see any way. When are we to see a way? My suggestion would be this, that a joint committee be apointed from both Houses of parliament—12 good men from this House and 12 good from the other and that they be asked to take into consideration the constitution of the Senate, the methods of appointment and the distribution of the work, and, after a thorough examination and consideration, to report to the government and to both Houses their plan. We would get the wisdom of the two Houses after examination of all the different systems, with a knowledge of the conditions of our own country thoroughly canvassed. We would then get their reasoned opinion upon the subject. We might not agree with their plan, but there at least would have a basis on

which we might work. As I say, I do not propose to offer this as an amendment, but I offer it as a suggestion that may be worthy of consideration.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, as I understand there is going to be a vote. I would like to state why I intend to support the motion. I believe in the bicameral system, particularly under our constitution. But I believe there was a distinct pledge, made by the Liberal party when it was in opposition, to reform the Senate, but this pledge, like others, has not been carried out. What is the mode of constitution of our second chamber? In two words, it is a reward for party services rendered. That is the mildest expression one can apply to the mode of recruiting the second or revising chamber. Is there any better method of organizing that chamber? I do not intend to discuss the many plans that are spoken of, or that are treated in books, but the worst of all is certainly the one that we have in this country. I do not intend to make any reflection on those who sit in that chamber. But I say that to-day the revising chamber to check hasty legislation, as we imagine the upper chamber ought to be, is constituted in that way; uniformly it is a reward for party service. The reform promised has not been carried out. If it is not carried out I am inclined to support this motion. My right hon. friend is in the position that history has assigned to a pope who was called upon to abolish a great religious order. He set out to reform it, and as history informs us he was told by the members of that order that it should remain as it was or cease to be. For my own part, whatever truth there may be in that story, I believe that the Senate, continued as it is under our institutions, is a useless appendage. It is not properly fulfilling its mission. I do not believe in making it elective; I believe it might be recruited under certain rules and principles which would give it the constitution which is desirable as a second and revising chamber, and since it seems impossible to have recourse to, or carry out, that reform, I am inclined to think the proper course to follow is to support the motion of my hon. friend.

Mr. F. T. CONGDON (Yukon Territory). Mr. Speaker, one phase of this subject has not been dwelt on during this discussion to the extent it deserves. A federal government is always, of necessity, in the nature of a compromise. It is a compromise between, on the one hand, a single large independent state and on the other a large number of small independent states. That compromise is always effected by an agreement. The agreement in this case has been embodied in our constitution, and all the discussion practically which has taken place to date, all the various suggestions as to the mode of constitution of the Senate and the mode of appointing to the Senate were undoubtedly discussed in the Quebec conference, and the result so adopted is the basis upon which the constitution of the Senate now rests. Reading the resolutions as reported, one finds innumerable amendments, innumerable suggestions put to the vote and all rejected after due consideration. Undoubtedly at that time there was one feature in connection with the Senate that probably obtained undue prominence; that was the idea of strengthening the central government. The Senate of the United States was especially constituted as a limitation and restraint upon the presidential powers, and as representative of the sovereignty of the States, and no doubt the condition of conflict which existed in the United States at the time of the framing of our constitution led, to some extent, to the framing of the constitution as relating to the Senate in a way to secure the strengthening of the central power at the expense of the separate powers. But this Senate, as it exists, is a result of the compromise and agreement by which the various provinces now constituting the Dominion of Canada entered into that confederation, and it seems to me it would be a very wise thing for this House and for the people of this country to hesitate a very considerable time before in the least they attempt to invalidate, alter or amend that original agreement.

There has been a number of motions before this House tending in that direction. They have all been voted down for the simple reason, in my judgment, that the most overwhelming case must be made of the necessity for such a change before this House should contemplate it or endeavour to undertake it.

The existence of the Senate is, in a measure, the existence in our constitution of that which represents the sovereignty of the different provinces. To my mind, the only reform of the Senate which would render it more effective to-day for the discharge of that duty would be making it possibly more representative of the provinces than it is at present. It does preserve the sovereignty of the provinces to this extent that it gives to the various districts equal representation in the Senate and requires the members to come from these different parts. It seems to me that the framers of the constitution were wise in adopting this bi-cameral system. It has been mentioned that in all large constitutional governments since the world began there has been a second chamber, and if there is a necessity of a second chamber in a single state, there is a double necessity in a confederation such as we have in Canada. There is the neces-

sity of having some power that can, in a measure, prevent any infringement on the sovereign rights of the provinces, which under the confederation agreement have been inserted in this British North America Act. I think further that this House does not sufficiently examine the work of the Senate, in order to find justification for it. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) spoke of the demoralizing influences of the appointments to the Senate. I do not think any one can visit that body without finding that they are an extremely moral and respectable body.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to ask my hon. friend if he thinks that is fair tactics. He surely did not understand me as saying that the men who constitute the Senate were immoral and demoralized? I would be verry sorry if he would allow that idea to go out on 'Hansard.'

Mr. CONGDON. The hon. gentleman said the appointments were made in a demoralizing mode, that it was practically a purchase of them.

Mr. FOSTER. I gave my hon. friend a chance to set himself right.

Mr. CONGDON. And one was that the Senate was appointed in such a manner as to demoralize the gentlemen going into the Senate. If that does not make the men immoral I do not know what does. He also spoke of it as a place filled with rancor or strife. If he visited it he would find neither rancor nor strife, it is the calmest atmosphere to be found in the world and one might almost think it the place where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest, because it is as calm and sober as it can be; I really believe that if members of this House before framing these attacks on the Senate would examine a little more carefully the work done by the Senate, they would not make so many charges. I think that before charges of that kind are made there should be an investigation into the Senate, and it would be found that in many respects it exercises a revising and a critical influence upon this body, which is for good.

The existence of a second body is to my mind an absolute necessity in our constitution. If it had no other purpose it would serve the purpose well defined and aptly described in the very name of the Norwegian second chamber, which is called the Lagthing. It is necessary in a country becoming so democratic as this country that we should put some checks upon ourselves in order not to rush too rapidly into hasty legislation. There is great danger in this country of every one with a little fad starting up some movement which may get on the statute-book and in that way practically frittering away the liberty of the subject. I believe that many of these things are saved from being placed on the statute-book of this country by the opportunity which is afforded for their consideration in a second chamber. Occasions may arise in the future, where the senatorial body will have an opportunity more largely and in a more important manner to fulfil its functions than it has had in the past. I think the fathers of confederation must have been influenced by the fact that going through the constitutions from the earliest confederation of which we have any knowledge, from the Achaean League down to the American constitution, they found all the best intellects who had ever been engaged in framing a constitution determined and insistent on having a second chamber. I do not think we should too hastily rush away from the precedents supported by such eminent authorities as the great constitution makers of other countries as well as the able gentleman who made a Senate part of the compromise upon which our own constitution is founded.

Mr. LANCASTER. I regret that I cannot see my way, as a matter of principle, to adopting the suggestion of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to withdraw this motion. And, not only as a matter of principle do I feel unable to comply, but also because I have heard nothing to-night to give me an excuse, if I were looking for one, to withdraw this motion. We have heard the Prime Minister, in a somewhat instructive address, tell us some of the history of the matter, and some of the ideas with regard to the constitution of the Senate that have been from time to time put forward. But we have not heard a suggestion from him that even now he intends to take hold of this matter which ought to have been dealt with, certainly, some time within the last fourteen years? It is idle to suppose that gentleman on the left of Mr. Speaker in this House can produce any concrete result or give effect to their suggestions unless the Prime Minister will, with his strength in this House, and in the country, take up these suggestions and undertake to give them effect. And, until somebody else—I would prefer the Prime Minister—makes a concrete motion, I am going to stick to my concrete motion to abolish the Senate. For it seems to me there is no reason for its continued existence ; and, I think that this is pretty clearly shown even by the speeches of the gentlemen who support the existence of the Senate. For, to be frank about it, these gentlemen have only tried to apologize for the Senate; they are driven by the stress of the argument to try to find excuses for the Senate's existence. After fourteen years there is a complete

failure to bring about a reform which the gentlemen now in power undertook to then bring about at once. And the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Congdon) asks us, in all seriousness, to go to the Senate chamber and examine their work. Why, it would take a microscope and telescope to find it. It would need two or three people to go there and ring the bells to bring about any movement in the Senate preliminary to having any work done at all. It is because I have examined the work of the Senate that I realize that some reformation should be brought about. But, as I have not found any two of the bright minds of this chamber agreeing upon any particular measure of reform, it seems to me that abolition is the only thing that can reasonably be proposed. It seems to have been assumed that if this resolution passes this House, the Senate will be at once abolished. Of course, that is not the case. But, if the resolution is carried, the petition proposed would go to the King, and it would be acted upon in some way. It does not follow that the prayer of the petition would be granted, but it does follow that some step would be made toward changing the present condition of affairs, whether in the direction of reform or in the direction of abolition. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) laughs. He doesn't want anything done apparently. But he knows that what I say is correct—that a motion passed in this House cannot alter the constitution of the country. Some hon. gentlemen, the Prime Minister among them, speak as if we could do something that the home government, imperial parliament could not do—that we could reform while they can only abolish. We cannot amend even in the most infinitesimal way the constitution ; that is the work of the imperial parliament.

In view of the fact that, though the whole evening has been taken up in discussing the subject no one from the Prime Minister down has said that the government intends to take a step toward a reformation that was promised before the present government came into office, I should be derelict in my duty if I consented to withdraw the motion.

Motion (Mr. Lancaster) negatived on division.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Prime Minister intend to go on with Supply after the preliminaries are finished to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take up first the third readings of two Bills, those first on the list—the Bill to amend the Immigration Act and the Bill to prohibit the importation and use of opium and other drugs. After that, Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. And the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows that the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) intends to propose an amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I give notice that on the first opportunity afforded on going into Supply I will move:

That the recent mergers of heretofore competing industries and the issue of securities resulting therefrom should be the subject of public investigation, with a view of ascertaining how far such mergers or the methods of carrying them out affect the public interest, either as causing continuing high prices for the commodities produced, as damaging the reputation of Canadian securities abroad or further as restricting the banking facilities of the country.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 31, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 104) to amend paragraph (1) of section 2 and paragraphs (n) and (o) of section 9 of the Post Office Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to introduce in the larger post offices of the country a new device called the self stamp selling box. It is a box by which any man, by putting in it a cent or a penny, can get his stamp of that denomination. At the same time, the use of this box saves to the department a large amount of money, as no commission has to be paid to any vendor of stamps. The box has been tried in two or three large post offices in Canada, and is found to be a great advantage to the public, especially in the rush season at Christmas time. It is used in Australia, where the invention was first taken out, and is also largely used in Europe. On the second reading of the Bill I will give fuller explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the same kind of box that has been used in the Ottawa post office for some time ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think there is one in the Ottawa post office.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister, in his peregrinations, may not have heard of the incident that took place down at the Ottawa

post office. A young lady wanted a cent stamp, she put in her cent and the one cent stamp came out. But the blamed thing kept on turning out stamps one after the other, without additional money. It frightened the young lady, and she took to her heels and ran away. She made complaint, and I believe either the police or the engineering department was called in, and in due time they stopped the thing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The use of the box at first was an experiment, and there may have been something wrong with it. The hon. gentleman, I know, will be pleased to learn that one great advantage of this box is that it rejects all kinds of false coins.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RECIPROCITY—TRADE STATISTICS.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to a document which has been received from the United States by various members of parliament, a document issued, I suppose, by one of the departments of the administration at Washington. It is a most complete document; all the proceedings, all the data and a complete set of statistical tables are appended under one cover. It is a most important thing that full statistics should be in the hands of the members of parliament and available at as early a period as possible. I cannot think that the Minister of Finance has been a fortnight at these negotiations with efficient help with him, and that he has not had that basis or data for his negotiations that evidently, the United States Commissioners had very skillfully prepared and very full and comprehensive in all its parts. If the Minister of Finance had that, what reason in the world is there that the House has not been put in possession long before this of an equally comprehensive statement, The Minister of Finance seemed yesterday very unwilling to adopt a practice of the United States for fear that it might be unconstitutional here. I think the House would forgive him in that respect if he would give us something on a par or an equality with what the United States administration have given to their people.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has overlooked the fact that at the moment of presenting the matter to this House I laid on the table or made accessible to 'Hansard' a somewhat elaborate statement containing comparisons which at the moment I thought probably covered all that any hon. member might desire. We had two most capable officials with us in Washington, a most efficient staff, but high as is my regard and esteem for these gentlemen, I would not say they were equal to the large army of officials which was available to our friends of the United States government. Day after day as incidents occurred in the negotiations they were able to turn the matter over to their army of officials, and they could have statistics prepared very much more elaborately than we could possibly expect to have within the same time. I quite agree, however, that it is desirable that the fullest possible information, and practically along the same lines should be given to this House ; our officers are now engaged in preparing it, and I will promise to expedite the return and see that it is laid before the House within a reasonable time before the discussion is resumed.

Mr. FOSTER. Meanwhile, as it seems to be so difficult to have that done here, perhaps, through the kindly offices of the administration, we might be able to get a supply from Washington.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend thinks it desirable to have some extra copies of the statement prepared at Washington I would be happy to ask them to favour us in that respect, but I would think that the House would prefer to have the information prepared by our own people. I think the House will agree that we are not to be blamed if we were not able to have more statistical information when we were so far away from home. We did have all the information which we thought necessary for an intelligent study of the subject but it could scarcely be expected that after the negotiations were completed we could go to work and prepare the statistics while we were on our way back to Ottawa. There is no comparison between the two conditions. I will adopt my hon. friend's suggestion, and ask our friends in Washington to give us some extra copies containing this information, but I think the House would like also the information prepared by our own officials.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister if his attention has been directed to a statement made by Mr. McInnes before a commission at Vancouver to the effect that he discussed with the Prime Minister the desirability of taking the head tax off Chinese immigrants, and I would also like to ask the Prime Minister if there is any truth in the evidence of Mr. McInnes?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My attention was called to an article in the Victoria 'Colonist' from which I read this paragraph :

Mr. T. R. E. McInnes says that Sir Wilfrid Laurier told him that he contemplated the

possibility of doing away with the present restrictions on Chinese immigration.

I have no recollection at this moment of having discussed the matter with Mr. McInnes, but I have no doubt that if he says so it is true because I discussed this matter not only with Mr. McInnes, if I did so, but with several parties when I was in British Columbia last summer, and since I came home also with different friends who take an interest in this question, not with the view, however, as stated by Mr. McInnes of withdrawing the present restriction on Chinese immigration so as to make immigration from China absolutely free as it is from Europe, but I probably discussed with Mr. McInnes. and certainly with numerous parties, the advisability of abolishing our present legislation with regard to Chinese immigration, and if possible obtaining from the Chinese government such an arrangement as we have at the present time with the Japanese government which has worked admirably. The House is aware that we have at the present time an arrangement with the Japanese government whereby they undertook, some three or four years ago, themselves to restrict their own immigration to Canada to a certain figure. This arrangement has been faithfully carried out by the Japanese government and Japanese immigration has been kept, under the arrangement, constantly in check. At the present time, we have, and we have had for some twenty years on our statute-book, a law which imposes a capitation tax upon every Chinaman coming into Canada. Last year the immigration suddenly went up to a pretty high figure, to something like 1,400 or 1,500. It is said that this was the result of frauds which had been committed, and the capitation tax is now the subject of an investigation in Vancouver. Whether there has been fraud or not I am still of the opinion that if it were possible to obtain from the Chinese government such an arrangement as we have had with the Japanese government it would be far preferable. But, at the present moment, I have no recollection of discussing the matter with Mr. McInnes although it is quite possible I did so. I certainly discussed it with many other persons.

Mr. SPROULE. As I see the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) in his place I would like to ask if his attention was drawn to an intimation which appeared in the press of this morning regarding a mill which is said to have taken place under the Marquis of Queensberry rules between one Jardine and the Minister of Inland Revenue, and to inquire how the encounter ended, whether the account of it which we have received is absolutely correct or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, as so many hon. members in the House seem to be interested in the subject, I may say that the account, as it appears in the Morning 'Citizen', is very highly coloured.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the correct version?

SPRINGHILL COAL STRIKE.

Mr. KING. I would like to further answer my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) who asked me a question yesterday with reference to the Springhill strike. On inquiry I find that there are still at Springhill some 30 members of the Canadian militia, but the manager of the Springhill mines informs me that he does not think it likely that they will remain there much longer. They have been kept there at the request of the local authorities to assist in maintaining order. I might just say to my hon. friend that a short time ago the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) moved for a return of the papers respecting the strike at Springhill and they were brought down immediately. He intimated to me that it was his intention to ask some questions on this subject when the House went into Committee of Supply on the estimates of the Department of Labour. If my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) had intimated to me when he was asking the question yesterday that it was his intention to bring the matter up I should have been prepared to give him a definite answer at the moment.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 47) to amend the Immigration Act.—Mr. Oliver.

PROHIBITION OF OPIUM AND OTHER DRUGS.

Mr. KING moved the third reading of Bill (No. 97) to prohibit the improper use of opium and other drugs.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). When this Bill was being considered in Committee of the Whole on Thursday evening last, some question was raised by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) as to the propriety of the twelfth clause which provides that no conviction, judgment or order in respect of an offence against this Act shall be removed by certiorari, and the hon. gentleman said that he could not understand the Department of Justice giving the advice that such a provision should be inserted in the Bill. In view of what then took place, I wish to make an explanation that it was, I think, at my suggestion that this clause was inserted in the Bill by the Minister of Labour when the Bill was in preparation. Such a provision used to be of very considerable importance thirty

years ago before the courts possessed the power that has since been conferred upon them to amend technical defects in summary convictions. Hundreds and hundreds of convictions were quashed by the courts upon technicalities where no question whatever existed but that the offence had been committed, and that the defendant had been justly convicted. The courts, however, at that time, possessed no power to make even the slightest correction or amendment in a conviction, which had to be dealt with, on its being removed by certiorari, in exactly the condition in which it came before the court; and, for that reason, I have no doubt, a provision of this character was very frequently inserted in Acts both of the imperial parliament, and of this parliament with a view to preventing justice being defeated by objections which had no merit, but which took advantage of some slip on the part of the convicting magistrate or of the person who had prepared the record of the conviction. The courts held, however, both in England and in this country, that notwithstanding such a clause in any statute, which, apparently, prohibits a court from issuing a certiorari to bring up a conviction, the courts still might do it if it could be seen that there was an absence of jurisdiction on the part of the convicting magistrates to have entertained the complaint. The courts took the view that, in the absence of words clearly indicating the intention of parliament to take away this remedy which might be of the greatest use, the legislature could not have been supposed to have intended that the courts could not give relief if magistrates had acted in total absence of jurisdiction. So that the presence of such a clause never was an absolute prohibition against the courts reviewing the proceedings upon certiorari. Since the amendments which I have referred to have been made in our statutes, under which the most liberal power is now conferred upon the superior courts to correct technical mistakes in convictions which may be brought before them on certiorari, there is probably not very much value in a clause of this sort. But still it would have the legal effect of restricting the cases in which a convicted defendant would have the right to obtain certiorari to cases in which there was absence of jurisdiction on the part of the convicting magistrates. And, for that reason, when considering this measure, it seemed to me that it might be of use in furthering the purpose of the statute that such a provision should be inserted. And that was my reason for suggesting it to my hon. colleague the Minister of Labour. It is a provision which appears in the Canada Temperance Act, and which has been of effect in the history of the Canada Temperance Act to save from destruction a very great number of convictions where the defendant had no real merit in his effort to get rid of his fine or other punishment, but where, but for the existence of such a clause as this, the courts would have been compelled to quash the proceedings. This legislation is of very much the same character as the Canada Temperance Act, and it seemed to me that just in that view such a clause should be inserted in this Bill. But I wish to disclaim altogether the idea that I favour the presence of such a clause as a general thing in statutes which may be passed by this parliament creating criminal offences. I agree entirely in the views which were expressed by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) when this Bill was in committee, that such a clause ought to be very sparingly used; and it was only because it seemed to me that the purpose of this Bill was of rather exceptional character that I recommended the insertion of the clause. There was another point in the committee which was more discussed. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) pointed out the objections which, undoubtedly, ordinarily would exist to delegating to the Governor in Council the right to make new offences, new crimes, by adding to the schedule of the statute. That objection was possibly cured in this case by an amendment of the clause which delegates this power to the Governor in Council, an amendment made in the committee which limits the authority of the Governor in Council to add to the schedule the names of substances which may be derivatives or preparations of the drugs which by the Bill are prohibited, and, that amendment being made, I understood the objections to this particular clause or feature of the Bill were very much minimized, if not quite removed.

The hon. member for East Grey expressed a desire that, upon the third reading of the Bill, I should state my opinion with regard to that feature of the statute. And, while I do not think it is any question of law, I am willing to say, speaking simply as a member of this House, that I think such a course, while perfectly within the power of parliament, is one that ought to be very seldom and very sparingly taken.

Mr. DOHERTY. The hon. gentleman (Sir Allen Aylesworth) referred to the question raised about the desirability of the provision under section 14, that the Governor in Council shall have power to add to the number of substances, the possession, sale, or handling of which would, under such legislation, constitute a crime. I desire to say—and I think I made that clear the other evening—that there was no suggestion on my part that there was no

legal power to do this; but I did point out, what I am glad to see the minister finally recognizes, that it was very undesirable that a power in as wide terms as were set forth in the section originally, should be conferred on the Governor in Council to create a crime. The terms of the section, as originally introduced, were wide enough to make it possible for the government, without any intervention of the legislature whatever, to add any substance whatever to the schedule, and to make the possession or the handling of that substance a crime; and I think that before we got through, we were all pretty well agreed that that was not a desirable kind of legislation. But I never suggested, or wished to be understood as suggesting, that there was any question of the power of parliament to do this if it chose to do it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—MR. J. A. MACDONALD AND RECIPROCITY.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I am pleased to state that I observe by yesterday's 'Globe' that the editor of that journal has been fully restored to his wonted vigour. On the front page of that paper there is a long telegram from him which shows that whatever rumours may have been around the country to the contrary, he is in possession of his usual mental faculties. However, I regret that I am called upon again to dispute some of the positions that gentleman has taken. I would not refer to the matter but that this is the first occasion on which he has appeared in the arena directly. The 'Globe' editorial, referring to the public says:

To them it may be necessary to say that the editor of the 'Globe' has not at any time or under any circumstances made an arrangement with any person under which he agreed to advocate any fiscal policy as lending itself specially to the cause of universal peace.

I never said that he did 'agree' to it, Sir. What I did say was that Dr. Starr-Jordan and Mr. Macdonald and those other gentlemen, whether they agreed to it or not, are actually doing it, and I proved it the other day by reference to Dr. Starr-Jordan's own speeches here—that while preaching peace, they were at the same time preaching reciprocity between Canada and the United States along lines which could only have one termination, that is, the annexation of this country to the United States. Mr. Macdonald's telegram, after a long newspaper extract, in which is used the term 'reciprocity' instead of the term 'peace society,' is as follows:

San Diego, Cal., Jan. 29.—The statement published as having been made at St. Catharines by Col. Sam Hughes is absolutely false in every essential particular.

I will prove before I am through that it is true in every particular.

I neither was sent nor did I go to Washington in connection with the reciprocity question.

I will show further on that he is quibbling and equivocating on the word 'reciprocity.'

If Col. Hughes cares to know, salaries double the amount he mentions have been offered to me for regular professional services, but never a dollar for any purpose he named.

I am very much surprised, knowing Mr. Macdonald's character, that he has not taken advantage of these large salaries.

In association with President David Starr-Jordan of Leland Stanford University, John R. Mott and others, I am a member of the board of directors of the 'World's Peace Foundation,' established by Mr. Ginn for promoting in every civilized country the settlement of all international disputes by judicial arbitration and not by war. Necessary expenses are paid, but no director is under salary or makes gain financially.'

We will discuss that later on.

Reciprocity is not on the programme.

Then, why did they put it on?

Tariffs are a matter of no concern.

Then why is the discussion of tariffs foisted on this country by Dr. Starr-Jordan and others?

The task is much more serious. It is to direct the national systematic awakening and organizing of public opinion in every civilized nation on the question of the demoralizing curse of war, and the intolerable folly of increased armaments. We advocate the substitution of independent arbitration as at The Hague.

Neither the founder nor any of the directors favours the political union of Canada and the United States. Personally and in the interests of world peace, I oppose any change in Canada's imperial relations. As a free nation in the empire, Canada can exercise greater influence than is possible through independence. Col. Sam Hughes' statement is a 'wholecloth' falsehood. Only a slanderer and a coward will repeat it after this.

Well, Sir, I am here to prove that I have not mis-stated a single word, and that I am neither a slanderer nor a coward. Mr. Macdonald has attained to that mental condition wherein the spirit of selfishness, insane ambition and tyranny bordering on a sense of divine right, has become domination, a mental condition which is never found in any of the great men who, like

him, profess to be followers of 'the Meek and Lowly One', nor in any of the great editors of the great journals of the country; but it is common among the inferior class of clergymen in all churches, and among the inferior editors generally. I need not again repeat my assertions, Sir, further than to put them in consecutive order, to show that neither Mr. Macdonald nor the 'Globe' has directly or indirectly attempted to meet my charges.

I stated, first, that Mr. Macdonald went to Washington either on his own personal account or as the confidential agent of this government to conduct reciprocity negotiations. This Mr. Macdonald technically denies. I re-affirm it, however, and will prove him to be a deceiver and equivocator.

My next charge was that Mr. Macdonald is not now paid a full salary or for full time as editor of that great oracle of truth, righteousness and fair dealing, the Toronto 'Globe', but is paid for only part of his time by the 'Globe'.

My third charge was that for part of his time Mr. Macdonald is in receipt of salary, or expenses, or rake-off, or income, or solatium, or indemnity, or consolation, or alleviation, or balm, or any other word that would fill the bill, from the fund largely provided by Mr. Ginn, of Boston, named the 'Peace Society Fund', such 'balm' being in the form of golden Yankee eagles, or their equivalent. These three statements were made by me first in St. Catharines on an open public platform. I knew that there would be some coward garbed as a 'Globe' editor, or some despicable colleague of Mr. Macdonald, imbued with the same spirit of persecution and hypocrisy, shielding himself behind a five cent white necktie and attaining notice not by his personal worth or godliness or ability, but by the atmosphere of superstition and tolerance surrounding him—one of that fry that bring the sacred name of religion into disrepute; one failing to follow the maxim and practice of the Master as aptly put by Chaucer:

> Christ's lore and His apostles twelve he preached,
> But first he followed it himself.

—one despised by every capable godly minister of the gospel, as well as by every honest citizen and newspaper editor;—I knew that some such ignorant person would charge me with shielding myself behind the privileges of parliament. Therefore I made the charge first openly on the public platform at St. Catharines, and subsequently in the House. Yet I have been told that one of this tribe, no longer ago than Sunday in the city of Ottawa, in the pulpit of one of the churches here, charged me with shielding myself behind the privileges of parliament in this matter. I am informed that this is the same gentleman who, when an election was being held in the city of Ottawa, a few years ago, went with his five cent necktie on, and pledged himself to a member of the Conservative party that he was sick and tired of the 'rascally Ross government' in Toronto and would do his utmost to turn it out: yet when the leader of this same 'rascally government', the Hon. George W. Ross, appeared in Ottawa, the foremost heeler in the gang who paid honour to him was this same individual.

And he would do his utmost to turn them out. Inside of a very few days this same leader of that 'rascally government in Toronto,' the Hon. G. W. Ross, appeared on the public platform in Ottawa, and the foremost heeler in the gang which surrounded him, was this same individual. On another occasion in that same election, in order to still better carry out the plans of the Grit party, this individual—I shall not disgrace the sacred calling of the ministry by calling him a clergyman—attempted to bring this man Macdonald, the editor of the 'Globe' from Toronto to preach in his pulpit on the Sunday before the election, so that he might try and convince the congregation of the aggregation of virtue of which that good government was composed; but to the credit of the congregation, they refused to allow Mr. Macdonald into the pulpit. Not content with that, this same parson took a list of the members of his congregation and marked—I do not know in what colour—how they might be influenced to vote or how they might be disposed to vote, and he did this for the Grit heelers of the party in Ottawa so that they might use it for election purposes. This is the gentleman who is backing up Mr. Macdonald.

In his lecture before the Canadian Club on Saturday, and in his sermon on Sunday, Prof. Starr-Jordan said that if we could only do away with the custom house officers, that would be an ideal condition between the two countries. Yet Mr. Macdonald will claim that these peace society speakers are not meddling in reciprocity. Mr. Macdonald's next statement was that he never was sent, nor did he go to Washington in connection with the reciprocity question. But he is quibbling with the word 'reciprocity.' What is the meaning of reciprocity? He will not deny that he went to Washington in order to bring about negotiations for a change in the United States tariff which would do away with the maximum clause trouble. We wanted to induce the United States not to enforce that maximum clause and Canada humiliated itself by making certain changes. That was the kind of reciprocity that Mr. Macdonald wanted to bring about. The

meaning of reciprocity is: 1st. Mutual action and reaction; 2nd. Reciprocal advantages, obligations or rights. His next statement was that he was associated with Prof. Starr-Jordan—rather an unfortunate admission after the speech of Prof. Jordan, deliberately advocating reciprocity—and that only his expenses were paid by the peace society, I have it on good authority that he gets a pretty large sum from this society every year and he dare not deny it.

Mr. Macdonald says that reciprocity is not on the programme of the society. Why is it not? It certainly looms out largely in the speeches of the oracles of that society. He speaks also of the demoralizing curse of war, but inasmuch as my hon. friend from Algoma is anxious to take the floor, I shall not touch that aspect of the case now, but defer dealing with it until another occasion. In speaking of war, Mr. Macdonald reminds me of the small boy who said to his father: You had better give up cussing or leave the church. In like manner, Mr. Macdonald, had better show a little more Christian spirit if he intends continuing in that great cause, the promotion of peace among nations. In this connection, I cannot refrain from quoting the words of Eliza Cook:—

> Never trust the soft breathing that preaches of peace
> With a smile on the lips and a tear in the eye—
> Hear it all with good will but be provident still,
> With men that are earnest and powder that is dry.

In Dante's Inferno, we are told that in one of the nethermost regions below there are a tremendous number of gentlemen who parade clothed in pure and spotless white—I do not know whether they are members of the peace society or not—but they wear a rueful aspect, the lining of their garments is the heaviest lead and the road they have to travel is rough, rocky and jagged. These are the hypocrites who once defaced human society. I sincerely hope that so great an evil will not befall this editor of the 'Globe.' Might I be allowed as a layman, to express the wish that he may not be found in this company in this nethermost region in the future. Therefore I would respectfully suggest that some steps be taken to reclaim him—and in that connection, I would do my best to bring him back to what he should be—namely, an open, square man, and have him give up equivocating to the extent he has been practising that art for some considerable time.

TESTIMONIALS TO MINISTERS OF THE CROWN.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, for the House to go into Committee of Supply, I desire to refer as briefly as possible to a matter respecting which I gave notice last Monday, and which was discussed during the latter part of last session. At the close of my remarks I shall offer a resolution on the subject, which, I feel satisfied, from the manner in which it will be offered, and the principle it emphasizes, cannot fail to meet with the approval of both sides from the right hon. gentleman down. At the outset let me say that this is not a motion of want of confidence so that hon. gentlemen opposite need have no qualms of conscience about accepting it if they feel so disposed. All I desire is to intercept the House, on the motion to go into Supply, for the short time necessary to consider the principle involved in the resolution I am about to offer. This resolution lays down the principle advocated by the Liberal party some twenty years ago, and which, in the public interest, it is necessary should now again be discussed. This necessity arises from recent occurrences which call for the application of that principle. I refer to the principle involved in the accepting by cabinet ministers of testimonials in the shape of gifts of money.

In whatever I have to say, I desire this to be distinctly understood, that in bringing this matter to the attention of the House I have no intention of injuring any public man.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOYCE. Hon. gentlemen opposite jeer, but I have learned, in my eight years experience of parliamentary life, that the best encouragement I can receive is the dissent and opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite. I repeat in all sincerity that in the observations I am out to make, I have no desire to injure any public man; no desire to arouse public opinion against any public man, and no desire to make political capital out of whatever discussion may ensue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOYCE. Yes, I expected that jeer, but I do desire to emphasize this fact that the necessity for what observations I have now to offer to this House, the necessity for the resolution I propose shortly to place in your hands, emphasizing that position, is laid at the doors and attributable to the right hon. the Prime Minister of this government; to him and to him alone, because, Sir, nine months ago in this House, as was my privilege, and my duty as a public man, I moderately and temperately, and I think in no objectionable manner, drew to his attention certain facts and certain principles applicable to those facts, and what did I get

from the right hon. gentleman, but sneers and contumely? I desire now to emphasize those principles and to draw this matter to the attention of the House for the second time, in the manner in which a great principle affirmed unanimously by this House in 1891 should be again repeated and emphasized. The principle announced, struggled for, claimed as a great victory by the Liberal party in 1891 has been departed from in 1910, and is in danger of being departed from again in 1911; to emphasize further my desire as to the need of a rigid adherence to these principles by asking the House to accept the resolution which I will move at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy of which has already been placed in the hands of the Prime Minister. Sir, the resolution which I shall place in your hands is based upon one of twenty years ago. On August 13, 1891, the right hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, then a prominent member of the opposition of this House moved the following resolution on going into Supply and not as a vote of want of confidence:

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the chair, but that it be resolved: That the acceptance of gifts or testimonials of any kind on the part of ministers of the Crown or of any member of their families from contractors, government officials or other persons having pecuniary relations with the government, is entirely opposed to sound principles of administration, and is calculated to bring parliamentary government into contempt, and that the example thus given tends to corrupt and demoralize the officials serving under ministers who have accepted or permitted the acceptance of gifts or testimonials as aforesaid.

I shall ask the House to reiterate and reaffirm these words in the light of recent events, and I cannot help noticing that at the time that resolution was passed, lodged as it was against the late Sir John A. Macdonald as well as others, lodged against members of the family of that right hon. gentleman by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, Sir John Macdonald had hardly been two months in his grave. Yet my right hon. friend on the 3rd of May last, and his friends now, can jeer and treat me with contumely because I endeavoured, as is my public duty, to refer moderately to that resolution and to express my desire not to go beyond the limits of what would be proper in dealing with a subject inviting such delicate and proper treatment. I have no desire to injure any public man; I am not here for that purpose and I say no one can truthfully say that there is any attempt in referring to this matter to detract from any prestige which the friends of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance are of opinion he has gained by recent events, meaning the negotiations at Washington. I brought this matter to the attention of the House on May 3 last, and gave notice of my intention to discuss this matter before the return of the Finance Minister from Washington, and when on the day I expected my hon. friend to be in the House I found he was not, I postponed the discussion until he should return. In all that I say about my friend, the Minister of Finance, I speak after due notice, and I am glad to say in his presence. I say it when his friends laud him, and I am not going to say improperly—think, he is erect in public opinion, when he is in the eyes of the whole commercial world, when his followers believe him to be strong in the confidence of the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYCE. The full disclosure now by the Minister of Finance or by the right hon. the Prime Minister of facts and circumstances long withheld from this House and this country can form the only justification of this transaction, and further withholding of information which it is of the utmost importance that this House and this country should have, can only avoid one unfortunate circumstance and that is that grave suspicion must hang over a minister of the Crown of this country.

Let us discuss for a moment the manner in which the resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright was supported. The right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce in this government, then a prominent member of the opposition, spoke to the resolution as follows: at page 3829 of the 'Hansard' of 1891:

You cannot by possibility—and every man knows that I speak the truth—you cannot by possibility allow a minister of the state to accept gifts of any kind, without, if the practice becomes known, demoralizing in a very high degree the whole society over which he presides.

Those are not my words, those are the words of a minister high in the confidence of this government, of an hon. minister presiding over a very important part of this government, the Department of Trade and Commerce.

At page 3831 of the same 'Hansard,' Sir Richard Cartwright said:

I have observed, Sir, that some of the hon. gentleman's apologists have undertaken to mitigate the error, or the crime, call it what you will, which was committed by the reception of that testimonial under the circumstances, by the plea, which I think was also advanced in the other case, that the hon. gentleman did not know who had subscribed to his testimonial. Such a plea, in my judgment, is a direct aggravation of the offence. A public minister has no right whatever to allow any gift to be made to him unless it is done publicly, and unless he knows from what sources it proceeds; and, Sir, I would say this, that if a minister of the Crown tells

me that he has accepted a gift, not knowing and not choosing to know from whom it proceeded, so far from regarding such a plea as a mitigation, I say that such a plea raises a presumption of guilt. It was his duty to know it; it was his duty to find out; it was his duty to see that not one penny went into his pockets or into his coffers unless it came from such sources that he could honourably and fairly receive it.

Now, Sir, the leader of the opposition of that day, who is now the Prime Minister of this country, in the same debate, made use of these words which I quote from page 3840.

The Minister of Justice said a moment ago in reference to the testimonial offered to the honourable Minister of Public Works, the member for Three Rivers, that that hon. gentleman did not know who were the subscribers. Sir, if he did not know, why did he not look at the list? If the hon. gentleman did not know, it was because he choose to remain ignorant of who were the names on the list, and if he chose to be ignorant of the names which are on the list, is it not because his moral sense told him that he might there find names of persons giving contributions which could not be accepted at all? Is it not simply because his conscience told him that if he were to look at that list he would find there the names of men who were every day supplicants in his office for favours? That is the reason why the honourable Minister of Public Works did not choose to have a look at that list. If that is not the reason why did he choose to be blind on that matter? Then, I call upon hon. gentlemen opposite to tell what is the reason, if there could be any good reason for it. Certainly there could be nothing wrong in the admirers of a man in public life coming to his help and rescuing him; but it seems to me that the recipient of such favours would be naturally too glad to know who are the persons to whom he owes gratitude, and if he does not choose to know who are those to whom he owes gratitude, it must be because his moral sense tells him that he would find there names which would be a condemnation of his accepting such a testimonial.

Sir, these are not my words, they are not the words of any gentleman on this side of the House, they are the words of the present Prime Minister of Canada who is sitting at the right hand of the Minister of Finance. But in conjunction with a testimonial involving the gift of a large sum of money, said to be as much as $120,000, presented last April or May to the Finance Minister, let us see what was said by the party organs with regard to it, and let us see how much it is in line with what my right hon. friend the Prime Minister said on that occasion. The Ottawa 'Free Press,' the government organ in this city, published the day after the testimonial was presented, made this remark :

The list of donors is anonymous, and Mr. Fielding is made aware only of the fact that the future of himself and his family is provided for.

My right hon. friend says there is only one justification, namely, that there is a list, and that the list is made public ; that if a public man chooses to accept a testimonial in the shape of a gift of money, and chooses not to look at the list, it must be because his moral sense tells him that he would find on it the names of the men who ought not to be there. That is the position. In view, therefore, of the fact that the Minister of Finance did, early in the spring of 1910, receive a large testimonial in the shape of a sum of money amounting to a fortune, without knowing who contributed it, the case falls directly under the condemnation of the right hon. gentleman who leads this House. The testimonial, if we are to understand aright what the right hon. gentleman said on the 3rd day of May last in this House, was accepted ; it was accepted in the presence of the right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister of this country who was himself present, agreed to, approved of, and applauded the giving of that testimonial, entirely in contravention of the words and the principles which he had laid down in 1891. Yet there has been no list of the donors made public, and there was a statement, not denied by my right hon. friend, that the Minister of Finance did not know who the donors were. I do not say, Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to be understood as saying, that under all circumstances and conditions the friends of a cabinet minister may not, in his hour of need, come to his rescue, and in their enthusiasm and admiration for the services he has rendered in a public capacity, make that provision for him which his devotion to the pressing cares of state has made it impossible for him to provide for himself. This principle was laid down by the present Prime Minister when speaking to the resolution of the 13th of August, 1891, and I will again run the risk of wearying the House with a short quotation from page 3840 of the 'Hansard':

Of course, in the matter of this testimonial, it is an act absolutely indifferent in itself. It may be wrong or it may be good, according to circumstances, but if such an act is done in the open light of day, then, Sir, it is the best prohibition that there can be against any wrong taking place.

I have the utmost sympathy, Mr. Speaker, for any public man who, having devoted the best years of his earning power to the service of his country, finds himself, when the years are crowding upon him, in a state of embarrassed circumstances, which contribute their bitterness to the weight of his care. But I say that public men, especially ministers of the Crown, must realize that gifts of money to releive their embarrassment must only

be accepted under the most stringent safeguards of public honour and national integrity, the most important of which, as has been said, is absolute publicity to the light of day, letting the people know who furnished the funds constituting that testimonial, letting them see that nothing is concealed, that there was nothing wrong, that everything is open to the broad light of day, before all men. Sir, those were the facts before the public of this country prior to the 3rd day of May, 1910, facts which, as I have stated, were banded about in the public newspapers of this country prior to that date—except of course the facts which have taken place since. And how was I then not justified, on the third day of May, 1910, in referring to that matter in this House, with an idea of doing what? Of criticising the Finance Minister? No, Sir, I defy any hon. gentleman opposite to say that the remarks I made on the 3rd of May, 1910, were not offered in a fair and reasonable spirit, that they were not moderate and temperate remarks, and I say they called for a more dignified reception than that accorded them by the right hon. the Prime Minister. I asked the right hon. gentleman if there was a list, I asked the right hon. gentleman whether he would produce that list, I asked him to name the services for which the testimonial was granted; and the right hon. gentleman scornfully and satirically characterized my inquiry as 'curiosity,' curiosity which he emphasized by repeating the word twice. Now, Sir, the Prime Minister's reply, on the 3rd May last, is worthy of some consideration by this House, in view of the circumstances in bygone years when, as leader of the opposition, he was declaiming against the Conservative party. The right hon. gentleman commenced by emphasizing the manifest and undoubted integrity of the Minister of Finance. Who doubted the integrity of the Minister of Finance? I certainly never did. There was no remark made by me which would cast any aspersion on the Minister of Finance. I have no desire now to cast any aspersion upon the integrity of the Minister of Finance further than the right hon. gentleman cast upon him himself by attempting to derogate from his honour by placing a shield where the rays of the sunlight of day ought ever to be falling on a public man. The right hon. gentleman said on that occasion that the friends of Mr. Fielding came to him and that the reply that he gave them was that 'There is nothing too good for Fielding,' to use his own words.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TALBOT. We think so still.

Mr. BOYCE. I have no doubt. The right hon. the Prime Minister, under certain other circumstances said of another minister of the Crown that he was prouder of him than ever. The Prime Minister did not stipulate that there should be a public list, he did not lay down any of the precautions that his resolution and his remarks in support of his resolution of the 13th of August, 1891, called for. He did not provide that there should be a list, that that list should be open to the light of day, and to the public and that it should be approved of by the Minister of Finance himself. The Prime Minister made a statement on his own responsibility that no one had subscribed to that list whose name ought not to be there. On page 8791 of 'Hansard' of last session, the right hon. gentleman says that:

> The money came from private sources.

Of course it did. It did not come from the public treasury—it was not as bad as that.

> The money came from private sources; that I assert on my honour as a man, on my responsibility as the Prime Minister of Canada.

The right hon. gentleman, having pledged his responsibility as the Prime Minister of Canada, that this money came from private sources, is unable to tell me, in referring to the newspaper report that the Dominion Steel Company had contributed, where the money came from because he says that he does not know whether the company contributed or not. There is a remarkable contrast, the remarkable state of things with regard to a very important subject in which a very large principle is involved. May I ask the right hon. gentleman what he meant when he said that upon his honour as a man and upon his responsibility as the Prime Minister of this country he could assert that this money came from private sources, that not one dollar was subscribed by any person who ought not to have subscribed and why he should also say in the same speech and almost in the same breath when asked if the Dominion Steel Company had subscribed, that he had no personal knowledge? With regard to the Dominion Steel Company, he said :

> I do not believe there is a word of truth in it. At all events, if such an institution as that had been allowed to subscribe, it would be a gross breach of the understanding which was arrived at when Mr. Fielding's testimonial was started.

How does the right hon. gentleman square one statement with the other? How can he pledge his honour as a man and his responsibility as Prime Minister in answering a very important question upon a very important principle, pledging himself and committing himself to a certain statement,

while, with regard to another subscription, saying that he does not know whether it is so or not and that if it is so it should not be allowed? Therefore, I say in criticism further of the hon. gentleman's attitude on May 3 last, that he did not deal fairly, with me or with this House, or with this country with regard to this question, and I leave it to the judgment of the House in view of what I have just quoted as to whether the right hon. gentleman did or did not. Why should the right hon. gentleman side-track the information in that way? Why should he pledge his responsibility and a moment afterwards confess that he had not personal knowledge upon which to base the responsibility that he pledged before the House on this important matter? On May 3, 1910, I asked for the production of the list and I will just quote from page 8789 of 'Hansard' of that date the concluding words of the remarks that I then offered to the House:

I shall not attempt to dwell upon the principles involved nor to moralize upon the dangers of the situation, but I feel safe in assuming that my right hon. friend, realizing that he spoke upon this resolution in 1891, and that he congratulated his party upon the signal victory obtained, will see that the grand victory of which he speaks, and which was attained as he would argue through blood and tears, be not besmirched now in 1910 by a derogation from the principles then enunciated. The only way, as I submit, in which my hon. friend can put himself square with the resolution, the only way in which I submit he can discharge the duty he owes to this country as Prime Minister and leader of the government, is to make full disclosure, and publish the names and lay the list on the table.

The Prime Minister, in effect, declined to do that, did absolutely nothing, took no action, made no statement to the effect that the list should be published, although the list was in existence, absolutely departed from the resolution of 1891 and from all the principles which he enunciated in support of that resolution. Why has there not been a statement since that time? A testimonial of so large a sum of money as $120,000, a fortune, presented to a minister of the Crown in secrecy, subscribed by persons whose names are absolutely withheld on the demand of this House—why is there this secrecy? Can the right hon. gentleman now offer to this House or the country any excuse whatever for withholding the names of those who subscribed to that testimonial, for withholding since that time the testimonial which was given and will the right hon. gentleman now offer to the House any reasonable excuse why the list has not been made public which was demanded on the 3rd May, 1910. I would be very glad indeed to have an answer from the right hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I have offered to take my seat and give the right hon. gentleman the floor in order that he might reply to a question which, when he was in opposition, he thundered at the then government, and, Sir, he is speechless. Then, Sir, I hurl my right hon. friend's words back in his teeth, though twenty long years have rolled by since he uttered them. There being a list —and he has admitted that there is a list —and the Minister of Finance not knowing the names of those on the list, then I say to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the words I have just quoted from his speech with regard to moral sense, rectitude and public integrity are borne out, and he, and he alone, under these circumstances, must bear the onus and the odium. What condition of things has he brought about? What do we find the newspapers saying regarding our public men? How have the newspapers been reviling the Minister of Finance in a way that no man in private life would tolerate for one half hour. Here I extract from the St. John 'Standard' of the 20th of January——

Mr. CARVELL. A bad authority.

Mr. BOYCE. I am not saying what kind of newspapers these are, but that any kind of newspapers——

Mr. CARVELL. That is in a class by itself.

Mr. BOYCE. And you are in a class by yourself. In the front page of this newspaper, the St. John 'Standard,' is a flaring headline with these words: 'Mr. Fielding got stolen money.' A nice statement for the right hon. Prime Minister to make it possible to publish in any newspaper! Will the Prime Minister suggest that any newspaper in this broad Dominion would have the audacity to make such a statement concerning a public man had the Prime Minister given to this country the list of contributors to this fund? Or will he suggest that the editor who made such a statement could have remained outside a jail? Why, it would have been a criminal libel of the most outrageous character, and the newspaper would have been utterly without defence to it, if the Prime Minister had been true to his pledges and to these great principles that he enunciated. This article and others, published in the press throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, declare that it is reported upon high authority that Wm. R. Travers, late general manager of the Farmers' Bank —now under sentence of six years' imprisonment for stealing money from the bank, falsifying government returns, which led to a terrible financial catastrophe in the shape of a bank failure—had contributed to this testimonial the sum of $2,500. And who, I ask, is responsible for that state-

ment? Who but the Prime Minister of Canada is responsible for the fact that it is possible for anybody to say that Travers, or Sheldon of Montreal, or any other person has contributed a dollar to this testimonial? I give my right hon. friend this warning for what it may be worth—that he has gone a step too far. In departing from his principles, in his hysterical effort to cloak and cover up this transaction in which his Minister of Finance is concerned, he has brought down upon his colleague very severe criticism and very grave suspicion under which, unless this list be published, I fear the Minister of Finance —by reason of the action of the Prime Minister—will suffer for some time. Here is the evening 'Capital' of Saskatoon. I do not know what kind of a paper it is—

Mr. McCRANEY. It is a Tory paper.

Mr. BOYCE. I do not take responsibility for the statements of these papers; I merely indicate what is printed in them to let the public know that the Prime Minister and he alone is responsible for what they say. This is one of the few instances in which one can saddle the Prime Minister with full responsibility for what is published in a Conservative newspaper. In the evening 'Capital' of Saskatoon, of January 20, instant, appears this heading, 'Convicted bank manager said to have contributed to Fielding testimonial.' Now, I ask the Prime Minister, in all sincerity and earnestness, and realizing the gravity of what that means—and no one knows how intense is the gravity of a personal character for the hon. gentleman about whom it is said—why does not he relieve his friend the Minister of Finance from his lying under an imputation so gross, so awful so criminal as this, when to do so he has only to stick to his principles and publish this list?

It has been suggested that all sorts of people have contributed to that testimonial. My right hon. friend has seen, as I have, the names of different persons given as contributors to this testimonial, persons occupying high positions in this country, many of whom have pecuniary relations with the government in one department or another, but especially with the department of the Finance Minister, almost every day of their commercial lives. Is it fair, is it just, is it in accord with the principle that my right hon. friend laid down, that it should be possible that such a statement as that should go out to the public, yet not be brought into this House and denied when by that statement a minister of the Crown is laid under grave suspicion?

I need not mention names of those who, it is said, contributed. It is advisable not to do so in the absence of their verification. I do not know the number of them, although I might give him greater evidence than possibly he thinks I may be able to give with regard to these names. But I say it is not my intention in this debate to indulge in personalities, or to implicate one person more than another. I desire merely to emphasize those grand and noble principles, which my right hon. friend on the 13th of August, 1891, hailed with delight as the achievement of a magnificent principle, a principle long fought for by the Liberal party in this House, and long denied by the then Conservative government, which principle at last, owing to the arguments brought forward and the tactics employed by my right hon. friend as leader of the opposition, they were forced to concede in the interests of purity of government. If that testimonial, in the shape of the gift of a fortune, were given and accepted in the manner and under the circumstances set out in the newspapers of the day, and in the newspapers which have been publishing accounts of it in the last nine months, I say that the giving of it and the acceptance of it would be a brazen defiance of the first principles of parliamentary government, of the resolution of this House, of the pronounced views of the present ministry, including the present Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and of all decent and honest practice which should characterize public men.

That a public man occupying so high a position should be allowed, and should be led into—because that is the way I prefer to put it, as I fancy my hon. friend engineered the whole deal—led into the position in which he now finds his minister, an absolutely inextricable position, from which there is no outlet except that which he provided for himself in 1891, the publication of the list, is a most startling fact to put before this House, and the country, and I say that if he persists in that position, it is a disgrace to our public men and a blot on this administration, a blot possibly darker and more flagrant than any of the dark blots which have characterized it. Sir, we have charged in this House since 1896 different scandals against this government. We have charged that under this government there is the reign of the middleman, and the grafter, dishonesty in public affairs, and wantoness in the expenditure of public money. If the Prime Minister clouds this thing with a cloak of secrecy in defiance of his own principles enunciated in this House, it is a fitting climax to the carnival of graft and corruption that has characterized his administration. I ask my right hon. friend now, where did the money come from? I do not ask it lightly ; I ask it in all seriousness ; because he repeated that question himself

in this House in May, 1910, and then gave an answer on his responsibility as Prime Minister of Canada which, if a six-year-old boy had given at school, he would have been whipped. He first said that the money had come from private sources, and then he said he did not know where it had come from except one subscription which was charged, but if it had come from that source, it was wrong. I am entitled to know, every member of this House is entitled to know, every taxpayer in this country, man, woman and child, is entitled to know, where that money came from. I am here to know—I am here to demand—I believe this House is entitled to demand—where that money came from ; and if the Prime Minister will awake to a realization of the position in which he has placed this country, and one of his ministers, he will see that it is of the utmost importance to this House and this country, for him now to tell where that money came from. I ask my right hon. friend another question here and now : Can a minister of state accept gifts of money privately subscribed, withholding the list of subscribers, and uphold the dignity of the Crown which he serves as a minister? I ask my right hon. friend to answer ; if he will, I will be glad to give place to him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. BOYCE. Sir, my right hon. friend is great at quotations. Sometimes he likes to quote the blunt and rugged honesty of the words of the late Hon. George Brown. My right hon. friend is quite an admirer of the writings, and the position taken by that late hon. gentleman on certain great questions. I want now, for the benefit of my right hon. friend particularly, and for the benefit of this House, to quote to him words of the late Hon. George Brown with which I have no doubt he is very familiar :

If, Sir, a public man avows certain principles, agitates those principles and seeks to overthrow the government of the day and establishes those principles, and if when he attains power he laughs at his principles and casts his professions to the winds, he is aiming a blow at public morality.

Shades of George Brown, Mr. Speaker! When the right hon. gentleman cannot rise in his place in this House and affirm a principle which he adhered to so strongly in 1891, when he was struggling to attain the confidence of the Canadian people. I say my right hon. friend occupies a very invidious position in the light of the words which I have just quoted, when he declines or is unable to answer a question so pointedly put to him, a question so near the heart of this great question which affects so deeply the honour of this great Dominion. Along that line I might ask the right hon. gentleman another question: will he deny that in 1891 he affirmed that if a minister accepted gifts of money without ascertaining himself and then making public the list of the subscribers thereto, he was aiming a blow at public morality? Can my right hon. friend answer that question? Will my right hon. friend deny that if the act of giving testimonials to ministers was done in the open light of day, it would be the best safeguard that there could possibly be against any wrong taking place? I must confess that I never saw the right hon. gentleman so reluctant to answer questions in this House as he is to-day. I would ask him whether he did not affirm in this House in 1891 that the receiving of such testimonials without publicity was causing the name of Canada to become a byword and a reproach? The Prime Minister stated in May, 1910, that there was a list. An hon. friend near me suggests that I should go further and ask the right hon. gentleman whether he saw the list of subscribers to that testimonial? Mr. Speaker, I am speaking in all seriousness. My right hon. friend evaded my moderate question in this House on the 3rd of May, 1910, by saying that there was no name on the list which ought not properly to be read, and he pledged his responsibility as Prime Minister of this country to that effect. I ask him here and now whether he saw the list of names of persons who subscribed to that testimonial, and with the utmost pleasure I will take my seat to give my right hon. friend an opportunity to reply to that most potent question—Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that I gave place to my right hon. friend, he still elects to maintain a silence which in my humble judgment is anything but dignified. I will ask him one more question on this most important matter: Was he not present and did he not see the testimonial presented to the hon. Minister of Finance, and did he not approve of it, applaud it, and at the time he approved of it had he seen the list of persons who subscribed to it? I ask the right hon. gentleman again whether he was not present when that testimonial was presented to the Finance Minister, whether he did not approve of it and applaud it, and whether he had not at the time a list of those who subscribed to it? Will he answer that question? He is silent, but if any significance is to be attached to the stand he took in 1891 and the charges he made against the Conservative party of that day in that connection, it is of the utmost importance now that we should have from him a full disclosure of all the facts. And I say that he is not upholding the dignity of the country when he refuses to answer a question of such pith and moment. It is

a question, in the asking of which I am within my rights and privileges in this free parliament, and it is a question, in refusing to answer which, the right hon. gentleman shows his autocratic contempt for the people and their representatives. In view of the right hon. gentleman's silence, may I again ask him now whether he is prepared to affirm that a cabinet minister may properly receive money from any source and refuse to make public the subscribers of that money, so as to satisfy public opinion that there is no wrong? I see the hopelessness of trying to get from the right hon. gentleman further information and must simply draw the only conclusion which can be drawn from his continued silence.

What is the position in which the right hon. gentleman and the subscribers to this fund have placed the Minister of Finance? In what position is the Minister of Finance after accepting, upon the assurance, no doubt, given him by the Prime Minister that it was all right, that nothing was too good for Fielding—what is the position in which the Finance Minister finds himself after accepting this gift, without seeing the list of those who gave it? What a commentary on the conduct of the Finance Minister must be the declaration of the right hon. gentleman made in 1891 as to what was right and proper in this connection? Can any one urge any good reason why the Prime Minister, in flat defiance of the principles laid down by himself, should now refuse to publish the list? I am asking him in 1911 the very question which he himself hurled across the floor in 1891. My right hon. friend knew who subscribed to that testimonial to the Finance Minister and he must have pledged his responsibility, not only as a private citizen but as Prime Minister, that there was nothing improper in connection with it. Then, in the name of all that is fair and reasonable, why does he not make the list of subscribers public? How long is he going to allow this condition of things to continue? How long is it going to be possible for newspapers all through the country, without fear of libel suits, to make statements reflecting on the honour and credit of ministers of the Crown? Why does he not remove the aspersions that are being cast on himself and his colleagues? If there be no improper subscription, let him publish the list and raise even at this late hour the cloud which rests on the Minister of Finance and which must continue to rest on him so long as this information is withheld. The very evil at which the resolution of the right hon. the Prime Minister in 1891 was aimed is the one which is now being perpetrated by him. I am of the opinion that public men who serve in the capacity of ministers of the Crown should be adequately rewarded. They sacrifice a great deal, they sacrifice their personal means and health, they give to their country all their ability, all their time and all their strength; and I say that when the Minister of Finance in 1905 introduced a measure to provide life pensions for Privy Councillors, he did the right thing. And I know of no valid reason which warranted the hon. gentleman repealing in 1906 the measure which he put through the House in 1905 and in thus subjecting cabinet ministers to embarrassements such as are now being experienced by the Minister of Finance. On the 17th April, 1905, the Finance Minister moved a Bill which went through its three readings based upon this resolution:

That it is expedient that every member of the Privy Council, who has served as cabinet ministers and head of a department for a period of five consecutive years shall, upon retirement from the cabinet, be entitled to receive out of the consolidated revenue of Canada——

Not out of personal subscriptions——

—an annuity equal to one-half the salary attached to his office.

Out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, an annuity equal to one-half the salary attached to his office, or position at the time of his retirement.

2. If any person receiving an annuity hereunder becomes entitled to any salary in respect of any public office under the government of Canada, or to the additional sessional allowance provided for the leader of the opposition in the House of Commons, such salary or allowance shall be reduced by the amount of such annuity.

Sir, what was that Bill for? My hon. friend in moving that said that cabinet ministers were in the same position as judges, they had similar duties to perform, they were in the same dignified position and should be provided for to the same extent. That is a very rational and logical argument and one that calls for this question which I will address to all hon. gentlemen sitting on the government benches: What would they think of a judge occupying a seat on the bench receiving a testimonial from erstwhile clients or suiters, from litigious or non-litigious persons who might at any date have suits before him? Would my hon. friend think it decent or proper that a judge of the High Court should receive such a testimonial of large sums of money? It would have been far better if the Minister of Finance had stuck to his bill of 1905 instead of receding from it in 1906 and saying that he was in favour of it, that he thought the principle was a sound one but was afraid of public opinion. I wonder if he is less afraid of public opinion now. This is what the Prime Minister said on that question on July 10, 1906:

I am quite prepared to have the matter considered by the country generally, by the press, and I would always hold myself ready to consider any scheme that would be suggested to us in favour of providing for the case of those who, having given the best of their lives to the service of the country, find themselves in a position in which they cannot, with any decency, maintain the high position which they have reached.

The Prime Minister then suggested that the matter be left over until the next session for the consideration of a new scheme to meet general conditions. No new scheme was proposed by the Prime Minister to meet the case of a minister of the crown, nothing was done; but the scheme by which the Prime Minister is now allowing himself to be connected is a scheme by which certain unknown persons have subscribed to a testimonial which has been received by the Minister of Finance, both contribution and reception being contrary to the resolution of 1901, to the form of my hon. friend's speech, to the principles enunciated by him and to all principles of decent and honest government. I am curious to know—and I use the word 'curious' again, hoping my right hon. friend will spare me the satire on that word to which he treated me in May last—I am curious to know what the right hon. gentleman proposes to do. I am here, as I said before, asking that my right hon. friend's profession be made good and that he will publish this list. I hope the right hon. gentleman will see his way clear to acceding to what I am asking. I propose asking the right hon. gentleman for this list in order that the principle which he laid down may be maintained, that the sources of the contributions to that gift shall forthwith be made public. I ask him to accede to that principle and I ask the House to accede to it, because it is a right principle, a just principle, an honourable principle, a principle which will add to the dignity of this country and will make for the removal of that stain on the fair name of Canada which lies there in consequence of the failure so far to give the publicity to this list which is required. Are there hon. gentlemen opposite who will vote for such a resolution as that? Are there hon. gentlemen sitting behind the Prime Minister who have so much regard for their personal honour and for the honour of this country that they will not tolerate the swallowing of principles in this wholesale manner by that right hon. gentleman time after time? If in the resolution I offer I quote back to my right hon. friend the very resolution he gave to this House in 1891, the words and the very principles which he loudly claimed as a signal victory for the Liberal party of that day, will any hon. gentleman behind him stand up and vote for it? In another House, illustrating possibly a similar position, and a similar spectacle, speaking of the subserviency of a following something like this, to a leader of a government, this statement was made: 'He cries white and they say it is good, he cries black and they say it is better, it is ever the voice of a god; never has there been heard such since the time of Herod, never has there been seen such slavish adulation.' The right hon. gentleman in 1891 cried 'white'. He cried 'white' by writing in the records of this House that this thing should not be done unless it was done in the sight of all men and before the sun. He said it should not be done and could not be done except under certain conditions and restrictions and bound and hedged about by precautions both for the honour of the recipent of the gift and the honour of the country which he was serving as a cabinet minister. That was the time when the right hon. gentleman was crying 'white.' Will he cry 'black' now? Will he take that resolution and gulp it down or will he adopt it, lay it down as a principle of this country, stand by it and produce that list which he says contains no name that could not be properly made known.

I offer this resolution in the same spirit exactly in which my right hon. friend's colleague, Sir Richard Cartwright, offered it in 1891. I offer it from the same motives, I accompany it not by my own professions, I know that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House do not think that they count for anything, but by the affirmation of the principles laid down by my right hon. friend, and I will ask him now if, having supported the resolution in that way, he will not rise to the occasion and feel that it is his bounden duty, in order to maintain the honour of the position which he now holds, to accept the resolution which I now have the honour to place in your hands and which reads as follows:

That all the words after the word 'that' be struck out and the following be inserted instead thereof:

That the acceptance of gifts or testimonials of any kind on the part of ministers of the Crown or of any member of their families, from contractors, government officials, or other persons having pecuniary relations with the government, is entirely opposed to sound principles of administration and is calculated to bring parliamentary government into contempt, and that the example thus given tends to corrupt and demoralize the officials serving under ministers who have accepted or permitted the acceptance of gifts or testimonials as aforesaid.

That in order to maintain this principle the source of any gifts of money to ministers of the Crown ought not to be surrounded with secrecy, and that an authentic statement of the names of the donors should forthwith be made public.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped it would not be necessary for me to address the House on a matter so largely personal to myself. But lest my silence should be misunderstood, I desire to make a brief statement, not to enter into any matter of controversy, but simply to state the facts as I know them, and then to withdraw from the House and leave the matter to be dealt with as my fellow members may deem best. Some years ago, at an earlier stage of my public career, I was approached by a gentleman, a warm personal friend, who told me that he represented a group of gentlemen who were pleased to entertain a favourable view of my public work, and he told me that they desired to present me with a testimonial in the form of what might be a considerable sum of money. I at once told my friend that while I appreciated his generosity, and that of my other friends, I saw good reasons why I should not permit the movement to go on; therefore, I requested that it be dropped. He referred to the matter once or twice again; I told him that I adhered to my judgment, and the matter was dropped. The friend to whom I refer has since passed away. Years afterwards, quite a number of years afterwards, a year or more ago, at all events, some months before the last session of this parliament, the subject was revived by another gentleman, a man of the very highest character in this country, a man whose motives were beyond the possibility of suspicion, a friend of many years standing, who came to me with a similar proposal. I had several conversations with him concerning it. My first decision was that which I had expressed in earlier years, I refused it. I told him the difficulties in my mind; I told him one of the difficulties was that I had understood that in an earlier case that had occurred in this House, I am not sure, but there were one or more cases, it had been alleged that testimonials had been presented of which a certain part at least had emanated from contractors, or from men seeking favours from the government, and that I saw great difficulty in a public man accepting any testimonial with the possibility of its coming from such a source. He replied that while I might have been justified in earlier years in refusing to allow my friends to take this step, he thought that at this stage of my life the conditions perhaps were not the same, and that my friends wished me to consider the matter further. I gave the matter further consideration, and I again discussed with him the difficulty which I had in my mind as to accepting a testimonial which might possibly come from sources which would be open to suspicion. He informed me that that matter had been fully considered, and that he was authorized by his associates, whose names he did not tell me at the time—nor do I even know yet who they all were—he told me he was authorized by them to say that they would guarantee to me that not one penny would, be accepted from any government contractor, from any person who was then seeking or was at any time likely to be seeking, any office, favour or patronage of any kind from the government. That assurance was given me by a gentleman on whose word I could rely. Let me say that he added further, in order that I might not at any time have any sense of personal obligation to anybody, that he was authorized to inform me that the list of contributors should not be made known. It has been suggested this afternoon that in that secrecy there was some harm. I know that the object of secrecy was not harm, the object was good, because my friend stated, 'since you will never know who the men are that gave you this testimonial, you will never feel under any personal obligation to any of them, they are not likely to come to you at all; but if they ever do come to you, you will have no means of knowing them, because the names will neither be made public, nor will they be communicated even to yourself.' I said to him there would probably come a time in later years when I might no longer be in public life, when I might desire to know the names of the friends who had manifested so much kindness towards myself. He replied, 'I do not believe even then you will know, because those who are promoting this movement are determined the list shall not be made public.' With that assurance, with the assurance that not one penny would be accepted from any government contractor, from any person who was likely to be an applicant for any office, patronage or favour from the government, with the assurance that I would not even know the names, and with the further assurance that the matter had been mentioned to my good friend the Prime Minister, and that he had given his approval to the movement, on those conditions, with those assurances, I agreed to accept the testimonial.

After the testimonial had been announced to the public, but before the transaction had really been consummated, some comment, ungenerous, I thought, was made in this House, and other comment more ungenerous in the press. I went at once to the gentleman who was chiefly instrumental in promoting the matter, and called his attention to this comment. I said: You have given me your guarantee that not one dollar would be accepted from any source except in the way we have arranged, that not a dollar would be accepted from government contractors or people who were likely to be seeking favour from the government; I suppose I can rely upon your

having kept faith with me. As it is not too late to retrace your steps, before you go further with this transaction, I want you and others concerned in it, to examine that list, and if you find that inadvertently any man has been permitted to make the smallest contribution to that list, who does not come within the category of those who were to be permitted to subscribe, I insist that you shall send him back his money, and do it instantly. That was the understanding I have had. I have no doubt that that gentleman with whom I was dealing, acted in good faith, I know that he wanted to do what was right in the matter; I know that he and his associates were moved only by what they were pleased to regard as an appreciation, perhaps too great an appreciation, of my services—they were moved by personal regard and friendship for me. They gave me the assurance that they would not permit a dollar to be accepted from sources that would be open to objection. Having received that assurance, and feeling satisfied that they were acting in good faith, and that not one dollar was accepted which would come within the terms of the discussion of former years, I felt, Sir, that I was justified in receiving the testimonial. I confess that, while the testimonial itself was one that a public man would value, and I did value it, I valued still more the expression of good will, confidence and regard which it brought to me from different parts of Canada, from men of all parties, from Conservatives as well as Liberals and, aye, from men who sit on your left to-day, Mr. Speaker, and for whose congratulations I was deeply grateful.

I do not desire to enter into any of the matters, which may be matters of controversy, referred to by the hon. member for Algoma. My purpose is simply to state the facts as they are known to me, the conditions under which this proposal came to me, the conditions under which I accepted it, and, whatever others may think, I feel that those who know me, whether they be my political friends or my political foes, will believe that the statement I present to-day is an exact statement of the facts, and I question whether anybody can say that a testimonial accepted under such conditions, is anything that would reflect upon my honour, or the honour of my colleagues, or upon my independent action as a member of this legislature.

Mr. MILLER (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLER. I am very glad——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. MILLER. If, Mr. Speaker, I supplied the word 'gentlemen' to those sitting on the other side of the House, or to any of them, and if, in saying that, I said anything that was unparliamentary I beg to take it back. Mr. Speaker, I am glad, I am delighted to think that there is but one man in this House of Commons upon either side who could be induced to make the attack which has been made this afternoon. The hon. member who made the attack used these words: 'I have no desire to injure any public man.' House flies are said to carry typhoid fever germs, mosquitoes are supposed to scatter yellow fever, there are even said to be in the water we drink millions of little bacilli that are able to conceal themselves in a drop of water, and yet are able to do much harm and scatter disease. I do not think that the hon. member (Mr. Boyce) who has addressed the House this afternoon bids fair ever to become large enough or great enough to do the slightest injury to any public man by anything which he might say or do. I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I was not surprised when the hon. member rose to his feet, nor was I surprised by anything he said. I was surprised that some hon. gentlemen, to whom I have been very willing to apply the word 'gentleman,' applauded him as they did, but I was gratified indeed to notice that the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) gave no sign of approval by any applause or any look of pleasure or satisfaction. I was glad to observe that the most prominent, the most influential, the most respected men on the other side of the House did not give any measure of applause. I think, Sir, that the leader of the opposition would have restrained the young man had he reasonably been able to do so, and I shall be astonished if he votes for the resolution which has been propounded. I noticed that some of the most respected members of the other side of the House were wrapped in slumber while the hon. gentleman spoke as he did. The hon. member quoted all the newspapers without asking the names of these papers. He said: 'any newspaper,' and he appeared willing to make his attack from any report, or any newspaper or any other source from which a report could be found or discovered.

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MILLER—from any source—

Mr. BOYCE. I am speaking to a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has paid me many compliments, but I object to his mis-stating what I said. I mentioned the name of every newspaper from which I quoted, or from which I extracted the headlines.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. member distinctly said 'any newspaper' and his whole address showed a willingness to use whatever story would help him in his attack.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member (Mr. Miller) must accept the hon. gentleman's version of his own statement, or his version of what he intended to say.

Mr. MILLER. I willingly do.

Mr. BOYCE. I ask my hon. friend then to withdraw the expression 'any newspaper.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw, withdraw.

Mr. MILLER—Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. member (Mr. Miller) to say that he is willing to obey the ruling of the Chair. The custom is to accept the statement of an hon. member.

Mr. MILLER. I have not the slightest idea of not observing your ruling in any matter, Mr. Speaker. I do not clearly understand the point of order. I quoted the hon. gentleman's words. If I quoted them incorrectly I am quite willing, of course, to accept his statement. I am speaking on this occasion because I was a member of the committee which assisted in collecting the Fielding fund. I might repeat that the understanding from the beginning to the end of the whole transaction, was, as has been stated that not a dollar should be accepted from any government contractor, from any government official, or any person having anything whatever to do with the Finance Department or with the government. It is urged that there ought to have been publicity, that the list of donors ought to have been published. Let me say, Sir, that there is no one who has the power to compel the publishing of such a list. The members of the committee determined from the very beginning that the names of the donors should not be revealed to Mr. Fielding or be made public in any way. The list is not the property even of the Prime Minister. It is the property of the committee by whom the funds were collected. It is not within the power of any man to say that the list shall be made public because it would be contrary to the understanding from the very beginning by the committee who collected the money.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That is the policy laid down by the Prime Minister himself.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. member for Leeds speaks of the policy laid down by the hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself. The whole volume of the attack of the hon. member for Algoma was based upon a resolution supported by the Prime Minister in this House in 1891. But as was distinctly stated by the hon. member for Algoma, that resolution was adopted because of gifts from contractors, government officials, and a number of persons having to do with the government. That was one thing. The matter before us now is entirely another thing, is as distinct and different as can be. It has been said repeatedly, it has been said correctly, that it was the understanding from the beginning that not a dollar should be accepted from any such person, and that understanding has been faithfully adhered to. Sir, I have collected moneys before, and for different objects, and for different persons, but I have never taken——

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to ask the hon. member a question. He has told the House that he was the promoter of this great undertaking——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. STAPLES. Then, one of the committee—if you cannot understand, I will be more explicit and quote the hon. gentleman's words; he was one of the committee. Then, I ask the hon. gentleman where is the list?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have never undertaken any task that afforded me greater pleasure than did the gathering of that part of the money that I did gather as a testimonal to Hon. Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance. Never were requests more cheerfully responded to, never did men seem more willing to contribute. And, Sir, these contributions came from all classes of men, men of all professions and belonging to both political parties; and not one of them within the classes condemned by the resolution supported by the Prime Minister in 1891. Many of the subscriptions were voluntary; many came from persons who were not asked to subscribe. And many who subscribed gave the heartiest expressions of appreciation of the value of Hon. Mr. Fielding's services to this country.

Mr. EDWARDS. I desire——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member from South Grey (Mr. Miller) has the floor. If he consents——

Mr. EDWARDS. The hon. gentleman has said——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for South Grey has the floor and cannot be interrupted.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. There must be an understanding, The hon. member for South Grey has the floor——

Mr. EDWARDS. I want to know if he will permit me to ask a question?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman does not wish to give that permission.

Mr. MILLER. Never before has there been a greater example on the part of any Canadian citizen of devotion to duty than the example shown for fourteen years while Minister of Finance by Hon. Mr. Fielding. During that fourteen years, he has served this country as well as any public man ever served any country. And, let me add, expressions of kindliness, of appreciation, of confidence, were just as common from Conservatives as they were from members of the Liberal party. And it may not be generally known to members of this House or to the people of Canada that, time and again, on more than one occasion, Hon. Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, has been offered, and has refused, from private business institutions salaries far in advance of any he has ever received or any indemnity ever given him as Finance Minister of this Dominion.

As chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee, during last session and the session before, when the committee was very busily engaged with the general insurance Act, in which members of both sides of the House took a deep interest, day after day, I noticed that Mr. Fielding, who was at my side while I presided over that committee, would call a messenger as the hour of adjournment approached, and send him for a lunch to be taken to Mr. Fielding's room. And, in place of spending an hour or an hour and a half as business men are in the habit of doing, in club or lunch-room, Mr. Fielding partook of his lunch while dictating letters or reading correspondence. It is a fact well known to every member of this House and to a great many business men of Canada at least, that Hon. Mr. Fielding has so devoted his time and thought and energy to the duties of his position and the interests of Canada, that he has paid not the slightest regard to his own business affairs, his own fortune, or the accumulation of any provision for himself or his family. I have heard members on both sides speak in the highest terms of Mr. Courtney, who was, until a few years ago, Deputy Finance Minister. Mr. Courtney is a man of experience, and a man of undoubted integrity, and, so far as he has any political leanings those leanings are to the Conservative party; he was appointed by a Conservative government. I happened to be walking one afternoon with Mr. Courtney some time after he had resigned his position as Deputy Minister of Finance. He spoke of Mr. Fielding. He said that Hon. Mr. Fielding came from Nova Scotia to accept the position of Finance Minister of Canada, a fresh vigorous, hearty young man, with hair as black as raven's wings; but, he said, that with these years of devotion to duty and to his country, his hair had become whitened. And he said: 'There is not a man in Canada, whatever may be his politics, who would dare to point a finger of suspicion at Hon. Mr. Fielding, Sir, we are all proud to know that that is true. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), speaking last night, speaking, perhaps, jocosely,—said: 'If the people of Canada were foolish enough to continue in power much longer the government that now controls the affairs of the country.' Sir, if the Liberal party have been in power for fourteen years, and if, as I anticipate, they will be in power for fourteen years yet to come, it is largely because of two reasons, and of two personages. The first is the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The people of this Dominion, the business men, the thinking men, of Canada, for fourteen years, have believed, as they believe today, that there is no other Canadian so well fitted to fill the position of Prime Minister as is the gentleman who now fills and adorns that position. And no less truly do the business men of Canada, whether they be Liberals or Conservatives, believe, as they have believed for the last fourteen years, that Canada has never had a Finance Minister equal in his devotion, in his integrity, in his ability, to Hon. W. S. Fielding. Sir, business men in Canada, even Conservatives, men whose every vote has been cast for the Conservative party, have hesitated to mark their ballots against this government, for the very fear that some man other than Hon. W. S. Fielding might control the financial affairs of this country. And one of the strongest cards it has been possible to play for the Liberal government in any part of this country is to ask, 'If you vote Hon. W. S. Fielding out of office as Finance Minister in Canada, whom do you think you are voting in ?'

It would not have been right, it would not have been fair, it would scarcely have been honourable or honest, for Hon. W. S. Fielding, when men who had no connection whatever with this government, not government officials, not government contractors, not men who had alliances in any way with the government, chose to present him with a magnificent sum of money as an evidence of their esteem, of their confidence, of their approval of his long-time work for Canada—I say that when men of that class chose to present a money token to Hon. W. S. Fielding, it would not

have been right or honourable, having his family in view, for him to have refused that gift. Neither would it have been a nice thing for the gentlemen who proffered the gift to have had it refused in that way. The Hon. W. S. Fielding has given his whole life and has sacrificed his health in the service of this country ; he has refused financial positions yielding much greater revenue; and this he has done out of love for the country quite as much as any military general who has lost his life on his country's battlefields. And, Sir, when a man who has been of such great value to the country of which he is proud to be a citizen, is asked to accept a gift which has been proffered to him by his friends, I say it is not to the credit of this House that even one of its members should have been willing to make the charge which has been made to-day. Sir, I take up the morning 'Citizen' of this city, a Conservative newspaper, and I read in it the following expression of opinion spoken by one of the clergymen of the city in his pulpit last Sunday morning:

Right of Parliament—Rev. J. W. H. Milne Condemns Actions of some Members.

Rev. J. W. H. Milne, in his sermon Sunday in Glebe Presbyterian church, in referring to men being able to differ and yet remain friends, said:

Some men in politics can agree to differ. Some men can contend openly and honourably, yet withal retain no unkindly feeling. But even now and then there are men, even members of parliament, who are so venomous in their opposition to those who differ from them that they are ready to suggest or say anything that will leave a stain on the character of an opponent. There is something essentially villainous in the makeup of a man who, in order to gain his ends politically, will accept any story floating about and then ask a question, because privileged, with the object of destroying another who may be opposed to him. But worse still is it for any member of parliament, because shielded by four walls, to bring before the public the name of any man against whom he may have a grudge, on mere pretext of suspicion. Any man may have his name brought before the House by any member. He may be maligned by innuendos. He may, although innocent, have suspicion cast on his character, yet have no means of redress.

This may be called the right of parliament but it is not in harmony with the spirit of Christian civilization. No civilized community would tolerate the highwayman who would jump from an ambush and steal the purse of a respectable citizen and yet we permit political highwaymen to stand up in the House and rob sincere, earnest citizens of their character. There must eventually be some means provided which will prevent such public outrages.

Sir, if I should make the application of that article which I should like, you would at once rule out my language as unparliamentary. I am glad to believe that there is in this country perhaps only one representative of the press who would so demean himself as to have spread that garbled and false report through the length and breadth of Canada as to the contribution from W. R. Travers to the Fielding fund. And I think the hon. member who spoke this afternoon when he knew that a proper denial had been made of the story, ought at least to have been sufficiently manly to have made some reference to that denial. I hope, Sir, that, with more years of parliamentary experience, if by any chance or by any foolishness of the electorate the hon. gentleman is permitted to continue in this House, he will some day regret the action he has taken to-day, and will apologize, as I believe an apology is due, to the House, to his constituents, and to the particular member who was the object of his attack.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, I regard it as a subject of regret that any hon. member of this House should be ready to take up a false statement, started by some evil-minded person, and give it so much publicity. I am aware that it is the right of every hon. member to do so; but with that right there is a corresponding responsibility. In my judgment the man who circulates a false story is only a degree less guilty than the man who starts it originally. If an hon. member is to deal seriously and not flippantly with a question of this kind, he ought to be able to produce some proof; he ought to be brave enough to make a charge and put behind it some kind of proof before he brings the matter before the House. My hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) has not had the courage to do anything of the kind.

As I acted as a humble member of the committee in charge of the testimonial question, I think it is due to the House and to the hon. Minister of Finance that I should say a few words. I will not discuss the general subject of donations to cabinet ministers. My opinion is that this discussion is brought on, not for the purpose of settling any general principle, but for the mere purpose of making an unprovoked attack upon the character of the Minister of Finance. This is clearly understood on both sides of the House, and it is very well understood in the country. Now, Sir, I wish to assure the House as a member of that committee that the statement made in the press and repeated in this House by the hon. member for West Algoma on the 23rd day of this month, that Mr. W. R. Travers, the late manager of the Farmers' Bank, contributed $2,500 to the Fielding memorial, is false. Not one dollar of that memorial was contributed by Mr. Travers; not one

dollar of the memorial was contributed by the Farmers' Bank, or I may say by any other bank in Canada. I wish also to assure the House that the committee was scrupulously careful that no money should be accepted from contractors, from corporations, from banks or from any party having any dealings with the government. That was the understanding on which the memorial was started, and that understanding was very carefully carried out by every member of the committee. Every dollar of that memorial was clean money contributed by the personal friends and admirers of the Minister of Finance; and I am glad to repeat, what has already been said in the House, that some of those are to be found in the ranks of the Conservative party. I also desire to assure the House that the utmost secrecy was maintained by the committee, and that the names of the contributors were not given to the Minister of Finance. I question if he knows to-day the name of a single man who contributed to the memorial.

The fact that after 30 years of faithful service devoted to his country, his closest friends felt that something of that kind was necessary is of itself sufficient proof of the integrity and honesty of the Minister of Finance. I cannot think that the Conservative party as a whole—and I feel sure that the Conservative party in this House—are not behind the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) in the attack he has made this afternoon upon the Minister of Finance. It is quite clear that the applause which met his remarks did not come from the front benches of the opposition. My hon. friend quoted some newspapers of the baser sort speaking for the Conservative party. Let me quote in my turn from the press, and I shall not now quote from the Liberal, but from the Conservative press. I want to be permitted to read an editorial which appeared in the Kingston 'Standard,' which, I am told, is one of the old time Conservative papers of Ontario. At one time, I believe it was the organ of the late Sir John Macdonald, and is one of the decent and respectable Tory papers in this country—and I am glad to say there are a number of them. It is not a scurrilous newspaper like the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' and others I could mention. It is one of the good old fashioned, simon pure Tory papers which believes in British fair play, and I wish to be permitted to read the editorial. This is what the Kingston 'Standard' says.

> We cannot see how any political advantage is to be gained out of the statement put in circulation by sundry people and newspapers that W. R. Travers contributed $2,500 to the fund which made up the purse to the Hon. Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance. In the first place, there seems no warrant or foundation for the statement; and in the second place, it is one of those petty, miserable, nasty charges that usually do their originators more harm than good—and per contra, usually do more good than harm to the person or persons at whom they are directed. Fair play in politics is, it seems to us, as necessary as fair play in business—but this charge is not fair; it is merely contemptible, for we all know, and it was announced at the time, that Mr. Fielding has never been told, has not known and does not want to know who were the contributors to his fund.
>
> For our own part we have felt that in respect to this gift to Mr. Fielding that it could not possibly make any difference to him in his official capacity or conduct. If he is honest—and we think he is—the gift would not make him dishonest. If he is dishonest the gift would not make him more so. But, however this be, one thing is certain, and that is that no harm will come to him through innuendos and sneers that are not worthy any decent newspaper or any decent man.
>
> It's a great thing to know how to play a game—even a political game—fairly.

That is the opinion of one of the respectable newspapers supporting the party of my hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce). It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that in these days the good name of no public man is altogether safe, especially if he takes an active part in political warfare. The late Alexander Mackenzie is now universally regarded as having been a disinterested pure-minded statesman. Honesty and integrity are admitted to have been his chief characteristics. If any one should happen to mention Mr. Mackenzie he would say of him: Well, there is an honest man. In the history of this country, Mr. Mackenzie is considered as the Sir Galahad of Canadian public life. Yet one has only to turn back to the newspapers and to 'Hansard' of that day to find that the scavengers were busy trying to blacken his character. But, thank God, they failed, and the character of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie stands to-day as an example and inspiration to young men of Canada. This attack of my hon. friend on the Minister of Finance, I regard as an analogous case. The Finance Minister had just returned from a successful mission to a foreign government. Everybody was glad, hon. gentlemen in this House generally on both sides were glad, to welcome him back and to see that his health was improved. The people of Canada, from Cape Breton to Victoria, were listening with interest to the message he brought back from Washington, and he brought back a proposed treaty which ought to earn for him the gratitude of every patriotic Canadian; but scarcely had he taken his seat in this House when he discovered that an hon. member of this House had been spending his time during his absence gathering up mud to throw at him. I want to say in closing to the scavengers outside this House—I am quite

well aware that if I were to call a member of this House a scavenger, I would be called to order—I want to say to the scavengers that their attempt to besmirch or blacken the character of the Hon. Mr. Fielding will fail. Mr. Fielding is too well known in Canada, and wherever he is known, he is respected, honoured and loved. His 15 years of faithful public service in his own native province have not been forgotten, and the 14 years during which he acted as the lieutenant of our great leader, and helped to shape the course and guide the destiny of this country in the larger arena will always be one of the brightest chapters in the history of Canada. Let me tell you, Sir, that the reputation and the good faith of the Minister of Finance is one of the most precious possessions of the Canadian people. Any one who attempts to besmirch or blacken that good fame will earn the contempt from all decent Canadians that his conduct deserves. Let the scavengers throw mud if they will, it will not stick. It did not stick to Mr. Mackenzie, and it will not stick to Mr. Fielding.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I shall slightly vary the trend of my remarks this evening owing to the attitude assumed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I had intended to speak, as far as possible, in a purely judicial way. I shall endeavour to do so still, but I shall bring into discussion several matters that I would have been disposed to leave out had not supporters of the government assumed such an extraordinary attitude in reference to this motion. We have reached a very unfortunate pass in Canadian affairs if a member of this House, feeling it to be his duty to do so, as it would have been the duty of many other members of this House, may not venture to bring to your attention and to the attention of the House and of the country the extraordinary circumstances that present themselves in connection with the gift of about $120,000 to a minister of the Crown. I am quite prepared to join with any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House in paying tribute where it is necessary, not a pecuniary tribute, but a meed of praise to any minister of the Crown who honourably and faithfully discharges his duties. I am not prepared to join with the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) who imagine that they should seize a circumstance that certainly reflects no credit upon the government or the Finance Minister as the occasion for fulsome and undeserved laudations such as we have had this afternoon. I have not understood that this side of the House launched any attack upon the Minister of Finance. I did not understand until the hon. member for Guysborough spoke that there was any mud-slinging. I have understood that the member for West Algoma thought it necessary, in view of circumstances that have transpired, to refer again in this House to the language which was so enthusiastically lauded by the First Minister in 1891, and from which unfortunately the ministers have signally and purposely departed. But in referring to that principle no attack has been made upon the Minister of Finance. Circumstances have arisen in connection with a gift to the Finance Minister, which having regard to the declarations of all parties in 1891, call upon the government at the earliest possible moment to make a full and fair disclosure of the persons who contributed to that testimonial. If there is an attack at all it is an attack upon the First Minister, certainly there is none upon the Minister of Finance. But I am prepared to say from my place in the House that I distinctly attack the position taken by the First Minister, for when I find an hon. gentleman like the First Minister declaring so emphatically in 1891 the principle and the only principle upon which a public testimonial can be made to a minister of the Crown and then find him in 1909 and 1910 distinctly going back on every statement he made on that occasion, I think it is time to call the attention of the House and of the public to the attitude of the First Minister. It is sometimes said among lawyers that in a certain class of cases the most unwise thing to do is to put your own client in the box and there has been no exception to that rule this afternoon, for whereas until I heard the Minister of Finance, I was prepared to believe that should the list be brought down it might establish that there were no improper contributions, I am not now prepared to take that attitude. I thought that we were vindicating the honour of the House by asking for the production of this document. I hoped it would show that the people had not been deceived and that contributions had not been made which ought not to have been made. I had hoped that the government would have vindicated their position by bringing down a statement of the names of the contributors and have shown that there was not one improper contribution upon that list. Why don't they do it as the right hon. gentleman said in 1891? Why don't they do it? Because they dare not do it. I challenge the First Minister now, after all that has been hurled from that side of the House, I challenge him again to get up in the House and implement the statements he made in 1891,

and say that for once he will redeem a pledge and a promise, and lay upon the table of the House the statement that we are entitled to; and I will then join with him, or any other member of the House, in paying any reasonable measure of tribute to the Minister of Finance.

But the Finance Minister made a peculiar statement. He says, I was approached on one occasion many years ago, a gentleman proposed to make me a testimonial, and I absolutely refused. He was not tempted on that occasion. But they came again. Who were they? It would be very interesting to the people of this country to know. On that occasion the hon. gentleman parleyed, he hesitated, and to hesitate in a case of that kind is to be lost. He parleyed; his better judgment told him, as he said this afternoon, that the thing could not consistently be done. He says he felt that the probability was that if that subscription list was put in vogue, names would occur on it which ought not to be there, and there would be a political scandal. Therefore, tempted as he was—and I do not blame him for being tempted—he resisted their blandishments and their suggestions, and they went away. But the tempter came again, in, I think, a more unholy guise than before, came in the person of a gentleman that I will mention presently. I am no seer, but I think I can put my hand upon that gentleman—not in this chamber; but I think I can point him out, and I will point him out through the 'Globe' newspaper presently. This gentleman came in a more tempting guise and said: We want to get up a testimonial—thoroughly disinterested, not one of the subscribers should derive any benefit from the government, purely voluntary. Even if we are not disinterested, it is no matter, because we will never never tell who we are. And the minister listened to the voice of the tempter, and he fell; and Mr. Speaker, it was a great fall in the public life of Canada, it was a very unfortunate circumstance in the history of this country, it is something that will take us some time to wipe away. What does the minister tell us? He tells us that he made a bargain. Did you ever hear Mr. Speaker, the like before? He says: We made a hard and fast bargain, then and there, that this would be an absolute and inviolate secret for all time to come; we made a bargain behind the backs of the people whose servants we are. That is what the Minister of Finance tells us. He says: This gentleman bound himself that these names would never be divulged, and I bound myself that I would put my head in the sand like an ostrich, and that I would never look to find out who these men were; and that in the meantime I would go on as before, as if it had never happened, and administer the affairs of the Dominion of Canada, conscious though I might be, he says, that perhaps a lot of that money came from an unholy source, but I would not know it. So, he says, I made the bargain. I say, Mr. Speaker, that a more infamous bargain than that by which the Finance Minister pledged himself, to use the language of the First Minister, to be 'deaf and dumb, and blind' for all time, was never made in the Dominion of Canada.

And was the minister perfectly innocent in the matter? I came here this afternoon prepared to say that in the career of the Minister of Finance, he had never put his hands into the treasury to enrich himself, that I would be in complete sympathy with him if he received private contributions from private friends, publicly made, in the face of day, before the people of Canada, and I would be glad if he got it, because I recognize that through no fault of his, perhaps, he needed it, and it was no reproach to him that he needed it. But to-day I have heard hon. gentlemen going out of their way to sling mud at this side of the House, and to laud the Minister of Finance as if, not only was he personally honest up to that time, but as if he were a paragon of political honesty, and an example to the people. I am not quite prepared to go that far, I recollect that in the history of this broad Dominion, where rampant extravagance has prevailed for the last twelve or fourteen years, where worse than extravagance has been witnessed in every part of the Dominion, there has been no member of parliament who has been less careful as to the manner in which he would hold his party in power, no member of this House who has been more reckless as to how the public money was being expended for the purpose of bringing grist to their own mill, than the Finance Minister of Canada. Whilst I am prepared to certify to his personal honesty up to this time, I am not able to close my eyes to the fact—which I would not have mentioned, but for the line the debate has taken that there has been no instance in the history of Canada, black as it is as regards the debauching of constituencies, so black as the case of the very constituency which is represented by the Minister of Finance.

Now was the Minister of Finance perfectly innocent in this infamous bargain? The fact that it was a secret bargain is a bad feature, the fact that it is kept secret is a presumption of guilt, and a very strong one, when persisted in as we find here. But I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have here the most cogent evidence that this bargain, made by the Minister of Finance, as he tells us, with those gentle-

men in the guise of friends, was not a fair and bona fide bargain. In other words—the Minister of Finance did not act in perfect good faith when he made that bargain, because he tells us, this mysterious gentleman told me that 'I would never be told who the contributors were.' So far so good. I agree to that, but, he says, before I let him go from me, I asked him for one concession. I said: I may retire from public life, and I might like to know before I die as to who they were who benefited me; will you grant this request that whilst it shall be inviolably concealed so long as it may be a source of temptation to me to do wrong, it will be divulged to me after I retire from public life? Will the right hon. Prime Minister tell the House, if it was a perfectly legitimate transaction on the part of the Finance Minister and if it was bona fide intended that no gentleman was to contribute to this testimonial who could, in any way come in contact with the minister in his public office, how could there be any difference in the situation after he had retired from office from his situation while he remained in office? So, in moderate language, I hope, but impelled by a sense of duty as a public man, I charge that the Finance Minister in the statement he made this afternoon, proved conclusively and incontestably that he had an inkling into that transaction and into the nature of it before he parted from the mysterious friend who beguiled him on that occasion.

Well, who was this truly benevolent personage, this truly good man, who came to him and made this bargain? It was not the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), it was not the chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee. It was not he because he is not a big enough man for the position. It was a bigger man than that. If I have said that the gentleman of racecourse fame was not big enough for that situation I need not say that the member for Guysborough would not fill the bill. It was not he who came. Well then, who was it? Was it a gentleman by the name of Jaffray? I think we have pretty strong and conclusive evidence that it was. Let me recall to the House the description by the Minister of Finance of the gentleman who came here and you will see at once that it will not apply to the hon. member for South Grey or the hon. member for Guysborough. He says that he was a man occupying a very important position, a very distinguished gentleman, a man high up in social circles and so on in Canada, a man of irreproachable character and a man of the highest sense of honour. I wish we had him on file here just to examine him. When I got that picture I said to myself that I did not think there was anybody who could fill the bill except Jaffray, that gentleman of immaculate purity, that white-robed angel, slightly sprinkled with coal dust, who had performed certain injudicious, but very profitable pilgrimages into the Crowsnest Pass. But why did I think that it was Senator Jaffray?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). He was one of them.

Mr. LENNOX. He was one of them and a gentleman by the name of P. C. Larkin was another, and another of the beautiful quartette as far as is disclosed, was the hon. member for South Grey, the Under Secretary, if I may call him that, of the Minister of Finance, the chairman of the Banking Committee and a gentleman who can always whisper into the ear of the Minister of Finance, and tell him what he will; this man ought to go; this man ought to stay, and you can imagine what a valuable character he will be when the great Banking Act comes up for investigation at a very early date. I will have a word to say about the hon. member for South Grey, not because of his position, but because of his connection with this matter, later on.

Mr. BOYCE. And Larkin.

Mr. LENNOX. Larkin is a gentleman who is—oh, he is a man of means—a man of ways and means. Well now, a certain newspaper that can sling mud almost as well as we can on this side of the House, as described by the hon. member for Guysborough, was attacking the member who introduced this resolution in its editorial columns on the 25th of January last. This is the 'Globe' and it speaks of 'The detractors of Mr. Fielding.' As soon as it is asked to have a resolution passed affirming the attitude of these gentlemen, trying to re-establish them in their faith of 1891, the 'Globe' takes up the cudgels and attacks us as 'the detractors of Mr. Fielding.' In referring to what the hon. member for Algoma had given notice of, it says:

> The whole fantastic fabric is founded on falsehood from beginning to end. Had Travers contributed $2,500 or any other sum to the testimonial, Mr. Fielding would never have known of it,——

Mr. Fielding never would have known of it. That is rather a significant statement. We have this fact set out by the organ of the Grit party, the first organ of the Grit party in this country, that even Travers or any other criminal, had contributed to the testimonial Mr. Fielding would never have known of it and innocently would have been enjoying the secret fruits of dishonesty.

> —for to this day he has not seen or in any other way been informed of the names of the contributors so careful were those who arranged the testimonial to make sure that no

contributions would be given because of a lively sense of favours to come.

These gentlemen appreciate the situation, at all events.

Senator Jaffray——

That is the gentleman in disguise who came to the Finance Minister——

—and Mr. P. C. Larkin, who obtained the Toronto subscriptions,——

And this with Montreal is the big end of it, with the smaller fry here in the House of Commons.

—desire it to be known that neither directly nor indirectly from Mr. Travers or any one on his behalf or on behalf of the Farmers' Bank was any subscription received nor was any subscription asked for or tendered.

Am I not right in assuming that the chief engineers of this whole affair were Jaffray and Larkin? Who is Mr. Jaffray and does he come within the limits of the definition laid down by the Liberals in 1891, by that great and good man, Sir Richard Cartwright, and by that almost equally immaculate gentleman, the right hon. First Minister who leads this House? Is Jaffray a contractor with the government or not?

An hon. MEMBER. Is Larkin?

Mr. LENNOX. Is Larkin a contractor with the government or not? We know of Jaffray's connection with the 'Globe' and we know that the 'Globe' has a better thing than this testimonial. Why not, when the 'Globe' is annually in receipt of a tidy little sum from this government, part of it earned and a great deal of it not earned except by fulsome laudations and dishonest statements, of about $8,000 on the average So that this thing is coming fairly well home.

Before I go on, let me say, I am reminded that P. C. Larkin is not the contractor, but a tea man. And the tea men are getting a pretty nice tea party in connection with the transcontinental at the present time.

Now let me call attention to the attitude which should be assumed by the government of Canada to contributions such as those under discussion, an attitude much loftier than is called for by the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Boyce). Hon. gentlemen will recall the incident in the life of Mr. Pitt. In 1789, when King George III. was found to be incapable of carrying on affairs of state, it was necessary to appoint a regent. I will read from Mr. Stanhope's work a short quotation which will show how this affected Mr. Pitt's fortunes. On three several occasions parties approached Mr. Pitt—his circumstances being of extreme difficulty—to give him the means of living—very like the Finance Minister in that particular, but very much unlike the Finance Minister, in that Mr. Pitt declined on all three occasions; and different in this respect also, that while, when the first offer was made to him Mr. Pitt was about to retire from public life, when the second proposal was made he had actually retired from public life, but yet, having regard to the fact that he might at some future time re-enter public life (though it was pointed out to him that the funds collected would be paid into a bank and he would never know the name of any contributor) he answered that he would never be able to meet any body without feeling that it might be one to whom he was indebted and declined. This is Mr. Stanhope's account of the situation:

By these votes of the Commons and the Lords the ground was cleared for Pitt's proposal with respect to the Regency Bill, a proposal hitherto kept secret, and indeed not yet fully matured. But during the interval he received a most signal token of the public esteem and approbation.

It was well known by the public that Pitt would not be continued one hour in office by the Regent. It was known that he had already taken measures for returning to his first profession. It was also known, perhaps, that his neglect of his private affairs had involved him in some debts, which he trusted to discharge by an industrious application of his talents at the bar. At this very time, however, there was held, by public advertisement, a meeting——

That is not a secret meeting.

—of the principal bankers and moneyed men of London anxious to tender him on his retirement from office a substantial mark of their esteem. The sum of £50,000 was first proposed, but so great was the enthusiasm that in the space of forty-eight hours this sum was doubled, and Mr. George Rose, as his Secretary of the Treasury, was requested to press upon him, in the manner most likely to be acceptable, a free gift of £100,000. But Mr. Pitt answered his friend as follows: 'No consideration upon earth shall ever induce me to accept it.'

Years passed and Mr. Pitt was out of office. It was realized that his difficulties, instead of passing away, had been increasing. His creditors, who had been prepared to wait while he was in office, became pressing when he retired; in fact, executions were threatened to be put upon his property. In this state of things, a renewal of the former offer was made. This was in 1801, and concerning these events Mr. Stanhope says:

Pitt was too proud to utter a word of complaint even to his nearest friends. But they, and even, though in less degree, the public at large, soon became aware of the extremities to which he was reduced. There was a most earnest desire on their part, so far as he would allow them, to succour and relieve him. For this object three plans were at

different times proposed. In the first place, some gentlemen intended to bring forward a motion in the House of Commons for a public grant to him. But when Mr. Rose told Mr. Pitt of that design, 'he assured me in the most solemn manner,' so Mr. Rose continues, 'of his fixed resolve on no consideration whatever to accept anything from the public.'

It is not worse to accept it directly from the public than indirectly from the public of course. Further on in his account of these events, Mr. Stanhope says:

> Next there was a renewal of the generous offer which the merchants of London had made Mr. Pitt in 1789. A deputation from them waited on him to state that they had ready subscribed for his use a sum of one hundred thousand pounds which should be paid into any banking house which he chose, and so that he should never know the name of any one of the subscribers. This noble gift was, however, as nobly declined. If, said Mr. Pitt, he were ever again in office he should always feel abashed and constrained when any request was addressed to him from the city, lest by non-compliance he should be thwarting the wishes of some among his unknown benefactors.

This indicates the recognized standing of public morality in England. And, though I can hardly hope, from what I have seen as to the public life of Canada during the last ten years or more, to expect quite so high a standard of morality in Canada—and I speak this with shame—I would expect that the First Minister would not be ready to swallow himself, to take back every statement he made in 1891 and to tell the people: You are up against a barred door; call me despot or tyrant, or what you will, but the people of Canada shall not look in upon the transactions of the government and the Finance Minister in reference to this gift of $120,000.

Coming to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), and I must be very brief with him—he says that only one man dared make this charge. Well, of course, I did not expect a great deal from the hon. member for South Grey, but I should have thought, as he has been sitting in this House for some time, that he would know that only one man can speak in this House at a time and that only one man can move any given resolution. And when he whines about this, it shows to what straits he is driven. He will find, as time goes on, in this debate, that there are a good many who will, if not by their word, by their action, sustain every word of the resolution of the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce). It will be to their credit when they do so. They would be stultifying themselves as a party, having reference to 1891, if they took any other course; and hon. gentlemen opposite, including the First Minister, will be stultifying themselves when they vote down this resolution to-night.

Now, the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) was as candid and indiscrete as the Minister of Finance. He tells us that he was conducting and handling this subscription list, while he was or he is now, the right hand man of the Minister of Finance; and, if degrees can be drawn, we realize that no hon. gentleman on this side of the House who is not a cabinet minister will have the ear of the Finance Minister more completely than the chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee, and we realize that although he is not a cabinet minister, there is no one making a more persistent still-hunt after a portfolio than the member for South Grey—I do not say whether effectually or not. Well, he has got the chairmanship; but it is the member for South Grey not a contractor? Why, he is the gentleman who boasts all over the country, particularly in his own riding, that no man has the ear of the government as he has, that no man has secured the number of appointments that he has secured for people in his riding or to come from his riding, and take up their residence in Ottawa as civil servants, &c., &c. In fact, so numerous have his benefactions at the hands of this government been that when the hon. member for Peel the other day asked some questions as to the number of appointments which had been made through the instrumentality of the hon. member for South Grey, the government, after taking the matter into their serious consideration, came down to the House and announced that the information asked for was so voluminous and weighty that he would have to move for a return. This hon. gentleman, who is to occupy an independent position, who is to represent the people and not the government, who is to vote for the people and not at the beck of the government, will, I hope, have the decency, when this question is put to the vote, not to vote upon it. I am sorry the hon. member for South Grey is not here. I would like to ask him, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, do you imagine for one moment that this distinguished person, Mr. Jaffray, when he toted around that subscription list in the city of Toronto, was a small enough man not to himself subscribe? If he subscribed, then he came within the category. And, coming to the great divide that there is between Mr. Jaffray and the member for South Grey, does any one imagine that when the member for South Grey was trotting around that subscription list, he also did not subscribe? And coming to the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) would he or would he not be in the same happy category, not letting

his left hand know what his right hand was doing, and never give a whisper to the Minister of Finance when he wanted recognition as a senator later on? The hon. member for Guysborough is peculiar too. He asks why the hon. member for West Algoma had not the courage to move a resolution? Where has the hon. gentleman been sleeping? Why the hon. member for West Algoma did move a resolution, and he did exactly what the friends of the hon. member for Guysborough did in 1891. It is in really trying to reinstate them in the faith they proclaimed then that we are moving this afternoon. But they will not be reinstated; they have had a bad career in the meantime. Then he speaks of scavengers. He appears to be sensitive as to that, and I suppose it is hard, for he has been omitted from the list.

Now, what does this all mean? Mr. Jaffray and Mr. Larkin in Toronto, and the right hand man of the Minister of Finance, and the aspirant for a senatorship in the House of Commons—this combination of four handling this list, which is to be known to anybody they like to tell it to, but is not to be known to the people of Canada. It means this, that we, forsooth, are to take the statement of these gentlemen as to who was not on the list, but we are not to get a whisper as to who were on the list. It is not who was not on the list that we are after, and that the people are asking, and that they have a right to know, but who was on the list ; and they can judge for themselves whether they are proper contributors or not. It looks to me as if it were a general concerted scheme—the hon. member for Guysborough to represent the maritime provinces, the hon. member for South Grey to represent the province of Ontario, Jaffray and company to represent the big financial city of Toronto, somebody not yet divulged—and he will not be divulged after what I have said—to represent Montreal, and somebody from the west—a general levy from God knows whom, because they will not tell us.

Now, I will refer briefly to the attitude of the present First Minister, and the Liberal party in 1891, and I will try to make it clear to the House and the country that the right hon. gentleman, in putting up these gentlemen to oppose this resolution, is taking back every statement he made in 1891 as to the proper conduct of members of the Crown in a situation of the kind. First, we have his first lieutenant, Sir Richard Cartwright, that gentleman whose soul was plunged in misery if anything crooked was done unless he had a hand in it himself. That gentleman, actuated by a sincere and holy desire in 1891, just after the death of Sir John Macdonald, the man who gave him so many and so well deserved thrashings in his lifetime, moved this resolution in an effort to throw mud upon the memory of that great statesman. Although I do not believe all that Sir Richard Cartwright said at all times, I think it quite fair to take him at his word on this occasion. Referring to Sir John Macdonald's need—and he made a few complimentary remarks to make it a little more stinging as he went along. He said:

> Under these circumstances, if ever, it was quite justifiable for the hon. gentleman's personal friends and admirers to have contributed for the purpose of relieving his family from any danger of want, and had two or three very obvious and very reasonable precautions been taken, no blame could have been attached to the parties who were concerned in getting up the testimonial.

That is not as high a code of morality as they have in Britain. According to the British code, a gentleman in public life, or likely to be again connected with public life should not take gifts at all; and I am prepared myself to subscribe to that doctrine although that is not the gist of the resolution this afternoon. But the hon. gentleman proceeded:

> Unfortunately these precautions were not taken, unfortunately publicity was not given, as I have always said publicity should be given, to the names of those who subscribed.

What was the gist of this statement of Sir Richard Cartwright in 1891: It was that the only thing which could make the transaction defensible, was publicity, not merely publicity of the fact that there was a testimonial, but of the names of those who subscribed. And the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who sits here and would not speak this afternoon, was the gentleman who congratulated Sir Richard Cartwright very warmly on the excellent speech he had made, and who subsequently was elated over the signal victory the opposition then won in having had this resolution, which we again propose this afternoon, voted unanimously by the Conservatives. Then Sir Richard goes on:

> Still more unfortunately precautions were not taken to see that subscriptions to that fund were not accepted, save from sources from which they could honourably be accepted.

The hon. gentleman proceeds to make further observations which are still more pertinent. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to pay particular heed to these expressions and apply them to the facts now under discussion.

> I have observed, Sir, that some of the hon. gentleman's apologists have undertaken to mitigate the error or the crime, call it what you will, which was committed by the reception of that testimonial, under the circumstances, by the plea, which I think was also advanced in the other case, that the hon.

gentleman did not know who had subscribed to his testimonial. Such a plea——

And that is the plea advanced by the Minister of Finance this afternoon, and which the Prime Minister advanced a few months ago.

—such a plea, in my judgment, is a direct aggravation of the offence. A public minister has no right whatever to allow any gift to be made to him unless it is done publicly and unless he knows from what source it proceeds; and, Sir, I would say this, that if a minister of the Crown tells me that he has accepted a gift, not knowing and not choosing to know from whom it proceeded, so far from regarding such a plea as a mitigation, I say that such a plea raises a presumption of guilt.

How does that meet the case to-night?

It was his duty to find out; it was his duty to see that not one penny went into his pockets or into his coffers unless it came from such sources that he could honourably and fairly receive it.

Did the right hon. the Prime Minister adopt that view when he congratulated Sir Richard Cartwright some 20 years ago on the speech he then made in this House? If he did, and he did, how can he justify to the people, how can he justify to his own conscience, his own conduct in swallowing himself as he is doing on this occasion. Well, Mr. Speaker, Sir Richard Cartwright is now a kind of back number, and we will take the utterances of the Prime Minister himself, and ask him to apply them to the circumstances of to-day. Then if he can get up and tell us that he can honourably discharge his duties and act consistently with the statement he then made, and yet say that the public are not entitled to know who were the subscribers to this fund, he is performing an acrobatic feat in morals and politics, which I did not think even he was capable of. The right hon. gentleman then said:—

The Minister of Justice said a moment ago, in referring to the testimonial offered to the honourable Minister of Public Works, the member for Three Rivers, that that hon. gentleman did not know who were the subscribers. Sir,——

You can imagine the dramatic attitude and pose of the right hon. gentleman as he said these words:—

—Sir, if he did not know, why did he not look at the list

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. I ask the right hon. gentleman why the Finance Minister, if he did not know who were the subscribers, 'why he did not look at the list'? If the Finance Minister does not know, why does he not? It is because, before one dollar was subscribed to that fund, he entered into this utterly indefensible bargain as he has said this afternoon, that the whole thing should be done in a hole and corner behind the backs of the people of Canada and that the people should never know, because it might happen that there were subscribers to that testimonial whose names it would not be safe to make public or to disclose to the hon. gentleman himself even after he had retired from public life. But let me go on to quote what the right hon. gentleman then said:—

If the hon. gentleman did not know, it was because he chose to remain ignorant of the names on the list, and if he chose to be ignorant, is it not because his moral sense told him that he might there find names of persons giving contributions which should not be accepted at all. Is it not simply because his conscience told him that if he were to look at that list he would find there the names of men who every day were suppliants in his office for favours.

Has the right hon. gentleman's moral sense completely died out? Where is it to-night? Will the moral sense of the government permit them to longer continue this infamy, because it is an infamy to hide from the people of Canada these transactions in which they are most vitally interested. I ask the First Minister if it is not simply because his conscience told him that if he were to look at that list he would find there the names of men who are every day suppliants in his office for favours. How is it to-night? Is it not true and does the First Minister not know it that if they were to look at that list they would find there hordes of men, the majority of them men who, in a political sense, are from day to day suppliants in the office of the Minister of Finance for favours at the hands of the government? The hon. gentleman pronounced judgment upon it himself and I think we will leave it with that judgment. The right hon. gentleman says, summing it all up, that is the reason, the sense of conscience, the knowledge that they would be condemned in 1891 was the reason that they would not look at the list, and he says of the dead minister, that greatest statesman Canada has ever had, Sir John A. Macdonald, that was the reason that they would not look at the list. That is the reason why the Minister of Public Works did not choose to look at that list. And now that is not the reason why do they choose to be blind in the matter? I call upon hon. gentlemen opposite to tell what is the reason if there can be any good reason for it. The right hon. gentleman has for the time being the matter in his hands. He can refuse to give us this list. If it is a list such as they want us to understand it is, it will redound to the glory and to the honour of the Minister of Finance. If it is an honest list, if it is a list of persons who have the right to contribute, then the fair

name of the Minister of Finance will be vindicated above all question. Is that not a matter of some importance in the interests of Canada? Is that not a matter that ought to commend itself to the First Minister? Is that not a matter which he should grasp with eagerness? Is it not a reasonable request on behalf of the people of Canada which the opposition are making to-night? If it is not, will the First Minister tell us why it is not? I tell the First Minister that when he calls on his followers to vote down this resolution, as he is evidently prepared to do, he is putting a blacker mark upon his record than he has ever put there before, that there is no more complete and utter denial of a former attitude taken by any political party in this country that the right-about-face of the government and their supporters if they vote down this resolution. Politically speaking I care not at all which it done, Nationally speaking I would be glad indeed if that list were produced. and if it appeared that there was not one name upon it that ought not to be there, but I despair, after what I heard this afternoon, that this would be the case, for surely there could be no good reason, there can be and there is no honest reason for refusing it unless it be that the right hon. gentleman and his followers know that they dare not produce it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend who has just taken his seat opened his remarks by stating that it had been his intention to approach this subject in a purely judicial spirit, but that owing to the taunts of this side of the House and the manner in which the speech and the resolution of the hon. member who moved it were received, he would not follow his first inclination and would no longer approach the question in a judicial spirit. He has just given us an evidence that he was as good as his word and that he forgets the judicial in order to look after the vituperative spirit. When he reads his remarks to-morrow in cold blood I believe that he will come to the conclusion that he would have been better inspired if he had adhered to his first deliberate judgment and approached this question in a purely judicial spirit as it ought to be approached, and in no other spirit. I shall try if I can, and I hope I can, to discuss this question in the very spirit my hon. friend first intended to approach it, simply from the point of view of what is due to parliament, to the country, to the government, and to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, upon the present occasion. There is no use disguising the fact that this is an attack made upon the Minister of Finance. If this question had been approached on the broad line only of what should be the parliamentary law, the motion would have been brought up in a very different manner from that in which it has been brought up. My hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) stated in his opening remarks that he was not bringing this motion as an amendment to the motion to go into Supply, he disclaimed any intention of making it a non-confidence motion. If this was indeed the intention of my hon. friend not to make his motion a non-confidence motion, a motion which could be debated and disposed of on its merits, he had a very simple way of doing it. It was open to him to bring it forward as an ordinary motion after giving notice of it. If we were in the last days of the session, if we had reached a period when the government business has priority over the business of private members, there might have been some excuse for the hon. gentleman in bringing his motion as he does to-day. But we are in the early days of the session when private members on each side of the House have two days in the week on which to bring their matters to the attention of the country, Mondays and Wednesdays, and therefore it was quite open to my hon. friend to bring in a motion on any of these days. The hon. gentleman says that it was not his intention to bring this forward as a want of confidence motion, but he knows that by the rule of this House this motion cannot be separated, that it must either be accepted as a whole or denied as a whole. It must be accepted as a whole, even if there were in it, parts to which the House would not agree. It must be rejected as a whole, even if there were in it parts to which the House would be disposed to agree. Therefore, if the hon. gentleman was simply seeking to give us a lesson of morality in public life, he chose a very unfortunate manner of doing it. Then the hon. gentleman stated in his opening remarks that he had not brought forward this motion with any intention of injuring anybody. If such was the intention of the hon. gentleman, I must say that he has a very unfortunate manner of expressing his intention. I have only to quote his language. My hon. friend said he did not bring up this question for the first time to-day, he brought it up a week ago yesterday. On the House proceeding to the orders of the day, my hon. friend rose in his seat, and with great solemnity spoke as follows:

I beg to give notice that to-morrow I will move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, to wit, the receipt by ministers of the Crown of gifts of money in the form of testimonials and of the reported contribution to such testimonials or testimonial of a sum of money by one William R. Travers, late general manager of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, now in liquidation, said Travers having been convicted and being now

under sentence of six years imprisonment for having falsified returns to the government, and for theft of the moneys of the bank.

This was giving notice of a motion which was not intended to do injury to any one. If there was no intention of doing injury to any one, why was the name of W. R. Travers brought into the notice? Why was it stated that W. R. Travers was under sentence for having falsified returns to the government, and for theft of the moneys of the bank? Therefore I think I am justified in saying to my hon. friend that, whilst I must accept his statement that he had no intention of injuring anybody, he was most unfortunate in giving expression to his intentions.

Then the hon. gentleman referred to a motion passed in this House in 1891, and which he said was directed against the memory of Sir John A. Macdonald, who had been only three years in his grave. We have only to look at the record to learn, and the hon. gentleman must have known that that motion was never directed against the memory of Sir John Macdonald ; that motion was directed against a then living member of the House, the late Sir Hector Langevin, then member for Three Rivers. Sir John A. Macdonald was not mentioned at all, except incidentally. I do not remember that anybody on that occasion found fault with Sir John A. Macdonald for having accepted a gift from his friends when he was in dire circumstances. A moment ago my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), with a view of drawing a contrast between my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and William Pitt, read from the life of Pitt where he had refused a testimonial from his friends at a time when Pitt, like so many other public men, was in poverty, and even unable to meet his liabilities. Now, if the object of my hon. friend was to draw a contrast between the attitude of Wm. Pitt on that occasion, and the attitude of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance on the present occasion, have I not just as much right, and even more right, to draw a comparison between the attitude of the Minister of Finance and another eminent man in this country, a man in some respects as great as Wm. Pitt, I mean Sir John A. Macdonald. Sir John A. Macdonald was not blessed with the goods of this world. He had heavy liabilities which he could not meet, and his friends came to his rescue. There is, however, a little difference which I may mention. If Sir John A. Macdonald had been like Wm. Pitt, a bachelor, with no wife and children to look after, he might have done like Wm. Pitt, and have said, I will stand by myself, I will accept no gift from anybody. And, perhaps to-day, if the Minister of Finance, whose conscience is as tender as the conscience of any man in this House, were in the same condition as Wm. Pitt, if he had not a wife and children dependent upon him, if he had not known that he was advancing in life he might have done like Wm. Pitt, and said, I can shift for myself, I will accept a gift from nobody. But it is the good fortune of the Minister of Finance that he has a wife and children dependent upon him, a blessing which was denied to Wm. Pitt, and, therefore, who will blame the Minister of Finance if he thought of his wife and children when an occasion was offered him to make provision for them? Did anybody ever find fault with Sir John A. Macdonald for having thought of his wife and children? I have been sitting in this House for nearly forty years, for many years I sat in front of Sir John A. Macdonald, and I never heard a case mentioned, except one, where he had received a gift from his friends. I think if I remember correctly that in 1870, or thereabouts, when this testimonial was given to Sir John A. Macdonald it was not the object of such a motion as that made in 1891, or the object of such a motion as is made to-day. Now, if there was a motion made in 1891, the conditions were very different from the conditions that we have to deal with on the present occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Ha, ha.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do these gentlemen who laugh know the circumstances under which that motion of 1891 was made? When Sir Richard Cartwright made his motion in 1891, a Conservative paper in the city of Montreal, a paper which generally supported the administration, had been writing a series of articles appearing day after day, week after week, and month after month, which were republished afterwards in pamphlet form, and in which a charge was made against Sir Hector Langevin, that he had accepted a gift to which public contractors had contributed. Sir, that was the case in 1891. I stated last year when this matter came before the House that I did not care to speak of the dead, I did not care to repeat what I said in 1891 in the presence of Sir Hector Langevin, I did not care to read before the House what I then read in the House in the presence of Sir Hector Langevin.

But, Sir, I stated then, and I have to repeat again, that the occasion of the motion made by Sir Richard Cartwright was the fact that it was publicly stated, not in the press of the opponents of Sir Hector Langevin, but in the press of himself and his own friends, that public contractors had contributed to the fund which he had accepted. That was the reason why Sir Richard Cartwright moved the motion which he did, and which I shall quote at

the present time. Sir Richard Cartwright in the face of that statement which was current, which was repeated day after day, that contributions had been made by contractors, moved this resolution:—

That the acceptance of gifts or testimonials of any kind on the part of ministers of the Crown or of any members of their families from contractors, government officials or other persons having pecuniary relations with the government, is entirely opposed to sound principles of administration and is calculated to bring parliamentary government into contempt; and that the example thus given tends to corrupt and demoralize the officials serving under ministers who have accepted or permitted the acceptance of gifts or testimonials as aforesaid.

Nobody will take exception to this. Everybody will admit that it would be disruptive of all public morals if contractors, government officials, or persons having pecuniary relations with the government should contribute to a fund for a minister. That was affirmed, it was not denied by anybody, it was an obvious truth. That motion was accepted and has ever since been the law of this parliament. It is recorded in our journals that such should be the law which should govern all men having anything to do with the public affairs of this country. I went further upon that occasion, and I stated that, in view of the circumstances, in my humble judgment, all such contributions should be made public.

Now, Sir, were those views accepted on that occasion by the over-scrupulous gentlemen who now compose the Conservative party? When I stated that in my humble judgment the motion merely was not sufficient but that there should be another one to implement the first and to say that in order to make doubly sure in this case, especially in the case of Sir Hector Langevin, there should be publicity given to these proceedings, was the resolution adopted? Was it made the law of parliament as it was decided that the other motion should be the law of parliament? Not at all. My views, I was told this afternoon, were then thundered forth on the other side of the House, but if they were thundered forth they met with no response at all from the other side of the House and it has taken them twenty years to find out that there was some merit in them. But, if the motion and my views which I uttered and which I gave in all sincerity on that occasion had been received by the then government of the day they would have been made the law of parliament, as the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright was, and everybody would have been guided by that law. Now that has been the history of this question in so far as the previous proceedings of the House are concerned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was approached a year ago, and everybody knows that the Minister of Finance is not a wealthy man. His friends knew that he was a poor man. His friends knew that he was in the condition of Wm. Pitt, that he was still more in the condition of Sir John Macdonald, having a wife and children dependent upon him. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance was approached and he stated that he would agree to such a testimonial provided it was well understood that the lines laid down by the resolution of this House were strictly adhered to and that nobody would be permitted to contribute to the fund who was a public contractor, who was a government official, or any other person having pecuniary relations with the government. To anybody who knows the Minister of Finance, nay, I would say, is anybody on that side of the House who knows the Minister of Finance, not convinced that no matter how extremely dire might be the necessity of my friend and colleague he would not accept a dollar or a cent from that class of people who are mentioned in the motion? Is there a man on this side of the House, is there a man in this country, is there a man who has ever had anything to do with the man who is known as W. S. Fielding, who is not fully aware that his conscience would not permit him under such circumstances to do anything which would be at all contrary to his sense of honour. Sir, I believe I can say that even on that side of the House, there is not a man who would not be ready to say, and to say now, that the Minister of Finance is incapable of any mean action of whatever kind it may be. The Minister of Finance stipulated first that he would accept this testimonial if it were well understood that the men who would be at the head of the committee would not accept a dollar from any man who was a public contractor, a government official or who had any pecuniary transactions with the government. Every man has his own sense of honour, every man is the guardian of his own honour and if my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is characterized by any qualities—and he has many qualities to characterize him—he is mainly characterized by his sense of honesty, by his most delicate sense of honour. My hon. friend said he would not want to know those who had contributed to him so that, walking about, whether it was in public or private life, he wanted to be absolutely unaware of the unknown friends who had come to his rescue under the circumstances in which he was.

Now, Sir, I was sorry to hear my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) a moment ago, deprecating this attitude of the Minister of Finance. I may say again to my hon. friend what I told him a mo-

ment ago, that in his calmer moments, when, to-morrow, having forgotten the sense of excitement under which he was provoked to speak, he reads his own words, he will be sorry for one of the aspersions, the insinuation, which he made against the character of the Minister of Finance. The minister was blamed by my hon. friend because he did not want to know the names of those who had contributed to that fund. He relied upon the honour of the men who had been charged by that committee to levy this fund to ask no government contractor, no government official, no man having any pecuniary relations with the government to contribute anything to it. He relied that they would comply with that condition, and he stipulated that even the names of those unknown friends who were to assist him should not then be made known to him. My hon. friend blamed the Minister of Finance for this. Well, Sir, I leave it to him whether the Minister of Finance is not right. Perhaps another man would have said: No, I prefer to have them known. But, after all, if the Minister of Finance preferred under such circumstances, that he should not even know those to whom he might be grateful, he consulted his conscience, he consulted his honour; and the man does not live who can find fault with him for the decision he came to. Men there may be on the other side of the House, men there may be on this side of the House, who, putting aside all political proclivities and consulting only their higher sense of public honour and public morality, may differ upon that point with the Minister of Finance and may say that that hon. gentleman would have done better had he scrutinized that list himself. But he preferred to take the course he did; and I say that this is a question which, whether solved one way or whether solved another way, can reflect no dishonour upon the Minister of Finance. For my part, I said, speaking under different circumstances it is true——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER—very different circumstances—that there should be publicity. Publicity, after all, is always the safeguard in matters of this kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My words are cheered by hon. gentlemen opposite, in this year 1911; but similar words of mine gained no such response when I uttered them in 1891. But I have to say, the Minister of Finance did not violate the law of parliament as laid down in 1891; he did not violate any code of honour, nor any principle of honesty. He acted frankly and above board. And to-day he gave his version of the matter like a man. If any conclusion is to be drawn from the words of the Minister of Finance, uttered under great provocation to-day on the floor of this House, it is not the conclusion urged by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox); but to-morrow the name of W. S. Fielding will be dearer to the people than it is at the present time. Say what you will, do what you may, the man is not living who can breathe suspicion upon the character of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, Hon. W. S. Fielding.

I have stated that upon these matters a difference of judgment is always possible. But I am asked: How are we going to judge? In 1891, there was not only a suspicion against Sir Hector Langevin, there was an open charge, as I said a moment ago, day after day, and week after week these charges appeared in the press and they were published in pamphlet form under the title 'Le Metier de Ministre.' It was openly charged against Sir Hector Langevin that he had accepted contributions from contractors, that at the very moment when he was sitting in the House he had the money of contractors in his pocket. Is there to-day a suspicion that Mr. Fielding has a cent of public money in his pocket? No, Sir, in this country public men are liable to find charges made against them;—I do not complain of that, it is part of the game. We are liable to be accused, to be traduced; every man who takes his seat in this House, must be prepared for that. But there are, after all, certain things, however we may differ, which, in our heart of hearts, we know to be true. And there is not a man on that side of the House, as there is not a man on this side, but knows that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is absolutely incapable of a dishonest, a low, a mean action, word or thought.

I do not find fault with the hon. member for West Algoma for bringing this question forward again; the only fault I have to find with him is, because of the manner in which he has brought it forward. He brings it forward in such a form that an amendment would be out of order, forcing us on this side of the House either to adopt it entire, or vote it down entire. In his speech, my hon. friend took me to task again and again. He wanted me to speak when I did not feel inclined to speak; he wanted me to do his bidding, when I had no intention of doing his bidding. He must not find fault if I did not respond as he wished me to do; it is my privilege as a man, to speak and act as and when I wish. I do not find fault with the hon. gentleman's speech, but I repeat, that I do find fault with the manner in which he introduced the resolution.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask the right hon. gentleman a question?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. BOYCE. Does he find fault with the manner in which the motion of Sir Richard Cartwright was introduced in 1891? This resolution is introduced in precisely the same manner and is stated not to be a motion of want of confidence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have answered that already. When Sir Richard Cartwright moved his motion, if I remember well, it was in the month of July or August, and at a time when parliament had been in session for five months or so. At that time every day was a government day, and Sir Richard Cartwright had no other method of bringing the question forward than that which he adopted. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyce), is not in that position. He could have moved his motion on Monday, on Wednesday, and could have moved it at a time when we might have amended it. But I will go further with my hon. friend. When I came into this House to-day, I was disposed to say that to the first part of the resolution there was no objection whatever; we have voted it before, and would be ready to vote it again; but as to the second part of the resolution, I would have been prepared to ask the hon. gentleman to modify it so as to make it more acceptable than it is. For the hon. gentleman must realize, as the House will realize, that it is couched in offensive language. The first part of the resolution reads as follows:—

That the acceptance of gifts or testimonials of any kind on the part of ministers of the Crown or of any members of their families from contractors, government officials or other persons having pecuniary relations with the government, is entirely opposed to sound principles of administration, and is calculated to bring parliamentary government into contempt, and that the example thus given tends to corrupt and demoralize the officials serving under ministers who have accepted or permitted the acceptance of gifts or testimonials as aforesaid.

I may say to my hon. friend that there was no necessity for his introducing this part of the resolution at all, for it is part of the law of this parliament already. It has been on our Journals for 20 years. Therefore there is no necessity for affirming it now. My hon. friend is not so clever that we cannot see through him: he introduces this part in order to take the other part, which I shall now read:

That in order to maintain this principle the source of any gifts of money to ministers of the Crown ought not to be surrounded with secrecy, and that an authentic statement of the donors should be made public.

Mr. BOYCE. The right hon. gentleman's own words.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If I said, in the speech to which my hon. friend has alluded, that the testimonial to Sir Hector Langevin was surrounded with secrecy, certainly there was secrecy on that occasion; but would any one say that there was secrecy in this testimonal that was given to Mr. Fielding? Was it not done in open day? Was there not a public banquet at which the testimonial was offered to him? What secrecy was there about it? But, Sir, these words are put into this motion in an offensive way. To me, Sir, as they are put there, they are most offensive, and they have been received with a cheer which shows me that they were only intended to be offensive. If this question had been approached in a judicial and fair spirit, I would have felt called upon to ask the hon. gentleman to modify his resolution and to convey the same idea in different words. But in view of the manner in which it has been introduced, with the evident intention of being offensive, there is nothing for this House to do, while affirming the principle and the truth there is in it, but to accept the fact that this is a vote of want of confidence, put forward in an offensive manner, and to be treated as such and voted down by this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax) Mr. Speaker, I have seen the right hon. gentleman in pretty tight places on many occasions, but I have never seen him struggle so hard and accomplish so little as he has done to-night, I am perfectly confident that that is his own sensation and conviction at this moment. I will come a little later on to some of the arguments—I suppose it is necessary, in a parliamentary point of view, to dignify them by that name—and deal with them in detail. For the moment I want to point out to the House that the two strong points which the right hon. gentleman has made are these: first, that Sir Richard Cartwright's motion in 1891 was made about four months after the session opened, while this is made about two months after the session opened. That is convincing argument number one. Now, let us come to convincing argument number two—that in 1891 certain offensive allegations were made in a paper supporting the government of that day, while certain equally injurious statements have been made on this occasion in the press opposed to the government. Why, Mr. Speaker, as I understood my hon. friend from Algoma, his point was that in respect of all such matters there should be such perfect and absolute publicity that no paper in this country, Grit or Tory, would dare to utter even the breath of suspicion. It was only in that way that my hon. friend from Algoma alluded to the rumours in the press to-day, which have been contradicted, and I am willing and happy to accept the contradictions. But my right hon. friend was not ingenuous in dealing

with the position in 1891, because he forgot to mention to this House that the injurious statemeint, which he quoted in 1891, appeared in a certain newspaper in Montreal at a time when that journal was attacking the government, and when on one point at least it was actually opposed to the government and was trying to drive it out of power. When we make that qualification in the remarks of my right hon. friend, we shall see that there is really no distinction; and even if he had made his point, what has it to do, in the name of all that is reasonable and sensible, with the question before this House?

Now, I want to advert to some of the criticisms which have been made on the other side of the House upon the speech with which my hon. friend from Algoma introduced this resolution. There was evidently a pretty concerted arrangement to cast discredit and odium upon my hon. friend. One hon. gentleman referred to scavengers. I would like to ask that hon. gentleman. who were the scavengers in 1891? Because I am within the judgment of any hon. gentleman in this House who cares to examine carefully, as I have done more than once, the debate which took place in 1891, and who has listened to the speech of the hon. member for Algoma, as to whether that speech was not a more temperate and reasonable speech than that which was delivered by Sir Richard Cartwright in 1891; and there are rumours—I do not know whether they may be true or not—that Sir Richard Cartwright is not much more satisfied with the condition of affairs in 1911 than he was in 1891. My hon. friend from Algoma quoted copiously from the speeches of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, and I leave it to the judgment of any one within hearing of my voice whether the quotations he gave from those speeches were not the severest portion of the remarks which he addressed to the House this afternoon. In my judgement they were. No other man, said the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), could have been found to introduce this resolution than the hon. member for Algoma. Well, I will tell the hon. member for South Grey something about that. If it had been a Conservative Finance Minister who had received this gift of $120,000 without any publication of the names of the contributors, I will tell my right hon. friend that two gentlemen, if they were in this House, would have been prepared to take that matter up. One of them is the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the other is the Right Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of the Minister of Finance. I did not see any reason why he should not have taken part in this debate in the ordinary sense, as his name was introduced only by reason of the incident to which I have referred. This resolution does not name him, and is not particularly concerned with him except with regard to the incident to which I have alluded, and because of the desire that parliament should establish a reasonable and salutary rule in this connection. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, made his statement. I accept absolutely, and not merely in a parliamentary sense, every word he said. I have been in pretty active opposition to him, in political life especially, during the past ten years, but I am perfectly willing to accord to him the tribute of having worked hard and earnestly in the administration of his department, and I desire to cast no personal reflection upon him. But taking his statement to-day—if I may venture to pass an opinion upon his conduqt, which he has exposed to the House in a very frank way—I feel inclined to say that when he stipulated, or assented to the stipulation, that everything connected with the source of that fund should be shrouded in secrecy, he took a wrong course. The stipulation he should have made was that everything connected with the source of that fund should be, exposed to the utmost possible publicity. In other words, the better—the only proper course—for him was to say: if you bring me a list of names which I can conscientiously accept, I will be willing to accept the testimonial these gentlemen offer, but only upon the condition that the name of every one of the contributors shall be published in the press from one end of Canada to the other. That is the standard which the right hon. gentleman himself laid down in 1891. I am bound to say I could not quite understand why my hon. friend the Finance Minister should have desired these names to be kept secret, although I have carefully considered and analysed his statement and I desire to do him no injustice. He was willing, even desirous that the names should be made known to him later on, after his official career had terminated. Well, if the source of this fund was of the character demanded by the resolution of 1891, why should not the Finance Minister know the names now? As a matter of fact, every one of us knows, because we all have common sense, that ignorance with regard to the source of the contributions would in the future be absolutely impossible. In the case of the Finance Minister, holding the position he did, it would be idle for any of us to attempt to keep up the pretense that these contributions could be made and that the Finance Minister would not know who made them. The very idea

seems on the face of it utterly out of the question. He was told that this money was to come from friends and admirers. Well, he would have a pretty shrewd idea as to who were his warmest friends and admirers, and it would be utterly preposterous to assume for one moment that he would not in the end have a pretty shrewd idea who these gentlemen were. So there could not be very much secrecy about it even if secrecy were desirable; and from the point of view taken in 1891 by the right hon. gentleman, secrecy was the last thing to be desired.

My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) says that this list was a clean list. I have no knowledge, and therefore I do not for one moment gainsay his statement; but if it is a clean list, then it is a list that ought to be published. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) said that this money was clean money. Neither do I gainsay that statement, but if it was, why should not the names of the donors be published in the press and laid upon the table of parliament? For what possible reason will it be proper for my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to know all these names ten years hence after he had passed out of official life, and yet not be proper for him to know them to-day, when he is holding an important position in the government, if this list be of the kind described?

Let us come to the debate of 1891 and the terms of the resolution now before the House. My hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) thought it would be difficult to find any one in this House prepared to vote for this resolution. Well, I would be surprised indeed if there were anything in this resolution that did not commend itself to every member of this House. Why, it is precisely on the same terms as the resolution of 1891, with this one addition. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has characterized that addition as being couched in offensive terms. I fail to find any offence or even suspicion of offence in it; and in order to make my point good in that regard I shall read it to the House:

> That in order to maintain this principle, the source of any gifts of money to any minister of the Crown ought not to be surrounded with secrecy, and that an authentic statement of the donors should be made public.

If there be anything offensive in that, it is my right hon. friend the Prime Minister who is the author of it. He gave the offence in 1891, and Sir Richard Cartwright gave it before 1891. It is all very well for my right hon. friend to deprecate passion and attack but he was not so scrupulous in the old days. Inside of a couple of minutes I could bring to this House a volume of 'Hansard' in which he declared that judges of the highest court in the province of Quebec had bought their places and that these men were making political contributions to the Conservative party. Respect for the judiciary has usually been inculcated in parliament and these men were not here to defend themselves. My right hon. friend was quite capable of hitting hard and quite willing to hit hard in the old days and he must not be too sensitive if some blows should pass across the floor of the House now, particularly when the severest of those blows comes in the very words which he used himself in 1891. He regards the speech of the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) as offensive. What did he think of his colleague Sir Richard Cartwright in 1891? He thought that he had made a splendid speech and had attained a notable triumph. What occupied more than one half of Sir Richard Cartwright's speech? An attack on Sir John Macdonald, then only two months in his grave, in respect of a testimonial presented to him 15 or 18 years before. I have the report of some speeches made by ministers of the Crown as far back as 1877 and I find that even at that date the same colleague of my right hon. friend was raising questions about this matter. Here is what he then said in a speech delivered in the town of Simcoe on September 21, 1877, published by the Globe Printing and Publishing Company and used in the campaign of 1878, no doubt quoted by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister in the campaign he made in that year. He said:

> Moreover, and it is a point of the very gravest importance as bearing on the conduct of all public men, I hold that it was Sir John Macdonald's duty not to have accepted, he being a public man, any testimonial unless everything connected with it was clear and above board, and capable of being published to all the world. That was his clear duty, and that he should have insisted on from the first. Sir, I will not tolerate the poor pretence that he did not know who had subscribed to his testimonial. Before he took that money he should have taken care to prove that it came from 'clean hands,' and that he could take it without a smirch on his. One hundred thousand dollars is no small gift, and Sir John knew—no man better—that the very first principle of all agency is that no agent of any kind or degree has the smallest right to receive a present from any of his principal's customers or clients without the full knowledge of that principal. Sir John Macdonald was the agent of the people of Canada; he was a public man; he ought to have known better, and he did know better than to allow any testimonial to be presented to him without the fullest publicity attending it. Does this seem a harsh rule to impose on a public man's conduct? One moment's reflection will show you not only that it is most just, but most necessary and inexorable. Do away with this, and you throw wide the door for every kind and shape of bribery in

disguise. Do away with this and you may at once and forever blot out every law against tampering with the independence of parliament. (Hear, hear). Such testimonials, unless they are made publicly are, I repeat, a most dangerous precedent, one which no man is justified in accepting, and one which should not be permitted to be given by any people having a regard to their own interests. Well, Sir John Macdonald shut his eyes, and knowing only too well what sort of money would be taken to get up this testimonial, declined to investigate the matter, though he did not decline to receive the money.

I would point out to the Prime Minister that that was the tone of Sir Richard Cartwright's remarks and his own remarks all through the debate of 1891. If I might analyse what was said in that debate it amounts to this: In the first place Sir Richard Cartwright took the ground, he did not insist on it in the motion, but he did distinctly take the ground that no man in office ought to take gifts at all. I do not think that portion of his remarks has been quoted. He spoke at Ingersoll on November 14, 1889, and he regarded his remarks as so impressive and important that he repeated them in his speech in the House in 1891. He said:

Ministers should not take gifts. Now surely if there is any one maxim in political ethics better established than another, if there is any one thing which ought to commend itself to every honest man of every party in Canada, it is this: that under no circumstance should a minister of state permit himself to accept gifts, either directly or indirectly, while he continues in office.

And further on he said in the same speech:

If a man's political supporters do really desire to testify their administration by making him a gift of money let them wait till he is out of office, and then subscribe to their heart's content.

The same position was taken by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce in 1891. I am free to admit that it was not included in the resolution and that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister did not subscribe to it because in his speech he said that there might be circumstances under which the gift of a sum of money to a minister of the Crown would be a matter of credit not only to the men who presented it, but to the man who accepted it. There are two ideals, the higher and the lower. We have not attempted to put the higher ideal in our motion to-day. Sir Richard Cartwright did not attempt to put it in his motion in 1891. We have been satisfied with putting in this motion the lower ideal but we have accompanied it with a clear statement of the necessity of publicity, which was insisted on by both Sir Richard Cartwright and the Prime Minister in the debate of 1891. That was the first standard which Sir Richard Cartwright set up but which he did not attempt to enforce by resolution. The second standard which Sir Richard Cartwright set up was that gifts ought not to be accepted from contractors or officials or any persons having pecuniary relations with the government. That was embodied in the resolution of 1891. It is also embodied in the resolution of to-day. Then the third principle which was put forward both by Sir Richard Cartwright and the right hon. the Prime Minister was not embodied in the resolution of 1891, but is embodied in the resolution of to-day. It is this ; that absolute and perfect publicity should attend all gifts of money or testimonials to ministers of the Crown. It does not seem to me to require very much argument to show that that position is absolutely good. How are the public of Canada to know, (and they have the right to know) that contractors, that officials, that persons having pecuniary relations with the government are not subscribers to this fund, unless you publish in the light of day, in the press of Canada, so that every man may know, the names of every man who has contributed to any such fund. It is absolutely impossible to work out the resolution of 1891, unless you adopt that principle which was a good principle in the judgment of the right hon. gentleman in 1891. Is it not a good principle in his judgment to-day ? If it is, why is it that he asks this House to vote it down? Further than that, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has defended himself against any suspicion in this matter by pleading that very ignorance and secrecy which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister denounced and which the Minister of Trade and Commerce denounced in 1891. The thing that these hon. gentlemen denounced in 1891 is the defence of the Minister of Finance to-day, yet my hon. friend the Prime Minister says that the defence of the Minister of Finance is an admirable one, is a defence to which no hon. gentleman in this House can take the slightest exception. Let me repeat at the risk of wearying the House one or two of the strongest statements of opinion on this point taken from Sir Richard Cartwright's speech.

Unfortunately these precautions were not taken, unfortunately publicity was not given, as I have always said publicity should be given, to the names of persons who subscribed; and still more unfortunately precautions were not taken to see that subscriptions to that fund were not accepted save from sources from which they honourably could be accepted.

So right on through the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, couched in the strongest possible terms, and directed with great force against the principle for which the right hon. gentleman stands to-day. The Prime Minister says that publicity is not necessary to-day. What did he say in 1891?

The only thing, however, with which my hon. friend found fault in regard to what was done on that occasion by the friends of Sir John Macdonald was that instead of it being done publicly, as it should have been done, it was done in secret.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance stood up before parliament and before the country to-day and stated that he stipulated, in connection with his testimonial, that there should be absolute and perfect secrecy with regard to it. I do not see how you can reconcile that statement of the Minister of Finance to-day with the statement in direct contradiction thereto made by the right hon. gentleman who leads the House when he spoke on that subject in 1891. But that is not all.

It may be wrong or it may be good, according to circumstances, but if such an act is done in the open light of day, then, Sir, it is the best prohibition that there can be against any wrong taking place.

What does that mean? That means that if there is absolute, perfect publicity, you have an absolute safeguard that no contractor, no official, no person having pecuniary interest with the government, is a subscriber to that fund. That is what the right hon. gentleman meant by that statement. Yet the Minister of Finance has told us that one of the main stipulations with regard to this fund was that the names of the subscribers should be kept an absolute secret. Then the Prime Minister went on :

If the hon. gentleman did not know, it was because he chose to remain ignorant of who were the names on the list, and if he chose to be ignorant of the names which were on that list, is it not because his moral sense told him that he might there find names of persons giving contributions which should not be accepted at all?

I hardly like to read the strictures of the right hon. gentleman in 1891, because they come home with so much force to us to-day in view of the statement that was made this afternoon by his colleague whose name has been brought up in connection with these matters. Further on :

Certainly there could be nothing wrong in the admirers of a man in public life coming to his help and rescuing him; but it seems to me that the recipient of such favours would naturally be too glad to know who are the persons to whom he owes gratitude, and if he does not chose to know who are those to whom he owes gratitude, it must be because his moral sense tells him that he would find there names which would be a condemnation of his accepting such a testimonial.

Is there anything in the remarks of my hon. friend from Algoma to-day approaching in severity the quotation I have just read from the Prime Minister in addressing this House in 1891? Mr. Speaker, were these principles sincerely held by the Prime Minister in 1891 or not? Does he withdraw from them to-day, or say that they are not as good now as he deemed them to be in 1891? He has not told us so to-night. This list is a clean list, according to the statement of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). Is there any reason that the Prime Minister can assign, that any hon. gentleman can assign, why it should not be published? I have heard none from any gentleman on the other side of the House, from any gentleman who has spoken to-day. I have heard no reason whatever why this list should not be published. The people have the right to read it and to form their own conclusions. Assuming, as I do, the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to be an absolutely true and frank statement with regard to this whole transaction, I say that it affords the best possible reason why that list should be published to the people of Canada without one hour's delay.

Now just one word in conclusion. My right hon. friend has struggled manfully, but in vain, to find some reason why the government would be justified in refusing to accept this amendment. My hon. friend from Algoma has stated that he does not present it as a vote of want of confidence. He follows in that respect the course which was adopted by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce in 1891. The resolution contains no charge against any Minister of the Crown, it contains no reflection upon any Minister of the Crown, it is purely and simply a recital, a renewed declaration of a principle agreed on by both sides of the House in 1891. It contains further a statement of principle, of public importance, and even necessity which was put forward in 1891 as an absolutely necessary accompaniment to the resolution passed in that year. My right hon. friend considers this amendment as a resolution of want of confidence. The hon. member for Algoma says that he does not present it in that view. The government call upon their followers to vote it down. They have accepted within the past ten years at least ten motions proposed in amendment to Committee of Supply, which were quite as much motions of want of confidence as the one now proposed. The government are asked to accept the principle of 1891, together with a further principle which is an absolutely necessary accompaniment and corollary thereto, without which the principle affirmed in the resolution of 1891 becomes easy of evasion and cannot be carried out. Two standards were set up by the then Minister of Trade and Commerce. He set up the standard that no gifts of any kind should be made to Ministers of the Crown. We are not going that far to-day. He set up a second standard, that no gifts

from contractors, no gifts from officials, no gifts from persons having pecuniary relations with the government, should be accepted. He laid down a third principle, strongly affirmed also by the Prime Minister, that no gifts should be accepted, although they came from absolutely untainted sources, unless those gifts were accompanied by the utmost possible publicity in respect of the sources from which the contributions came. A regard for the proper standards of public life demands that the resolution of 1891 should be reaffirmed to-day, not only in the form which it took then, which was agreed to by both sides of the House, but in the form now presented by my hon. friend from Algoma, namely, that any such contributions if made to ministers of the Crown must in the first place come from absolutely clean and untainted sources, and in the second place, those sources should be disclosed fully, and without the slightest attempt at concealment or evasion, to the parliament of Canada, and to the people of this country.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I do not know that I can add much to this debate, but some remarks have fallen from the lips of the leader of the opposition with which I have to take direct issue. The hon. member seems to think that because the mover of this resolution said that he did not introduce it as a motion of want of confidence we must absolutely ignore the linking up with it of the name of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and the well known facts with regard to the subscription to a testimonial to that minister, and the methods, manner and language in which this motion was moved. I may say frankly at once that as far as the substance of this motion is concerned I have no quarrel with it. I would not oppose in any way a substantive resolution which should propose to advance this House farther than it went in 1891. But, when a resolution comes as an attack upon the honour and integrity of a member of the government whose reputation and character are far above attack in this country and beyond the confines of this country I cannot recognize this motion as anything but a deliberate motion of want of confidence in the government, because it undertakes to asperse the character and integrity of one of the most important members of the government. Mere words to say that that is not the meaning of it are ineffective and useless in face of the tone and character of the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Boyce) who introduced the resolution. If he had desired to make this a simple declaration of the parliament of Canada involving what is included in the words of this resolution why did he make the motion as a result of his inquiries and his statements of a few days ago in parliament as to the subscription of Mr. Travers to the Fielding fund? Why was this the result of that? Why was it introduced at a time when the Minister of Finance himself should be present if it were not aimed at the Minister of Finance? It is not a motion enunciating a general principle, but it is a direct and violent attack upon the honour of a member of the government, upon the honour of the leader of the Liberal party, and I think that the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the leader of this House was well within his rights in calling upon those who have confidence in Mr. Fielding to vote down this resolution. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) quotes deliberately and at considerable length from the excellent speech of the gentleman who introduced the resolution in 1891, and he undertakes to say that the Liberal party has gone back on its principles then enunciated and has changed its stand. He does not say anything about a change of stand by his friends of the Conservative party. I suppose he is so accustomed to such changes that he does not think them wonderful, but if the Liberals do change their front in any way it is open to objection.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that meant to be sarcastic?

Mr. FISHER. No, it is only the plain truth without any sarcasm in it. I will just point out what was the origin of the debate in 1891, and I shall quote the few words with which Sir Richard Cartwright introduced the motion. I shall not read the resolution because it has been read already several times, but this is what Sir Richard Cartwright said distinctly and clearly:

> This motion declares, Sir—and let this be carefully remembered—this motion does not object to and does not censure the acceptance of gifts or testimonials by ministers of the Crown from their political or personal admirers, unless, indeed, these parties should belong to classes having direct pecuniary relations with the government at the time. Such a proposition, it appears to me, ought to commend itself to every right-feeling and right-thinking man from one end of this Dominion to the other, and I go further; it ought to commend itself to every honest man and to every right-thinking man under every constitutional government. There could be, in my judgment, no proposition clearer or plainer than this. There could be no one thing which tends more to the interest of good government, and which is more vital to the proper management of the public service than laying down once and for all the declaration on the part of this parliament: That it is not expedient that ministers of the Crown should accept from persons who may appear before them in the guise of suitors, from per-

sons in regard to whom they stand in position of judges, any gifts or presents of testimonials of any kind or description. I repeat again, Sir, that I am not raising the vexed question as to whether a minister of the Crown should or should not accept gifts during his term of office from political admirers. That, I have always held, is a matter of opinion, and it must be determined by the peculiar circumstances in each case.

Mr. LENNOX. Go on.

Mr. FISHER. It goes on, but there is no need of reading further.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read on.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friends may laugh and interrupt and they are welcome to read on if they desire to do so. But, I want to point out that the declaration which is contained in the first part of this motion and the declaration of Sir Richard Cartwright when he moved it was a distinct declaration that it was aimed at the acceptance of gifts from contractors, from those who were receiving favours from the minister and from the government and not in regard to gifts of those who were political or personal friends. That is the difference between the situation then and the situation to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FISHER. Hon. members laugh and say, what is the difference? The difference is this, that at that time Sir Richard Cartwright was aiming at a testimonial which had been given to Sir Hector Langevin at a time when everybody, as well as the public press, including the Conservative press, had declared that Sir Hector Langevin was receiving gifts from the contractors in his own department, and when Sir Hector Langevin had been obliged to leave the Conservative government because of mal-administration in his office had been proved against him, mal-administration which shortly afterwards drove him out of public life. The conditions and the circumstances are entirely different from the position of to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What about the principles—are they different?

Mr. FISHER. The principles are the same but the circumstances and the facts are not the same, and principles should apply when the facts are the same and only then. Nobody declares or for a moment suggests that Mr. Fielding has received a favour or a gift from any man whom he has favoured in his public administration of the affairs of this country.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the hon. gentleman state that to his knowledge the names of no contractors or other persons having pecuniary relations with the government appear on the list of contributors to this testimonial?

Mr. FISHER. I do not state it from my personal knowledge, but I have no hesitation in stating it because I know that the committee that had charge of the testimonial was composed of honourable men, that they accepted the trust which they undertook at the request of Hon. Mr. Fielding on that distinct understanding and only on that understanding would he allow them to proceed with the work and allow them to give him a testimonial. Hon. gentlemen opposite shrug their shoulders.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, my hon. friend opposite says 'hear, hear.' I regret to think that there are men who have such a low opinion of the honour and integrity of their fellow citizens and of those who stand high in commercial, banking and other positions in Canada, who stand high in the life of this country, and who have declared solemnly and absolutely that there is no man who has that relation with the government who has made a subscription to this testimonial. I am prepared for one to accept that declaration and, I am prepared for one to believe that the friends of Mr. Fielding who surrounded him were sufficiently imbued with his own high honour and integrity to know that if they did that, notwithstanding the conditions which had been laid down by Mr. Fielding, they would be guilty of the basest betrayal of the friendship and confidence of a public man. I do not believe that the committee have said a word that is untruthful or that they would be so unfaithful to the trust that they had accepted. I am sorry for my hon. friend opposite that he cannot have that faith in human nature.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher), kindly explain what that has to do with the principle declared in that resolution ?

Mr. FISHER. It has a good deal to do with the facts; it has a good deal to do with comparisons between the conditions in 1891 and the conditions in 1910. And the whole circumstances, as Sir Richard Cartwright said, when he introduced that resolution, are left to the opinion and judgment of the minister who receives the gift from his personal friends and admirers. And so it is in this case with Mr. Fielding. Mr. Fielding is reproached because he stipulated for secrecy, and his words and his position are contrasted with those of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who, in 1891, expressed the opinion that secrecy was inadvisable. There is a difference of opinion. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax),

said a few minutes ago that if he were to make a criticism of Mr. Fielding at all it would be because his judgment had allowed him to stipulate for secrecy. There is a difference of opinion and of conduct between two men. I confess that I sympathize a great deal with Mr. Fielding's desire not to know the names of the men who were contributing to this present, so that, if, in future, any of these men happen to have relations with him, he might not be hampered in dealing with them by the fact that in a day gone by, they had contributed to a testimonial for his benefit. But that does not in any way acknowledge or pretend, nor should anybody think, that, at the moment that testimonial was made, they had or expected to have any relations with the government. When this testimonial was arranged for, what was the declaration of parliament? It was only the first part of this resolution. This Mr. Fielding knew, and he stipulated that it should be fulfilled to the letter. Mr. Fielding's friends accepted and acted upon and within, not the law of the land, I grant you, but the resolution and opinion of parliament which has the right to give its opinion upon such questions. Let me remind hon. gentlemen opposite that if the right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), expressed an opinion in 1891 that secrecy was inadvisable, and if Sir Richard Cartwright said the same, the House of Commons at that time, did not accept that view, did not insert that in the resolution, but simply passed the first part of the present resolution and left it there, thus dealing only with the question of those having relations with the government subscribing to testimonials.

Now, I wish to say a word with regard to another phase of this question. Mr. Fielding's name has been forced into this discussion, and none of us can in any way look upon this motion except in regard to Mr. Fielding. I say that frankly, and I say that that is the reason why I, personally, feel bound to vote down the resolution, because it is a direct attack and aspersion upon a man who as my colleague, I have known intimately, whom I know to be absolutely above reproach and whose character is such, that I am ashamed of the men who dare to make insinuations of this kind against him.

Mr. BOYCE. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher), referring to me?

Mr. FISHER. I am referring to anybody who has dragged Mr. Fielding's name into this motion and seeks to point the finger of scorn at him in this connection.

Mr. BEST. There are thousands of them in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. I do not believe that that is a correct statement of public opinion in this country.

Mr. BEST. I think it is.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member (Mr. Best) represents a certain class of public opinion, but it is not the class, I believe, that is in the majority.

Mr. BOYCE. I rise to a point of order. I do not think it is in accordance with the rules of this House that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) should be allowed to state that he is ashamed of any statement made by a member of this House. I covered that by asking if he referred to me, and he replied that he referred to any one who dragged Mr. Fielding's name into the resolution. As mover of the resolution, I referred to Mr. Fielding. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his remark and withdraw it immediately.

Mr. FISHER. I will submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but, until you rule that my words are out of order, I will not withdraw them.

Mr. SPEAKER. At first sight, any statement made reflecting upon the honour of a member is out of order, but in this case, I understand, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) refers more to the argument than to the person. To qualify an argument is different from qualifying a person.

Mr. FISHER. I was proceeding to another aspect of this question, upon which I would like to say a few words. Mr. Fielding has received a testimonial from friends and admirers of a large sum of money. There is no doubt that the reason for this testimonial is that Mr. Fielding, through a long period of public service, has given activities and mental qualities to the public service to an extent which has prevented him from laying up proper provision for his own old age and for the proper provision for his family. He has done this, as we all know, through more than twenty-five years of public service. I make the deliberate statement that he has done this for twenty-five years of public service of the highest character which, in the salaries he has received in the whole of these twenty-five years, have been absolutely inadequately rewarded or paid for. Mr. Fielding was for twelve years—speaking from memory—the Prime Minister of the province of Nova Scotia. I do not know exactly what he received through all that administration, but I think that during part of it he received $5,000 a year, I have no hesitation in saying that having to perform the duties of the Prime Minister's position in a province of Canada and having to fulfil the social obligations of that position and to live in accord-

ance with the position ; having a family depending upon him and being obliged to bring up that family in a way commensurate with the associates of that family while he occupied that position, and being called upon to meet the immense number of calls upon his charity and upon his public spirit which always go with a position of that kind—it was positively and absolutely impossible for Mr. Fielding to have made any savings or any provision for the future of himself or his family.

For the last fourteen years and more Mr. Fielding has been Finance Minister for the Dominion of Canada. We all know what salary he has received—$7,000 a year. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I can speak with a certain freedom, because being a bachelor my salary is sufficient for my needs. I speak advisedly, and I speak in all seriousness, when I say that for my needs the salary I have received during the last fourteen years has been sufficient—I will go further and say, with no surplus left at the end of the year. But I venture to say—and I say it so that it may be heard through all this House, and I hope it will be remarked throughout the Dominion of Canada that the salary which a minister of the Crown receives in Ottawa, if he lives according to the position he occupies, if he spends money in the way in which those with whom he has to associate spend their money, is not adequate to the demands upon his purse if he has a family and if he is expected to lay by a provision for his old age and to make provision for his family. When Canada undertakes to so pay her ministers of the Crown that they cannot make such provision, there is only one other way in which those men can be honourably helped if they have sacrificed their lives and their health in the public service, and that way is, if they have no fortune of their own, no resources to fall back upon, for friends and admirers to come to their assistance and relieve them from the anxieties and worries necessarily attendant upon the life of any man who has a family dependent upon him, and who has not made provision for them in case of accident to himself. I say further, that Mr. Fielding's devotion to his public duties, as we know only too sadly, has to a large extent broken down his health, we trust and believe only temporarily; but, at the same time, when a man reaches the age which he has reached, and has not made the proper provision for an older age and for his family's future, it is a cause of worry and anxiety. This in most cases, in any man not so devoted to the public service as Mr. Fielding, would render it very difficult indeed for him to perform the full measure of his public duty, and I say that a public service to the Dominion of Canada has been rendered by those who subscribed to this Fielding testimonial if by reason of that fact Mr. Fielding is able the better and for a longer time to continue that splendid service for his country which he has performed for the past twenty-five years. That is a debt of gratitude which the people of Canada owe to the subscribers to that testimonial, and I am satisfied that the people throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion will acknowledge that debt of gratitude, and will repudiate the accusations which have been made against those subscribers just as much as against the recipient of that testimonial.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Did not that apply as well to Sir Hector Langevin, who died poor?

Mr. TALBOT. How do you know?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I know.

Mr. TALBOT. You do not know.

Mr. FISHER. I will not dispute it, but I do not wish to resuscitate the accusations or discuss the conditions which were in existence at the time of that former debate. I dealt with that matter a few minutes ago, and I have nothing to add to what I then said and nothing to take back. Sir, there was one part only of the speech of the mover of this resolution with which I had some sympathy. It was that in which he spoke of the government having at one time passed an Act to provide pensions for ministers of the Crown who had administered a department for a certain length of time, and he believed that the government had made a mistake in repealing that Act. Sir, I believe that that Act on the part of the present government was justified, and I believe that its repeal was justified only for this reason, that cavil and criticism on the part of a number of people in this country was raised against that Act to such an extent as to make the ministers of the Crown who might be entitled to such a pension refuse to accept it. Only by reason of that agitation do I consider that the repeal of that Act was a wise act or justified.

Mr. BOYCE. Too sensitive.

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps too sensitive. I can appreciate that my hon. friend cannot sympathize with that at all; but I thank God that we have some men in public life in Canada who are sensitive. I appreciate the fact that there are men—and I am glad to be able to say that they are not confined to one party, but that there are a large number of Conservatives—who are sensitive in regard to their public reputation and their record in public affairs, and are therefore careful of their utterances and their actions, and for that reason are the better men—the better Conservatives

if you like, but certainly the better citizens and the better Canadians.

I have said these few things, Sir, to show not only to those within the sound of my voice, but to others, that there is a reason and in many cases a necessity, for friends and admirers to step in and do something for public men who have not wealth at their command; and that is only one of the reasons why a resolution such as this should not go very much further and say that it should be impossible in Canada for men in office to receive anything in the way of gift, testimonial or anything else. But in the condition of affairs which I have briefly described, I conceive that there are conditions and circumstances in individual cases where that is the only recourse to save for the country the continued work and effort of those great men who are thus circumstanced, and the only way in which they can be relieved of the anxiety and the worry which is natural to the father of a family and the husband of a wife. I regret that this motion has been brought forward in the way in which it has been. If hon. gentlemen opposite had wanted to lay down a principle in regard to the future of the public life of Canada, they should have done what the right hon. the leader of the House suggested—brought forward a substantive motion, and at a time when it would have no personal application, without dragging the name of either subscriber or recipient into the discussion. And then I believe that we might have been able to put upon the records of this House a resolution which would have been advantageous to the public credit of the country and be accepted unanimously and thereby, and only thereby, have that force which must be behind any resolution put or carried.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not propose to detain the House very long in the few remarks I am about to make on this question. Neither do I propose to argue it in a personal manner at all. I think there is a great principle involved in the resolution before the House, and just at this moment I am a little in trouble as to the fate of that principle if the determination of the Prime Minister is carried out, and the House votes it down. The right hon. gentleman says that we have to-day a rule or law of parliament in existence, that rule and law being the resolution which was passed in 1891, and which forbids gifts to ministers of the Crown by contractors or persons interested. Well, if that be a rule and law of parliament and a good one, established by the assent of both parties in 1891, and one which the Prime Minister himself then most vehemently supported, what are we going to have in its place after a vote on this resolution is taken and the right hon. the Prime Minister, through his majority in this House, abrogates that rule and law, negatives it, and leaves nothing in its place? I think that is rather a serious condition especially in view of the fact that the right hon. gentleman's colleague (Mr. Fisher) who has just sat down has elucidated and given governmental sanction to an absolutely untenable and vicious principle. I would ask my right hon. friend the leader of the House, if he will subscribe to that. What is that principle? It is that whenever a man who is a minister of the Crown is unable to take care of his wife and children and bring them up according to the conditions of the life in which he moves, whenever he is unable to do this and meet his other expenses, his friends and admirers are in duty bound to come to his rescue and make him a gift of $100,000 or so. That is a direct invitation to gift making and establishes a vicious principle—a vicious principle which I do not believe the right hon. the Prime Minister himself will stand for. It is a direct invitation to every minister in the present cabinet to come along with a statement of his finances, and show that he is not able to meet the demands upon him, that he has to spend so much on his family, that he has to give out so much to charity, and that he has to meet besides certain other furbelows and functions, and finds his salary insufficient; and then, on this appeal, two or three or more of his friends get together and start a foraging expedition and find subscriptions enough from his supporters to deposit the comfortable sum of $100,000 or so to his credit in the bank for his personal use and gratification. If there is anything in that statement of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), that is the principle involved in it. Does the right hon. gentleman stand by that? Oh, but it is urged, Mr. Fielding is poor and he is honest. Well, what about the other members of the cabinet Are any of them poor? I do not know. Will the Prime Minister draw a distinction between the Finance Minister and the other members of his cabinet? The Finance Minister is honest, but are any of the others dishonest? By what rule, now that you have started and given sanction to the principle as stated by the Minister of Agriculture, can you treat the others differently? Take the case of any other minister, whose friends want to stand well with him, what is to prevent them taking the same course with regard to him? Oh, but the Prime Minister was fine tonight when he was saying that publicity was the very groundwork and guarantee of ministerial honesty in this matter. Publicity, he said, was the modern requirement and the principal requirement, and in this connection everything was done in public. There was a banquet, there were speeches and a presentation—the elements

of publicity were absolutely complied with and there was a guarantee of the greatest amount of honesty underlying the whole business. It was fine—no doubt about it—almost as fine as that other flight of his in this direction. In 1891, it was all right to bring in—not a motion in condemnation of Sir Hector Langevin for no such motion was brought in by the right hon. gentleman at that time—but a general motion affirming a general principle. The argument of the right hon. gentleman then went to show that the resolution was not specially directed against Sir Hector Langevin, but a general one affirming a general principle which became the law, and rule of this House. In what manner was that resolution introduced? It was introduced on a motion to go into Supply, made by myself who was then Finance Minister, and it affirmed a general principle. In the discussion which took place, language was used by the right hon. gentleman himself and his colleagues which was not all honey and balm, and which would compare favourably for strength and vigour with the statment of my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Boyce), but the resolution was the affirmation of a general principle, and in that sense it was adopted. Sir John Thompson, who was then leader of the government said: This is introduced on the motion to go into Supply, but it is the affirmation of a general principle in which we agree and therefore we shall assent to it, and join in passing it. But Sir John Thompson reminded the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues that while he assented to that resolution as being the affirmation of a general principle, he did not at all endorse the very strong and emphatic language used by Sir Richard Cartwright, and my right hon. friend. But he did not make such a childish plea as to say that because the man who introduced that general resolution wore a gray coat instead of a black one, he therefore would oppose it and treat it as a want of confidence motion.

But the right hon. gentleman and his worthy colleague (Mr. Fisher) who has just taken his seat go a little further. The right hon. gentleman says : I agree with the first part of the resolution, I am willing to affirm it, I will not affirm the latter part. I am not sure whether he agreed with it or not but it is his own language, the very identical words that he used in 1891, not on a special matter but on a general principle. But the right hon. gentleman has so often disagreed with himself that he would feel out of common atmosphere, and some way leading off from the general tendency of his life if he agreed just once with the language of which he was formerly the father and the sponsor. But he says this is the reason why he treats it as a motion of want of confidence. If my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) had waited two months more and then brought it in in the very same way, he would not have treated it as a motion of want of confidence, it makes a difference as to the date of the month on which a general principle is affirmed as to whether it is right for him to support it. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture goes a step further. He not only agrees with the first part but he agrees with the second part. The whole resolution is absolutely right in the eyes of the Minister of Agriculture. But he has to vote against it. He ranges around the back part of his head to find out what strong reasons can be got up which will fortify him in his statement that although he agrees with it he will not vote for it. What are the reasons that he brings in? Because he believes Mr. Fielding is an honest man, and that this is an attack on Mr. Fielding. Is it any more an attack on Mr. Fielding than the very wording of the original resolution in 1891 was an attack upon Sir Hector Langevin? To-night, Mr. Fielding has not been attacked, he has been used, I think, with great magnanimity, and with great courtesy by the members on this side of the House, a magnanimity and courtesy which were absolutely wanting in 1891 with reference to both Sir Hector Langevin and Sir John A. Macdonald. But the minister, astute reasoner, logician from the early days, has to-night made the unparalleled record, reached the apex of all logical reasoning, and declares that he agrees with every word and line in the whole resolution, which is a general resolution, and the affirmation of a general principle, but will vote against it because he conceives that it might be construed into an attack on the Finance Minister. There are two able gentlemen, one the leader of the party, and the other his able and astute lieutenant. There are their statements as to the resolution, and there are the reasons why they must vote against it. Might I invite my right hon. friend to take that resolution and show in the second part of it one single offensive word. I shall read it, and shall leave it to Mr. Speaker to point out to this House the offensive word.

That in order to maintain this principle the sources of any gifts of money to ministers of the Crown ought not to be surrounded with secrecy, and that an authentic statement of the names of the donors should forthwith be made public.

Mr. Speaker, where is the offensive word? Might I ask my right hon. friend to point out the offensive word or line. Will he do it? That is the only objection the right hon. gentleman has to that part of it. Although it is made as an amendment to go into Supply he is willing to go so far as to adopt the first part and let it run in as a

motion of want of confidence, but he will not adopt the second, his own identical words, because he says it is offensive, and he will not point out to the House a single offensive word or phrase in that resolution. I commend these two hon. gentlemen, not to the tender mercies of this House, they always have them, but to the tender consideration of the public which will wake up to-morrow morning and at its breakfast table read these two weighty arguments and reasons of these two weighty men. I remember very well 1891, I remember the whole debate and I remember the occasion. At that time, the Liberal-Conservatives met these gentlemen in spite of their strictures and their partisan attacks and said yes, looking at the past, knowing what has been done, we agree now with you on that side of the House, we all agree to a general rule and law of action which shall bind us in the future. Who has broken this contract? This side of the House has never broken it, this side of the House stands by it to-day, and to-day, when that law is violated, we ask hon. gentlemen opposite to join with us and reaffirm the general law and rule, we ask them for the sake of the public life of Canada not to remove the salutary law which is at the present the law of parliament, as they say they intend to do, and leave this whole thing wide open, more especially with that wicked principle enunciated by the Minister of Agriculture, a call to the faithful, to contractors that are and contractors that are to be, lookers for favours for the present and for the future, to come to the assistance of every minister whose salary is not sufficient to keep his house running and his expenses paid. With respect to this $120,000 given with all the guarantees of publicity that have been so eloquently described by the right hon. gentleman to-night, the Prime Minister has sung as the refrain of his argument to the House and to the country: Will any one say that a word can be brought against the honour of William Fielding? The Minister of Agriculture beat out another and a little different refrain, but for the same reason, that he has given long and faithful services, and is poor. If they have thrown that before the House, it is not my fault if I comment upon it. My comment is simply this, that of all public men in Canada, I do not think you can pick out another whose position in a monetary point of view, in payment for services to the state, compares with that of the Finance Minister of this day. I make that statement, why do I make it? Mr. Fielding had not stepped out of private life into public life until he had a government position with its salary assured to him. Mr. Fielding has not passed one hour of his life from that time up to the present that he has not been a member of a government in receipt of a government salary. My right hon. friend has not had an experience like that. He fought some time before he got into the House. He got in, and he stayed in but a little while, and again he fought for many a long year in the cold shades of opposition. When he came in again in 1896 he did the work, but he enjoyed the emoluments of the office, the emoluments that this country has said is all that a man should receive from the master to the servant. But, Sir, there is not another example in the history of politics in this country showing so favourable a position as that of the hon. gentleman who is Finance Minister to-day.

Now I will tell you exactly the feeling that ran through me this afternoon when my hon. friend was making his statement; it was a feeling of pity, of absolute pity that any country as rich as Canada is, and any parliament as sensible as this parliament is, would run the risk of throwing its public servants to the tender mercies of contractors and seekers from the government for a provision which they refused to pay them. It is pitiable, Sir, and it no credit to this government nor to this country. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, plainly that if the proposition had been made, and the circumstances set out, and the government had come down to this House last year with this proposition or an alternative: Vote to the Hon. Wm. Fielding $100,000, or turn him over in his old age to the mercy of contractors—I would have voted, cheerfully voted, to pay him the $100,000. What are the circumstances, even in this case? The Finance Minister did not want to know and he does not know, the Minister of Agriculture, whether he wants to know or not, does not know, the right hon. gentleman who leads this House does not know whether the stipulations made by Mr. Fielding have been carried out or not. The stipulations were right in their way. Where is the evidence that the stipulations have been carried out as they were made? You will never satisfy public opinion, and you will never clear the Minister of Finance or the government, until you place in the possession of the people the evidence of that which you declare is true. The people of this country are not fools, they are sensible, and the man upon the street, and the man in the club, and the man everywhere will say: What in the world is all the trouble about? If the subscriptions are all right, who is ashamed of them? Are the donors ashamed that they have done so philanthropic an act as the Minister of Agriculture has described to us to-night? I do not think so. Are the donors ashamed that they should be known as public spirited citizens who had come to the aid of a government which is too miserly to make a living provision to its own working Finance Minister? I do not think so. Who would

be harmed, if that list is all right and the stipulations have been carried out, if the list were placed before the people of this country whose servants you and we are?

My view of it is this, and I challenge the Prime Minister to say that it is not the British view and the right view, that no minister of the Crown whilst he is in office, or when he is out of office with an expectation of coming back again in to office, ought to put himself into the position of taking gifts of any kind. That has to be modified only by some great emergent conditions, where a man has met with some disaster, where he has been borne down by hard luck, calamity, sickness and the like of that. I can conceive that a circumstance might arise when his friends might come to his aid. But I am speaking on general principles. Sir, to-day in Great Britain—though I think it may be that in some respects the grade is not quite so high there as it used to be, I will not say that dogmatically—but I say that no British minister could stand for a single hour in parliament with a gift of $120,000 in his pocket, nor with a gift of $10,000 in his pocket. He could not do it, it is un-British, and it is un-British for the best of reasons, that it is unsound as a maxim of public political life that such a thing should be allowed. Sir Richard Cartwright, with all his bitterness of invective and all his strength of expression, is pretty sound upon those constitutional points, and the statement that was read by the leader of the opposition to-night made by Sir Richard was concise, and true, and sane, and healthy, that no minister of the Crown should take gifts while he is in office.

Now I ask again the question which the common people will ask: If this thing is all right, why not let everybody know it. But one thing seems to have escaped the discussion to-night. There are some men that the Minister of Finance does know were interested in it. There are some men whose names are out in the open light of day; we have four of them mentioned to-night, two of them self-confessed, the other two given by the organ of the party—the 'Globe.' No one doubts that the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Miller) and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), Mr. Jaffray, the senator, and Mr. Larkin, the party leader and the party supplier of large campaign funds, were the head and front of it. The Finance Minister knows that. Some of those men are before him every day for favours. The hon. member for Grey is before him every day for favours. The hon. member for Guysborough is before him every day for favours and the minister knows that they engineered the funds and that without that engineering he never would have had it. There is an instance, patent to everybody of the violation of the principle, if there ever was any principle at all, in the resolution which the right hon. leader of the government in 1891 was so ardent an advocate of.

Now, I will say this in conclusion. I find that the little notes I have taken are all gone over with the exception of one—I have not prepared a speech, but I have just taken up some points that occurred to me. But, there is one that I think it would hardly be fair for me to let go entirely by. There was a remark made by the Minister of Agriculture, who declared that he was a sensitive politician. Then he thought that he said a wonderful thing when he said that there were sensitive politicians on that side of the House and he must thank God for it. So he was a sensitive politician, he said, and he thanked God that there were some sensitive politicians. The Minister of Agriculture is a sensitive politician when he is asked to vote for a resolution which he acknowledges to be right, but when he wants to vote against it he is not so sensitive then. There might be some shadow of a shade of an implication against the Minister of Finance and his sensitive soul will not allow him to envisage such possibilities and contingencies as that. Oh, would to God that same sensitiveness would suffuse the soul of the Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues in the case of the multitudinous mal-administration which has been exposed in this House by the opposition and sustained by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. What I pray for, if my prayers go any distance at all——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER—and I will invite the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), who looks serious enough just at this moment, to join with me in those prayers, is that a little more sensitiveness of conscience may be imparted to the members of the administration from the Prime Minister down to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) when those awful things are exposed to the House and when that publicity which is the guardian and the guarantee of private and public life so eulogized by the Prime Minister to-night is fought for by this side and the door is banged and bolted on the other side of the House.

But, I am not going to leave this discussion without bringing forward just one further thought, and it is this: Outside of this particular instance as it affects the office and as it affects the man in the office and the canons of public and private life, there is a very grave consideration which none of us, I am sure, will leave out of account. It is the power of example. Of all men in the whole public service, that man who ought to be the most careful, that man who ought to be the most circumspect, that man who ought to avoid the least suspicion or comment is the min-

ister of the department and the minister of the government who is to set an example to the whole public service and to the public life of this country. What would we think to-morrow morning if the customs collector in the port of Montreal, were to have had a meeting of his friends and admirers in the city of Montreal, and they had subscribed a testimonial of $50,000, had had a banquet and had all this beautiful publicity, but had failed to give the names of the subscribers and it went out through the length and breadth of this country that the collector of customs in the port of Montreal had received gifts from his friends and admirers ? What would the public opinion say ? Is it not proper for me, knowing the collector of customs in Montreal, to say, that, in my opinion, he is not rich and that he is honest? If, because a man is poor and honest in the case of a minister of the Crown is a reason why the sound canons of political morality should be violated, what reason is there that the collector of customs, a sub-officer under the Crown, should not take from his friends and admirers, on the ground that he is poor and honest, a testimonial, because this is the same reason as that which is given why ministers should accept it ? If the Minister of Finance may take $120,000 from his friends and admirers, why cannot the Minister of Public Works take $120,000 from his friends and admirers ? But I will venture this that if to-morrow morning the news went out through this country that the friends and admirers of the Minister of Public Works had given him a secret donation of $100,000 there would be ructions in this country. When the example is set, when the principle is formed and the practise is laid down in the case of one minister of the Crown, how are you going to prevent other ministers of the Crown from following it, and in exactly the same way the pernicious influence goes through the whole service and permeates the whole country. Your sub-officer or under officer, if you may speak of him as such, says: Well, the high muck-a-mucks take these gifts from their friends and admirers because they are poor and honest; I am poor—mighty poor—and I am just as honest as they are; why cannot I take a little gift on the side too, without any unnecessary publicity ?

I have not the least doubt in the world that demoralization, swift and sure, along the whole line follows this unfortunate movement in the wrong direction. To-night we find the Prime Minister with his party behind him, and this latest advocate closing the debate on that side, declaring that it is perfectly right for ministers of the Crown to take gifts if only they are poor and honest. Have any other members of the government taken gifts?—(Don't all speak at once!)—Is the Prime Minister a sinner in that respect? Would that make his feelings kind towards the Minister of Finance? Are any other ministers in similar positions for lesser sums? How soon this will spread, how far it will go, now that the supreme sanction of the Prime Minister and the Liberal party is given to the reversal of the law and rule of parliament which has existed for twenty years against it and which to-night they propose to abolish, leaving this matter wide, wide open.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Boyce).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Ames,
Armstrong,
Arthurs,
Baker,
Barnard,
Best,
Blain,
Borden (Halifax),
Boyce,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Cowan,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Currie (Simcoe),
Daniel,
Donnelly,
Edwards,
Elson,
Foster,
Fraser,
Gilbert,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes,
Jameson,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lennox,
Lortie,
Macdonell,
McCall,
McCarthy,
Maddin,
Magrath,
Meighen,
Nantel,
Northrup,
Paquet,
Perley,
Porter,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche,
Russell,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Smyth,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thornton,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox (Essex),
Wilson (Lennox and Addington) and
Wright.—63.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allard,
Allen,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Bickerdike,
Black,
Boyer,
Brown,
Bureau,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chew,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Conmee,
Currie (Prince Edward),
McCall,
McCraney,
McGiverin,
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Martin (Regina),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Papineau,

Delisle,	Pardee,
Demers,	Parent,
Devlin,	Paterson,
Douglass,	Pickup,
Dubeau,	Proulx,
Ecrément,	Prowse,
Emmerson,	Pugsley,
Ethier,	Rankin,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Richards,
Fowke,	Rivet,
Gauvreau,	Robb,
Geoffrion,	Ross (Middlesex),
German,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gervais,	Roy (Montmagny),
Gordon (Kent),	Rutan,
Graham,	Savoie,
Guthrie,	Schell,
Harty,	Sealey,
Hodgins,	Seguin,
Hunt,	Sinclair,
King,	Smith (Middlesex),
Kyte,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Lachance,	Smith (Stormont),
Lafortune,	Sperry,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Templeman,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Tobin,
Lapointe,	Todd,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tolmie,
Law,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
LeBlanc,	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Lemieux,	Turgeon,
Loggie,	Turriff,
Lovell,	Verville,
Low,	Warburton,
Macdonald,	White (Victoria,
MacNutt,	Alta.) and
McAllister,	Wilson (Laval).—118.
McCoig,	

Pairs.

Messieurs

Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
Borden (Sir F.),	Crosby,
Harris,	Beattie,
Spratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Talbot,	Owen,
Knowles,	Stanfield,
Miller,	Wallace,
Gladu,	Monk,
Girard,	Clare,
Béland,	Lancaster,
Roy (Dorchester),	Middlebro,
McLean (Huron),	Marshall,

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 12.07 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 1, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the All Red Steamship Company.—Mr. McKenzie.

Mr. FOSTER.

Bill (No. 106) to incorporate the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Harris.

ONTARIO AND MINNESOTA POWER COMPANY.

Mr. CONMEE moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend chapter 139, 4 and 5, Edward VII., intituled an Act respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Ltd. He said: The object of the Bill is to amend the Act of 1905, chapter 139, relating to the Rainy river at Fort Francis, which is a navigable river, and also an international stream; hence the necessity of federal legislation dealing with it. Works have been carried out upon the river which interfere with the navigation of the stream, and which have changed the conditions in connection with the Canadian canal that was constructed some years ago at that point. They also interfere with the water necessary for the navigation of the river, not only below the works, but also of Rainy lake, situated above the works. The question is considerably involved. It will be necessary, as I consider, to give some of the history of the conditions and circumstances leading up to the present situation to do That would involve a reference to agreements, to Acts of the provincial legislature, and to Acts of the federal parliament of Canada. These works were proceeded with a good deal in the manner in which such works are ordinarily undertaken. The first permission, as far as the federal authorities are concerned, to go on with the works was obtained by an order in council on the submission and approval of plans. The works have not been carried on according to those plans, but quite different plans have been adopted. After the works were constructed the company desired to have the changed plans ratified, but they have not been ratified by the Minister of Public Works of the Dominion, and, therefore, the work stands in that position. Hence the importance of making some regulation by enactment by which the public interest in the navigable stream and the chain of navigation both above and below should be dealt with. I assume that the Bill would have to go to a committee. Although it is a public Bill, I think the practice has been, where there are questions which might affect the private interests of individuals, or of a company, to refer it to a committee of the House. I may say that it is not the intention of the amendment to take away from that company any rights they now have under existing legislation, or to impose upon them new or more onerous conditions. The object is to clear away doubts that have arisen and to enact such legislation as will enable the proper protection of the public interest in the

matters involved. As it would take me a long time to go through these various documents with the necessity, here and there of short explanations of what has led up to the present condition, I would ask, instead of taking up the time of the House for some considerable time, as the question is involved and I take it that the Bill will get its first reading and be referred to the Private Bills, or the Railway Committee, that, in the meantime, I be permitted to put this record on 'Hansard.' Hon. members will then have before them the information which is necessary to an intelligent understanding of the question. When the Bill comes up, either in committee or in this House, for its second reading, or in Committee of the Whole House, hon. members will be able to discuss it very much more to advantage than can be done to-day under the circumstances. If I am permitted to hand these papers to 'Hansard' and allow the Bill to go through its first reading I will not take up any more of the time of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am unable to give permission as far as 'Hansard' is concerned.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not quite understand you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that only tables of figures are allowed to be put in 'Hansard,' and that nothing else can be put in 'Hansard' unless it is spoken in the House.

Mr. CONMEE. Then I shall have to make reference to these various documents. I may say that the development of this power, which affects the public interest in the manner I have shortly outlined was entered into as a joint undertaking, an international work, upon the strength of an agreement that was entered into at the request of the town of Fort Francis, and, on their behalf, by the government of Ontario, in 1904. I conceive it to be necessary to make reference to the agreement, as it is the foundation of the whole transaction, and, perhaps, I may be permitted, instead of reading this document, which is somewhat lengthy, to hand it in to 'Hansard.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is against the rules and cannot be done.

Mr. CONMEE. Well, unfortunately, I feel bound, then, under these circumstances, to read the document:—

Memorandum of agreement made in triplicate this 17th day of February, 1904, between His Majesty represented by the Hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands of the province of Ontario, hereinafter called the government.

Mr. BLAIN. Could not my hon. friend use this document to the same advantage before the committee? I do not wish to interfere with my hon. friend, because this is his right, but I was only making that suggestion, and it will likely have to be gone over again when the committee meets to discuss the Bill. I cannot just see how the reading will help the hon. gentleman in his case.

Mr. CONMEE. I feel disposed to accept that suggestion if I understand it aright. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) to suggest that instead of going into this matter in detail to-day, the Bill be read the first time, and that this information be used before the committee to which it may be referred.

Mr. BLAIN. I was expressing my individual opinion of it. I suppose that the question as to whether the Bill should be read a first time is a matter for the House to deal with. I was only directing my attention to the very large volume of records which the hon. gentleman has and suggesting that they might be presented to the committee which deals with the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that if my hon. friend would do that it would result in better economy of the time of the House. It has been the practice in this House to have very little discussion upon the first reading and especially not to introduce documents or the like of that. It all has to be gone over again on the second reading, and it duplicates time and expense. I think the Speaker has been very generally in accord with that idea, and has always suggested that the first reading be limited to a mere explanation of the Bill without the introduction of arguments.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Every Bill presented to this House is accepted for the first reading as a matter of course unless there is on the face of the Bill a paramount objection. There can be no objection to the Bill of my hon. friend being introduced; but, if I am correctly informed, he is attempting to amend a private Act, and there is a regular procedure to be followed in such a case. If it is a public Bill, there is no objection at all to the first reading.

Mr. CONMEE. The Bill is to amend a private Act, but it deals with a public question. The whole object of chapter 139 of 4 and 5 Edward VII. is to regulate certain works and the public rights in regard to those works. The Interpretation Act provides that all Bills, whether private or otherwise, are considered public Bills. Section 18 of that Act reads in this way:

Every Act shall be so construed as to reserve to parliament the power of repealing or amending it, and of revoking, restricting or modifying any power, privilege or advantage thereby vested in or granted to any per-

son, whenever such repeal, amendment, revocation, restriction or modification is deemed by parliament to be required for the public good.

I do not wish to take up the time of the House, and if the Bill can be read the first time and be sent to the committee, I am quite willing to accept that situation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So far as I have been able to follow my hon. friend, he is attempting to amend a private Act, and in that case there are certain rules which have to be followed. The parties concerned may desire to be heard. It is for the Speaker to decide whether the Bill is in order or not in order, and I would suggest to my hon. friend that he present his case so as to obtain the ruling of the Speaker on that point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think my hon. friend should address himself to the point just mentioned. It seems to be absolutely impossible that any gentleman, desiring that a private Act shall be amended, can get rid of all the requirements of this House with respect to notice and advertisement by introducing his proposed amendment as a public Bill.

Mr. CONMEE. I am quite willing to discuss that point if it is necessary to raise it at this time; but I did not think that would be necessary. This is not the first public Bill that has amended a private Act. I submit that the practice of parliament and the authorities sustain the position I take. I find the following in Bourinot, at page 688:

As a rule it may be stated that when Bills treat of matters of general policy, such as sanitary, or police, or commercial, or fiscal regulations, they may be considered as public measures. In fact, all Bills affecting the general interests of the community and involving considerations of public policy, are out of the category of Private Bills dealing with the special interests of corporations or associations.

I submit that this is a Bill of that character, not dealing with the private interests of anybody, but with matters of public interest and public policy. Further on Bourinot says:

Whenever public Bills involve private interests, which should be carefully guarded they are subjected to the same examination provided for private Bills.

He goes on to show that such Bills are referred to the committee. I find that several Bills of that character have passed the parliament of Canada, and I have no objection to this Bill going to the committee. Perhaps this case, referred to by Bourinot, might be cited as fully warranting the course I am taking:

Mr. CONMEE.

In the session of 1875, the Premier (Mr. Mackenzie) moved for leave to introduce a public Bill to rearrange the 'capital of the Northern Railway of Canada, to enable the said company to change the gauge of its railway, and to provide for the release of the government lien on the road on certain conditions.' Objection having been taken that some of the provisions affected private interests and altered the powers of the company in very material points, the Speaker decided that the Bill ought to be withdrawn. Separate Bills were subsequently passed by the House—one relating to the government lien, was treated as a public Bill, and the other, relating to the gauge and capital, as a private Bill.

This Bill may require treatment of that kind. If anything in it required to be cut out as not being within the legitimate scope of a public Bill, that could be done by the committee. According to Bourinot, all local and private Acts passed in Canada previous to and for some years after 1840 contained a clause declaring that it should be deemed a public Act and should be judiciously taken notice of as such by the judges, justices of the peace, and other people, without being specially pleaded. From 1850 to 1860 the clause was shortened and it was simply enacted that it shall be deemed a public Act. Bourinot says further, that in the first session of the Dominion parliament it was enacted that every Act shall, except by express provision it is declared a private Act, be deemed a public Act and shall be judicially noted; and he says that consequently the public clause has been ever since omitted. The law and practice seems to be that unless there is a declaration in a private Act that it is such, then ever since confederation it is held to be a public measure. Under these circumstances, I would submit that this Bill might very well go to the committee, where it can be looked into, and if it is found to contain provisions that ought not be in a public Bill of this character, why of course the Bill can be dropped. I will be glad to have your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether the Bill can be permitted to be introduced or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no doubt that my hon. friend is attempting to amend a private Act, and he may be right in his contention that it is possible to amend a private Act by a public Act, and to dispense with the notices, advertisements, &c. But, of course it is impossible for Mr. Speaker or the House to know whether this private Act can be amended by a public Act unless the hon. gentleman places his Bill before us. He will therefore, I think, be serving his own case if he told us what is the nature and object of his Bill.

Mr. CONMEE. I desired before taking up the amending Bill to give the House information as to the circumstances and conditions which make this amendment necessary, if the public interest is to be protected. There was a joint arrangement for the development of the power by a dam from side to side of the Rainy river at Fort Frances, which is an international stream, and the works were commenced by order in council.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A joint arrangement between whom?

Mr. CONMEE. A joint bargain between Mr. Backus, of Minneapolis, and the corporation of the town of Fort Frances, which was under an agreement bearing date 17th February, 1904, made at their request by the provincial government. I regret to have to take up the time of the House, but I feel it necessary in the public interest that I should do so. The community of Fort Frances have in my opinion and in their opinion been placed in a very unfortunate position. Rights which they had as natural rights, rights which they had by contract, rights which are vital to their future prosperity are attempted to be taken from them, and to deprive them of the use of the water power at the present time, and not only of the utilization of the power from this joint development but also of the navigation of the river. Several lines of steamers ply on that stream across the Lake of the Woods, and in a stretch of 100 miles of navigation on the river there are what is known as the Long Sault rapids, over which vessels cannot be navigated in low water. The goods are transferred from below the rapids to above the rapids and the people living along the stream are accommodated in that way. On two occasions since these works were erected that traffic has been cut off, in one case for nearly ten days. A vessel could not navigate the river for the reason that the gates were shut down and while the water was rising in the Rainy lake there was no navigation at all below the works. The same thing occurred on another occasion but not for the same length of time. At Fort Frances there is a lock which was built by this government many years ago at considerable cost. That lock is not now in operation. Goods are brought below the falls and transferred to vessels above the falls and carried on up to Rainy lake. That traffic has been entirely checked for weeks at a time because of the lack of construction of slides although such construction was imposed upon this company by the order in council authorizing it to go on with the work, and by statute of this parliament, chap. 139. Still there is no redress. What Fort Frances is asking for is not that the privileges which the company enjoys be taken away, but that the conditions under which the company obtained its franchise, the obligations that were placed upon it by order in council, and the plans which the company submitted, be complied with. I have referred to the plans. It was my intention to bring them here and lay them on the table, but I have not got them at present. I shall however, lay them on the table later so that hon. gentlemen may see that the first plan showed an equal number of units of water to be vented on each side of the International boundary, assuming that boundary to be in the centre of the stream. Hon. gentlemen will likewise see by the second plan that there is not an equal number of units on each side, but that there are more on the American than on the Canadian side. They will see by the first plan that this lock, which was previously constructed, was to have a gate at its upper entrance so that at any time the public could use the lock for navigation without difficulty. But what happened? As will be seen by the second plan, which the minister refused to approve, the whole entrance to the lock has been blasted away. There have been three or four inlets made into it, the south wall of the lock has been entirely blasted away, and possession taken of that public property in such a way as to make it very expensive indeed to open it for navigation. I am not going to argue that it is not in the power of the government to force this company to remove the works I speak of, but what I do say is, that these people have gone on in a high handed manner, without authority and constructed works designed for the very purpose of forestalling the operation of that canal. They planned their works, they planned their power-house in such a way that it is evident to any one —and I am sure the engineers of the department must know it—that these works were planned deliberately for the very purpose of forestalling the use either of the canal or the power on the Canadian side. The agreement to which I refer, provided that there should be a power-house on each side of the international line and the development of an equal quantity of power—one half the flow of the stream to be delivered on the Canadian side for use in Canada. The Act which was passed in 1905 by this parliament contains the same principle because it provides that the power shall be used concurrently on both sides and that there shall not be more power available for use on the American than on the Canadian side at any time. Now, if good faith had been kept, the conditions which exist today at that point could not exist. What are these conditions? To-day there is 18,000 horse-power from that development being used for the purpose of operating pulp wood

grinder for the manufacture of paper on the American side, while there is not a single horse-power used on the Canadian side for any industrial purpose. I submit that that is not a concurrent development or use of the power such as parliament intended. I do not believe that parliament ever intended to give this company the right to permanently take a greater portion of the power to the American side than the half to which they are entitled. I am aware that under Sec. 16—I refer to the electrical exportation Act—there is power given to the Governor in Council to impose conditions and regulations and to stipulate not only with regard to the quantity of power that may be taken away for use in a foreign country but with regard to the power that shall be reserved for use in Canada. But I want to point out that that Act was passed three years after the agreement to which I have referred was entered into. I do not think it was the intention of parliament, in passing that Act to make it retroactive or take away the contractual rights of persons who had such rights previous to 1907. I refer to the order in council upon which this company got the right to proceed with its work, and I must say that this order in council is a very extraordinary document. It compels me to make a little further explanation. In 1905 when the company applied for incorporation to this parliament, the Bill that was introduced as Bill (No. 86); and if I may be permitted, I wish to read the Bill as introduced by the company, for I think that is necessary to a proper understanding of the present position:—

Whereas, the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited, has by its petition represented that it was incorporated by letters patent under the general seal of the province of Ontario, dated 13th January, 1905, under the Ontario Companies Act, being chapter 191 of the revised statutes of Ontario, 1897.

Whereas the said company has prayed that it be enacted as hereinafter set forth and it is expedient to grant the prayers of the said petition, therefore His Majesty by the authority and advice of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada enacts as follows:—

The works of the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited, hereinafter called the company, are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Section 2 refers to the capital stock of the company. The head office of the company is located in the city of Toronto. The provisional directors are to be the gentlemen named in section 4, as follow:

4. The provisional directors of the company shall be Edward Wellington Backus, of the city of Minneapolis, in the state of Minnesota, one of the United States, Robert Alexander Grant, and Alexander McKenzie, of the city of Toronto, and William Johnston and Thomas Bremner Rankin, of the city of Ottawa, in the province of Ontario.

Mr. CONMEE.

Then the company is given powers as follow:

5. The company may construct, develop, acquire, own, use and operate water-powers on the Rainy river at or near the town of Fort Francis, in the district of Rainy River, in the province of Ontario, and construct, develop, operate and maintain works, canals, raceways, water-courses, dams, piers, booms, dykes, sluices, conduits and buildings, in connection with the said powers: provided that no work authorized by this section shall be commenced until the plans thereof have first been submitted to and approved of by the Governor in Council.

I have already referred to the fact that the works were carried out quite irrespective of the plans that were approved.

6. The company may—

(a) acquire by lease, purchase or otherwise and maintain, utilize and develop water-powers and other powers for the production of electricity and of electric, pneumatic, hydraulic and other power or force for any purpose for which electricity or power can be used;

(b) construct or acquire by lease, purchase or otherwise and maintain and operate works and appliances for the production of electricity and of electric, pneumatic, hydraulic or other power or force, and lines of wire, poles, tunnels, conduits, conductors, motors, devices, works and appliances for the sale, distribution, delivery and transmission under or above ground of electricity and electric, pneumatic, hydraulic or other power or force, and therewith convey, conduct, furnish or receive such electricity, current, power or force to or from any place through, over or under any lands or waters;

(c) acquire by lease, purchase or otherwise electricity, electric, pneumatic, hydraulic or other current, power or force, and store, use, supply, furnish, distribute, sell, lease or otherwise dispose thereof, as well as electricity, power or force produced by the company;

(d) construct or acquire by lease, purchase or otherwise, and operate in connection with the works, lines and business of the company and for the purposes thereof, lines of telegraph or telephone or other works and means of communication;

(e) carry on the business of manufacturing pulp-wood, pulp and paper, and other businesses incident thereto, and also the business of general merchants and manufacturers;

(f) erect, acquire and operate, saw mills, factories, elevators, flour mills, woollen mills and pulp and paper mills, and buy, deal in and dispose of the products of the said mills and factories, and acquire materials of all kinds for the manufacture of such products;

(g) aid by way of bonus, loan, guarantee or otherwise any industry or enterprise using or agreeing to use power supplied by the company or supplying or agreeing to supply to the company, and acquire stock, securities or obligations of any corporation carrying on or having power to carry on any such industry or enterprise, and act as agent or manager of any such industry, enterprise or corporation;

(h) make agreements with any power company having powers similar to those of the

company, for the purchase of the rights, powers, franchises, assets, property, business and undertakings of such other company, and for the assumption and payment by the company of the whole or parts of the contracts, obligations and liabilities of such other company; provided that such agreement shall not be entered into unless it has been first approved of by the votes of two-thirds of the shareholders of the company present or represented by proxy at a special general meeting of the company called for considering such agreement, and provided that the rights of creditors of such other company and of all persons having any claims or demands against such company, or any lien, charge, or security upon any of its properties or assets shall not be prejudiced by the said agreement;

(i) issue as paid-up and non-assessable stock shares in the company as consideration for any such purchase, or in payment of any contract, franchise, property, undertaking, privilege, right or power which may be assigned or transferred to it or which it may acquire, or to be engineers or contractors, or for rights of way, material, plant, buildings or lands or the construction or equipment of the works or any part thereof, or for services rendered in placing or assisting to place or guaranteeing the placing of any of the shares or other securities of the company, or in or about the promotion of the company or the conduct of its business;

(j) acquire and hold all the rights, powers, privileges, franchises, benefits, water-powers, contracts or other property under a certain agreement dated the ninth day of January, one thousand nine hundred and five, between His Majesty the King, represented by the Honourable the Commissioner of Crown Lands for the province of Ontario, of the one part, and the said Edward Wellington Backus and his associates of the other part, and may assume the obligations, liabilities, conditions and undertakings by the said agreement assumed by the said Edward Wellington Backus.

7. The directors may enter into an agreement for amalgamation and for the consolidation of the capital stock, franchises and powers of the company with any other company having like objects and powers and incorporated under the laws of the state of Minnesota, or under the laws of the United States on such terms and conditions in such manner, under such name, with such capital, and with such powers, not inconsistent with the laws of Canada, and with such board of directors as shall be provided in the agreement for such amalgamation:

Provided, however, that no such agreement shall be valid or binding unless and until it has been submitted to and approved of by two-thirds in value of the shareholders of the company present or represented by proxy at a special general meeting called for the purpose of considering such agreement, and of which meeting, and the purpose for which it is called, one month's notice shall be given in the 'Canada Gazette' and in one newspaper published in the city of Toronto, and in one newspaper published in the city of Minneapolis, in the state of Minnesota, in the United States.

8. Upon the said agreement being so approved of, a copy thereof under the seals of the companies, parties thereto, shall be deposited in the office of the Secretary of State for Canada, and a copy so sealed shall be deposited in the office of the Secretary of State of Minnesota, and notice of the said deposit shall be given by the secretary of the company in the 'Canada Gazette,' and the amalgamation shall thereupon become complete, and the amalgamated companies shall have, possess and enjoy all the powers, rights and franchises which, before said amalgamation, were held, possessed and enjoyed by each of the said companies, including the powers herein granted.

9. If authorized by a by-law sanctioned by a vote of not less than two-thirds in value of the subscribed stock of the company represented at a general meeting duly called for considering such by-law, the directors may from time to time:

(a) borrow money on the credit of the company.

(b) limit or increase the amount to be borrowed.

(c) issue bonds, debentures or other securities of the company, and pledge or sell them for such sums as are deemed expedient, but no such bonds, debentures or other securities shall be for a less sum than one hundred dollars each.

10. Lands actually required for the construction, maintenance or operation of the works mentioned in section 2 hereof may be taken and acquired as soon as the plans of such works and lands have been approved of by the Governor in Council, and all the provisions of The Railway Act, 1903, which are applicable to the taking and using of lands shall, so far as they are applicable thereto, apply as if such provisions were included in this Act, and all the provisions of The Railway Act, 1903, which are applicable shall, in like manner, apply to the valuation and payment of the compensation for, or damages to, lands arising out of such acquisition, or the construction, maintenance or operation of the works and undertaking of the company or the exercise of any of the powers of the company.

11. If the construction of the works hereby authorized are not commenced within two years and completed within six years after the date when the said plans are approved of by the Governor in Council and the proper authorities of the state of Minnesota or of the United States, then all the powers conferred upon the company by this Act shall cease and determine.

12. Section 195 of The Railway Act, 1903, shall apply to the works and undertaking of the company.

This Bill was sought to be obtained by this company, and it will be observed that it provides complete machinery for relieving the company from every obligation into which it had entered in its agreement with the provincial authorities and the municipalities. Having obtained an agreement with the consent of the corporation of Fort Francis, which corporation closed certain streets and conveyed

certain lands and water rights for the purpose of facilitating this development, having got all it could get from the corporation, all it could get from the provincial authorities, then it comes down here and asks for these sweeping clauses to enable it to amalgamate with any company incorporated in the United States, and after the amalgamation was carried out to exercise not the powers imposed upon it by the parliament of Canada or by the agreements into which it had entered, but the powers of the company with which it had amalgamated. I do not wish to dwell upon the ridiculous character of these clauses. To make doubly sure of its position and to shut out the provincial authorities the works were to be declared works for the general advantage of Canada.

Strange to say this Bill passed the House of Commons for the reason that it was introduced in the name of a member who knew nothing of the local conditions or of the hardships and wrongs that the enactment of such a measure would have imposed upon the community at Fort Frances. That occurred because of the deception that was used in connection with the Bill. I have read a clause purporting to legalize in this Bill the agreement of the 9th of January, 1905. That agreement was obtained by misrepresentation, I shall not use any stronger language just now, but it was obtained behind the back of Fort Frances and without their knowledge. In the advertisement which they published in the Fort Frances paper asking for this Bill they did not mention that agreement. They made reference to an agreement without giving its date. Fort Frances having the year previously made an agreement, having no knowledge of any second agreement made behind their back, were not on their guard and were not alarmed. While this Bill was in the Senate, after Fort Frances became aware of its existence and of the existence of the agreement secretly obtained, the council of Fort Frances entered a strong protest and the question of the legalization of that agreement and of the company obtaining the sweeping powers asked for, came before a committee of the Senate. This Bill which I have just read, was refused to the company and instead chapter 139 was worked out and came back to this House for ratification. In the order in council reference is made to that agreement of the 9th of January, 1905 Notwithstanding that parliament had refused the company the ratification of that agreement because of the exposure made of the clandestine manner in which it was obtained, the order in council which is a most extraordinary document revamps it.

I do not know that this gives it any force but it is, to my mind, a very strange proceeding ; all the more so because I took the precaution to interview the then Minister of Public Works, not only to interview him, but to hand to him a written memorandum with regard to the position of Fort Frances, the manner in which that agreement was obtained, and the necessity of embodying in any order in council that might be granted for the development of this power, conditions that would protect the community at Fort Frances. Notwithstanding that the order in council was issued, and, in my humble judgment, the minister did not take the view that I think he should have taken with regard to it. This is a report quoting portions of the order in council :

The minister further states that on the 9th of January, 1905, the said Edward Wellington Backus made with the government of the province of Ontario a certain agreement whereby the applicants obtained from the government of the said province a grant in fee of lands and power on the Canadian side of the international Boundary for the purpose of developing the water-power there and utilizing storage facilities with a view of creating a large amount of power for the operation of mills and other manufacturing establishments, the consideration of such acquisition being stated in the agreement at $5,000; the agreement in question containing several conditions as regards the character and dimensions of the works, the raising and maintaining of the waters of Rainy lake; the use or non-use of flash-boards, the construction of power houses, the expenditure of $50,000 on the works within nine months from the date of the agreement, the delivery of power to the town of Fort Frances after the 1st January, 1907, for municipal purposes and for public utilities; the operation and delivery of said power; the rate at which it shall be furnished; the intervention of the Lieutenant Governor in Council concerning the price of the power or energy to be created, and several other agreements of different kinds always bearing upon the delivery and price of the energy to be manufactured out of the works approved by the agreement. That the agreement also in clause 14 thereby reserves and excepts all the rights of the Dominion of Canada in navigation and in the improvement thereof by the construction of locks, dams, canals and otherwise. The government of the Dominion or the province of Ontario to have the power to enter upon the premises and maintain and repair such canals, locks, dams, or other works for the improvement of navigation without compensation. It is also agreed that no sawdust, chemical or other refuse of any kind shall be placed or deposited in the river.

The order in council is a lengthy document, and I do not wish to read it, but it contains this clause :

No work so authorized shall be commenced until plans thereof shall have been submitted to and approved by the Governor General in Council. The Act in question contains several clauses——

This has reference to chapter 139 ·

——referring to the production of power or electrical energy, the delivery thereof, the construction of power-houses, &c.

So that, while I do not wish to weary the House with too long quotations from this document it will be seen that permission to go on with the work was granted subject to certain conditions.

That the permission be granted subject to the conditions inserted in the agreement between the government of the province of Ontario and the applicants and also subject to all the conditions and reservations expressed in the Act of parliament passed at its last session respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.

That no work will be done under the permission to be given to the company which will in any way interfere with the lock, canal, or other works of a public nature already executed at Fort Frances by the government of Canada, nor will any bridge or any other erection or construction of any nature whatsoever on, over or across the said lock, canal, or other works, be built, nor generally shall any use be made thereof except by permission in writing to that effect by the Minister of Public Works.

Now, I submit that this work has gone on quite irrespective of this provision. No such permission for the works to be erected has ever been obtained, and I have already pointed out the very damaging nature of the work. The reason for the application for this public Bill on behalf of Fort Frances may be given in this way. First, the town obtained an agreement to which they consented, and which was made on their behalf. Perhaps I may be permitted just to read the preamble of the agreement in order to show that my statement is fully borne out by the document itself.

Whereas the Rainy river is the district of Rainy river forms an International boundary between the province of Ontario in the Dominion of Canada and the state of Minnesota, one of the United States of America, which said river in the neighbourhood of the town of Fort Frances forms a valuable and extensive water-power;

And whereas the municipal council of the town of Fort Frances and the municipal council of the township of McIrvine and the residents of the said town and township have at various times petitioned the government to develop or procure the development of the said water-power, so that the same might be utilized for municipal purposes and for manufacturing and milling in the said municipalities thereby assisting in the development of the said municipalities and of the surrounding districts;

And whereas application has been made by the purchasers for a grant in fee of such lands adjacent to the said river, and of such lands covered by the said river, and of such privileges as are necessary to enable the purchasers to develop the said water-power, and to render the same available for municipal manufacturing and milling purposes;

And whereas the said water-power can be more advantageously developed, and more power produced, by works embracing the entire width of the river, and dealing with it as a whole, than by an independent development on the Canadian side of the International boundary, and it is therefore in the public interest to adopt such plans of development;

And whereas the purchasers are the owners in fee simple of the lands and water-power on the Minnesota side of the International boundary opposite the said town of Fort Frances, and are desirous of obtaining from the government of the province of Ontario a grant in fee of the lands and power on the Canadian side of the International boundary, for the purpose of developing the water-power to the full capacity of the stream from side to side at high water mark, and of utilizing such storage facilities as may be available for maintaining the river at such high water mark, thereby rendering available a large amount of power on the Canadian side of the river, for municipal purposes and for the operation of pulp and paper mills, flour or grist mills and other manufacturing establishments;

And whereas it is necessary in order to carry out such a scheme of development, that the purchasers should be permitted to construct a storage dam at the outlet of Lake Namekan, at or near Kettle Falls, on the international boundary and to set apart sufficient lands for the construction and maintenance of the said dam, and that they should also, if necessary, be in a position to create storage reservoirs on upper and lower Manitou lake and big Turtle lake under conditions satisfactory to the government by the construction of the necessary dams for that purpose, with the view of maintaining a more regular and uniform flow of water over the falls at Fort Frances, by reinforcing the waters of Rainy lake;

And whereas the construction of the said dams and the maintenance of the waters of Rainy lake at a higher level during the low water period will be of great advantage to navigation;

And whereas it is expedient and desirable, in the interests of the town of Fort Frances, of the said township of McIrvine and of the public generally, that the said water-power be speedily developed to its full capacity and that an agreement be entered into to that end, upon the terms and subject to the conditions and stipulations herein contained;

And whereas the purchasers propose to form a joint stock company under the provisions of the Ontario Companies Act, for the purpose of acquiring this agreement and all the benefits and advantages appertaining thereto, and of assuming the obligations hereby incurred by the purchaser, and of carrying on the development and operation of the said water-power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly clear that at the request of, and on behalf of Fort Frances this agreement was entered into, and for the very purpose of creating water-power to be used in Canada for the operation of pulp and paper mills. I may now be permitted to state what has happened. I hold in my hand a series of questions that were asked of the company

by the Department of Inland Revenue which has the administration of the expropriation of electricity. Before granting the request of the company for a license, that department, as was quite proper, desired to know from the company how much power they would deliver on the Canadian side, when they would deliver it, and at what price, and on what conditions the Canadian consumer could get it. It was a well known fact that the company had refused to give to any Canadian either mechanical or hydraulic power which could be used for the manufacture of pulp, and the following question was put to the company.

5. As one of the main natural products on the Canadian side of the river is pulp-wood, state whether the company or those associated with the company in the manufacture of paper purpose manufacturing pulp-wood into pulp or pulp into paper on the Ontario side of the river as well as on the Minnesota side of the river, and if so, when?

The answer to that was :

The company propose to install a pulp mill on the Canadian side as soon as a pulp-wood concession is granted by the provincial government, which was promised to the company by the late Ross government. The company also propose to erect paper mills on the Canadian side as soon as a pulp concession is secured of sufficient capacity to supply the western Canadian demand.

The impertinence of that answer must be quite apparent to everybody. The Department of Inland Revenue asked the very plain question, if they intended to erect such works in Ontario, and the answer of the company is : We do if the Ontario government—a government over which this federal government has no control—will give us a pulp concession such as we ask, and we think sufficient to supply the Canadian demand. Now, it was well known at that time that the present government of Ontario had refused to give them or anybody else a pulpwood concession. The policy of the present government in Ontario was, not to give these pulp concessions subject to certain works being erected as had formerly been done but to put them up at public auction, and those who wanted them could bid on them. The writer of that answer knew perfectly well that there was no possibility of him getting that concession, and I, therefore, say that the answer was extremely impertinent under the circumstances. With regard to concessions, I can speak with knowledge of these early conditions because at that time I represented the community at Fort Frances in the local legislature, and I know the facts. It is true the Ross government did offer this gentleman a concession in 1882 or 1883, but it is also true that he refused to take it. Why? It is very easy to explain why. In the first place, he at that time regarded himself, and his associates as the possessors of the only available water-power on the watershed of Rainy Lake, and his words to me were : What advantages would a concession be ; we are obligated to do certain things if we accept, we control the price of wood, nobody else can enter into it, we have the only water-power in the district. But, Sir, we all live to learn, and this gentleman learned something later on because it transpired later on that the government of Canada proposed to build a lock at what is known as the Long Sault rapids of the Rainy river in order to improve navigation there. The construction of that lock would involve the building of a dam which would create a considerable water-power, and that might enter into competition with this company. Therefore, we had a revival of the application to get the pulp concession, and other difficulties interposed to prevent the use of the power on the Canadian side. Now, I will just refer to one more question, question 6 :

If question 5 is answered in the negative, please state whether the use of the grinding room in the Canadian power-house for grinding pulp direct, so as to make the manufacture of pulp by an independent Canadian concern feasible, could be obtained by any Canadian manufacturer desirous of embarking in such an industry, and under what terms and conditions?

Now, that is a very plain question. Here is the answer:

This would not be practicable, as the company would not allow outsiders to use its power-house. Therefore, in that case the grinders would have to be driven electrically.

That means simply a refusal, because there is no such thing, in a situation such as exists at Fort Frances, of operating pulpwood grinders by electricity. You have to transform the mechanical power into electric current, then it has to be stepped down, and motors have to be applied, so that the machinery is doubled and the cost is practically doubled. Every manufacturer will understand, without any argument, that that means shutting out any competition whatever with the American company.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman not think that he is discussing the merits of the Bill rather than following the custom on the first reading, of simply explaining the provisions of the Bill?

Mr. CONMEE. I will endeavour to comply with the views just expressed. I considered it necessary to make some preliminary remarks as to the conditions that justified the introduction of this as a public Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is not the time to give those reasons. They may be given on the second reading, but not at this time.

Mr. CONMEE. If I had a guarantee that the Bill would reach the second reading, I would be satisfied. Well, to come to the Bill, it proposes to amend chapter 139 of the statutes of 1905, as follow:

Chapter 139 of the Statutes of 1905 is amended by adding after the word 'council' in the last line of section 1 thereof the following: Provided further that the company shall from time to time, if directed by any authority having jurisdiction herein, provide further plans and execute any additional works, alterations or changes, and carry out any new work or works required; or if, upon any application of the town of Fort Frances or otherwise, it shall appear that the company has heretofore constructed, or that the company does at any time hereafter construct or erect any work not approved, the company shall, if directed by any order or ruling, provide plans showing such alterations, changes, additions and new works as may be required by any order or ruling made in pursuance of any such application, and, if so directed by any such order or ruling, execute, perform and carry out all works necessary or required, including the removal of any unauthorized works, if ordered to be removed, and shall, in the execution of such alterations, changes, removals, additions and new works, give full effect to any such approved plans, and also to the provision of any such order or ruling, not only in regard to the execution of the works or any of them, or other matter incidental thereto, but also in regard to the flow of water for navigation over or through the works of the company, and for the passage of logs and timber, and for the operation of the canal on the Canadian side, the supply of hydraulic power and electrical energy and the regulation of the methods and conditions under which such power and electrical energy shall be furnished to Canadian users, as well as the prices which the company may charge such users for such units of power or electrical energy provided for in the said order or ruling.

There are a number of amendments similar to this, none of which change the position of the company under chapter 139, These I submit are matters of public concern and not of a private character. It is not necessarily the duty of a private member to have to undertake an amendment of this kind, but I have introduced it at the request of the community of Fort Frances, who feel that their interests are vitally involved, and who feel that they ought to get protection at the hands of parliament—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will confine himself to an explanation of the main provisions of the Bill. The merits are discussed on the second reading.

Mr. CONMEE. I cannot do that unless I make reference to the laws which it is proposed to amend.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is easy for the hon. gentleman to explain exactly the chief provisions of the Bill.

Mr. CONMEE. I have read some of the sections which cover the purport of the Bill as to the regulation and protection of the public interests in regard to the navigation of the river and as to the works of this company in so far as they affect the public interests. There is another section of the Bill which provides, along the lines of the existing statute, that one-half the total power of the stream created by the works shall be delivered for use on the Canadian side, and that the conditions and prices under which such power may be used shall be regulated either by the Governor in Council or the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. Either would be acceptable, and that the power shall be supplied either in the form of mechanical power or electrical energy. I submit that parliament never intended to permit these gentlemen to dictate to Canadian users of power in what form they should use it, the Canadian interests are as great in this matter as are the interests of these American gentlemen. The Ontario and Minnesota company immediately transferred all its rights and interests to an American company incorporated under the laws of the state of Maine, which company is not registered in Canada and has no place of business in Canada. It is that company which is to-day in possession of, and operating these works, and while that company takes all the benefits of the Canadian company, and use the latter as a sort of conduit pipe through which to get favours, it refuses to carry out the obligations imposed by this parliament upon the Canadian company. The object of my amendment is to make it clear that the law may be invoked to compel these gentlemen to carry out their obligation in good faith.

There is another section of the Bill to which I might refer. Every one will admit that I have adduced sufficient evidence to show that there was to be an equal division of this power. While the town of Fort Francis finds no fault with this company getting its full half of the power of the stream or even more until the power is needed on the Canadian side, what we do say is that we want our position defined and have it definitely decided whether we are entitled to an equal portion of the power. This company says the Canadians are only entitled to one-quarter.

Mr. BRODER. How many horse-power are involved?

Mr. CONMEE. About 36,000 horse-power. That is the estimate of this company, but in my humble opinion there can be developed there and utilized 50,000 horse-power. Another clause of this Bill simply provides that the Act of parliament passed by this House in 1905, in which it was said there should be concurrent development and use of the power, be made as was the

evident intention to provide for an equal division of the total power of the stream—and not a division of the Canadian portion of it—and that that principle be carried out and that there shall be a clear declaration that Canadian interests are entitled to one-half of the total power of the stream and entitled to use it under conditions which will admit of its practical use, and that they are not to be denied the right to use mechanical or hydraulic power if it be their interest to do so. They are not to be shut out of the only industry which is natural to their position and for which they have the raw material, namely, the manufacture of pulp and paper.

I submit that these are all matters of a public nature. Although the Bill is said to be a Bill relating to the Ontario and Minneapolis Power Company—I refer now to chapter 139—I submit it is a public Bill. I have read the Bill that company introduced, hon. gentleman can look at it, it will appear in 'Hansard', and then look at chapter 139 and see that it is a very different Bill. Parliament imposed conditions for the purpose of safeguarding Canadian interests in this water-power, and therefore, whatever may be the title of the Bill, it is in every sense of the word a public Bill, and I submit that this amendment ought to go at least to a committee so that the community at Fort Frances, which has now for ten years been subjected to the very great hardship of sending lawyers and deputations a thousand miles from time to time to protect its interests, may have justice done it by this parliament. If by any technical ruling this measure might be shut out, I hope that there is no member in this House who would take, under these circumstances, a technical objection, and I ask that the measure be allowed its first reading and sent to a committee where it can be threshed out. If any of the provisions of the Bill affect injuriously the private rights of the company, the committee will not tolerate it, and no such measure can pass; but I submit it is a fair measure for removing doubts and difficulties which are due to hasty legislation passed in the manner I have described. One of the clauses of the Act, chapter 139, provides that the Railway Board of Canada may fix prices and conditions and that application may be made to that board by any applicant for power or by the town of Fort Frances. I submit that every layman would understand by that language that the town of Fort Frances was given the statutory right to make application to the Railway Board to have the prices and the conditions fixed in order that the town might be able to say to manufacturers: Here is the power which you can have at such prices and under such conditions. But I am told that the town of Fort Francis has been advised that, notwithstanding that language, it is doubtful if it could succeed on such an application. The reason given is that under the municipal law it could not apply for power for general purposes. As a town it could apply for power for municipal purposes, but when they go outside of that they might be met with difficulty. That is the difficulty raised by the lawyers. I do not know if it be good law or not, but I do know there is sufficient in it to put that small community against this powerful company in a contest in the courts, that it would take six or seven years to determine their rights and they have not the financial ability to do this. Under all the circumstances it seems to me there should be conscience enough in the House of Commons to grant this community some relief from the very perilous condition in which their interests have been placed.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not hear the objection to the first reading of the Bill, but it seems to me that the gravamen of it must be that this is a Bill proposing to amend a private Act. Now, private Bills, including Bills to amend private legislation, require certain notice to be given to the public. Such a Bill must be introduced by petition, but a public Bill may be introduced simply on two days notice in this House. In this case, the public have no notice of what this Bill purports to do, nor have the holders of rights under this private legislation any such notice as is provided for by the rules of this House. It seems to me that this is wrong. I say nothing at present about the desirability of amending the law referred to, or securing the rights of Rainy river; it is simply a question of observing the rules of the House in giving notice of legislation of this kind. There must be, I take it, vested rights grown up under the Act of incorporation, and this proposed Bill would affect such rights.

Mr. CONMEE. If I may be permitted to answer the hon. member: I do not think he was in his place at the opening of my remarks.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not.

Mr. CONMEE. I showed that, under sec. 18 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, of 1906, all Bills are public Bills,—that section states so in so many words; I do not need to read it again. And I showed by quotations from Bourinot what the practice of this House has been. A number of public Bills amending private Acts have been passed in this House. I do not know that I have prepared myself fully for an argument on the rules of parliament in that respect, but, so far as I have been able to examine—and I have consulted some of the gentlemen who are in charge of the

committees, and who have had a good deal of experience—the opinion seems to be that the procedure is quite regular. And, so far as notice is concerned, I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), that notice of this question has been before the public for years. The newspapers of Fort Frances are full of it; the company has had written notice,—I saw to it myself that they should know exactly what was done. And there is lots of time for anything of that kind. This Bill will have to go to committee, and it will be some time before it reaches the House again. No one will be taken by surprise, and no interest can possibly be prejudiced for want of all the notice necessary.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee), has quite appreciated the objection made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). If he has, I think that I personally should interpose here. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee), if there is any merit in his Bill, is seeking to amend a private Act. The hon. gentleman cannot evade the rules of the House, and introduce what is, in fact, a private Bill, of which notice should be given, by merely declaring it a public Bill. If this were introduced as a private Bill, notice in the form which is well known, would have to be given to the public so that those interested would have a chance to be heard. These rules are made for a purpose, and are always carried out, for our procedure in relation to private Bills is different from that in relation to public Bills.

Mr. SPROULE. And there are fees to be paid.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, there are fees to be paid and all sorts of things to be done in the case of a private Bill. It seems to me that the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), is trifling with the intelligence of this House in taking up time with this matter. I think the whole thing is out of order, because it must be apparent to you, Mr. Speaker, as to every member of the House, that the hon. gentleman is introducing what is really private legislation, and ought to be introduced in accordance with the rules applying to legislation of that kind. He had no right to introduce it as he did and call it a public Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I pointed out to my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee), that the purpose disclosed by the notice which he gave, and which appears on the order paper is to introduce 'an Act to amend chapter 139, 4 and 5, Edward VII., intituled an Act respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.' The Act to be amended is undoubtedly a private Act. It is quite true that all Acts passed by this parliament are public Acts; but it is equally true also that there are two categories of public Acts, one known as private Acts, to be introduced in this House in accordance with certain rules, and not to be amended except in the same manner. My hon. friend (Mr. Conmee), has quoted some authorities which go to show that private Acts may be amended by public Bills in some matters which are not essential, which are not part of the parliamentary contract,—for a private Act is a parliamentary contract and is to be amended only under the rules which have been provided by parliament for the security of private parties. My own impression, at first blush, is that the Bill proposed by my hon. friend certainly interferes with the corporate powers of a private company and is, therefore, to be introduced only in accordance with the rules relating to private legislation. But, if I may be permitted, I would suggest that the Bill be read the first time, and the question whether it is a private Bill or not, should be settled by you, Mr. Speaker, before the next reading.

Mr. LANCASTER. If I am in order: I would point out that it would, I fear, be trifling with the rules of the House to let the Bill go in that way. I think that the first reading should stand for the consideration which the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), proposes. We should be stultifying ourselves to let the first reading go through when the rules declare that it should not go through. I think the point ought to be decided.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is for Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am prepared to say now that my impression is, after hearing the explanation of the hon. gentleman and reading the provisions concerning the company, that this is purely a private Bill, and so comes under Rules 88, 89 and so on and must be introduced by petition, the fees paid and the other formalities that are provided for, observed. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee), wishes a more elaborate opinion, I will be able to give it tomorrow, setting forth the definition of private Bills, the precedents and so on. In the meantime, I may briefly quote Bourinot:

> Private Bills are distinguished from public Bills in that they directly relate to the affairs of private individuals or of corporate bodies, and not to matters of public policy or to the community in general. They must pass through the same stages as public Bills, but, at the same time, must originate by petition and be subject to certain special standing orders in both Houses of parliament.

There can be no doubt that this Bill merely relates to the community residing

in Fort Frances and its immediate vicinity, and not to the community generally. In another place, Bourinot describes this class of Bill:

Bills from the corporation of towns and municipal bodies, generally, are always treated as private Bills when they desire special legislation affecting their proper interests.

This is such a case, I submit, and therefore I cannot allow the Bill to be introduced. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee), will have to comply with the rule of the House. I will give a more elaborate opinion to-morrow if necessary.

Motion ruled out of order.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. OLIVER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 107) to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: This Bill is a very short amendment. It relates to the disposition of schools lands. As these sections stand in the Act at present they provide only for the sale of school lands. In practice it is frequently found desirable that school lands should be leased for various purposes, such as grazing rights, mineral rights, or timber rights. There is no specific authority in the Act now to permit leasing and while in practice we have granted leases it is thought it would be right and proper that the practice should be sanctioned by an amendment to the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What advances have been made since the 1st of July, 1905, to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners?
2. What rate of interest has been imposed on these loans?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. $543,748.16.
2. 4 per cent, but no amount of interest has been received on account thereof.

MR. FERDINAND ROY.

Mr. MONK:

1. Is Mr. Ferdinand Roy, of St. Lazare, county of Bellechasse, employed by the government or by the Transcontinental Company?
2. If so, what is the date of his appointment, what is his monthly or yearly salary, and what is the nature of the services he renders to the government?
3. Has he made any reports to the government or to the company since his appointment? If so, how many reports has he made, and are they in writing?
4. What amounts has he received from the government since his appointment?

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Mr. Ferdinand Roy is not employed by the Department of Railways and Canals, nor the Transcontinental Railway Commission.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

OTTLECOCK DAM.

Mr. CROCKET:

1. Did the Department of Public Works authorize the construction during the year 1910 of a dam and wing on the Ottlecock stream in the county of Victoria, New Brunswick?
2. If so, at whose request was said work undertaken, what was the object thereof, and what was the cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 1 and 2. No.

COTEAU LANDING BREAKWATER.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Has the government decided to construct a breakwater at Coteau Landing? If so, what amount is appropriated for this purpose?
2. Will the work be done by contract or by the department? If by contract, is it granted at the present time, and what is the name of the contractor?
3. Has the government considered whether the construction of a new sluice would not be preferable and less expensive?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes. An amount has been placed in the parliamentary estimates for the present session of 1910-11 for that purpose.
2. (a) Tenders will be called for in the usual way for the principal part of the work, which will be let by contract. (b) No. (c) None.
3. The engineers have considered all the circumstances, and have decided that the construction of a breakwater will be the most satisfactory solution of the problem.

Mr. BOYER:

Since when has the project of constructing a breakwater at Coteau Landing been under consideration?

Mr. GRAHAM. For several years past.

SOULANGES CANAL DAMAGES.

Mr. BOYER:

1. Is there a claim before the Department of Railways and Canals on the part of Mr. Denis Martin and others residing near the Soulanges canal for damages sustained?
2. In what years are these claims dated?
3. Does the government intend to reply to them shortly in one way or another?

4. What are the causes, which have up till now, delayed the solution of this matter?

5. The government having already replied to one of those interested that it could do nothing before having a report of the engineers charged to make a hydrographical or topographical plan, is this work finished and when did it commence?

6. Could not the department have a partial report of the plan relating to the persons claiming damages in order to take more speedy action in one way or another?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.
2. 1905.
3. Yes; as soon as the necessary reports from the engineers can be obtained.
4. The necessity of making certain surveys, &c., in connection with the water sheds.
5. The report of the engineers have not as yet been received by the department. This work commenced in 1908.
6. It is necessary that certain observations be made during the spring freshet before any action can be taken.

SARDINE CANNERIES.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. How many canneries are there in Canada in which sardines preserved in oil are put up, where are they located, and how many persons are employed in each?

2. How many cans of sardines, preserved in oil, were put up by each of said canneries during the last year, and what was the value of the pack of each cannery?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Four. Black Harbour, Charlotte county, employs 100 persons. Letang, Charlotte county, employs 80 persons. Fair Haven, Charlotte county, employs 40 persons. Leonardville, Charlotte county, employs 25 persons.

2. Black Harbour, 3,000,000 cans, value, $97,500; Letang, 950,000 cans, value $30,875; Fair Haven, 550,000 cans, value $17,875; Leonardville, 250,000 cans, value $8,125.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY TELEGRAPHERS CONCILIATION BOARD.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Under what statute and what section of statute was the Board of Conciliation granted to the telegraphers on the Intercolonial railway which is now sitting?

Mr. KING:

Under section 6 of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, the Crown consenting to take advantage of the Act, though not specially named in it.

TRADE WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. MACDONALD.

1. What is the total value of exports to Newfoundland from 1900 to 1910, inclusive, in each year?

2. What is the total value of imports from Newfoundland during each year of said period inclusive?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The total value of exports from Canada to Newfoundland during the fiscal years from 1900 to 1910, inclusive, was as follows:

1900	$2,144,070
1901	2,257,399
1902	2,373,445
1903	2,510,926
1904	2,898,690
1905	3,473,598
1906	3,213,609
1907 (9 months	2,244,469
1908	3,408,518
1909	3,552,293
1910	3,970,952

2. The total value of imports into Canada from Newfoundland during the fiscal years from 1900 to 1910, inclusive, was as follows:

1900	$ 660,678
1901	625,610
1902	1,118,567
1903	1,197,372
1904	1,076,757
1905	1,059,417
1906	1,758,807
1907 (9 months)	1,464,582
1908	1,777,659
1909	1,639,230
1910	1,468,099

TRADE WITH WEST INDIES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What was the value of the exports to the various British islands in the West Indies during the years 1907, 1908, 1909 and 1910?

2. What articles formed the largest item in these exports, with their values in said years?

3. What was the value of the imports from the said islands during said years?

4. What articles formed the largest items in these imports, with their values in these years?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The total value of exports to British West Indies during the fiscal years from 1907 to 1910, inclusive, was as follows:

1907 (9 months)	$1,799,426
1908	2,483,118
1909	2,549,043
1910	3,109,825

2. The principal articles of exports to British West Indies, with their values in said years, were as follows:

—	1907. (9 months.)	1908.	1909.	1910.
	$	$	$	$
Codfish, dry salted	681,711	859,138	870,545	840,615
Herrings, pickled	130,018	136,076	156,241	132,403
Mackerel, pickled	47,776	57,374	64,796	90,593
Herrings, smoked	15,703	24,624	21,282	38,882
Sea fish, other, pickled	24,399	35,684	37,255	47,873
Planks and boards	162,587	190,384	118,614	156,647
Butter	59,313	85,371	103,194	83,846
Pease, split	66,769	64,355	82,852	63,806
Flour of wheat	175,527	334,948	319,433	930,339
Potatoes	34,019	44,433	55,663	49,939
Total	1,397,822	1,832,387	1,829,875	2,434,943

3. The total value of imports into Canada from British West Indies during the fiscal years 1907 to 1910, inclusive, was as follows:

1907 (9 months)..... $2,174,392
1908 7,211,801
1909 7,387,056
1910 5,448,199

4. The principal articles of import from British West Indies, with their values, in said years were as follows:

—	1907. 9 mos.	1908.	1909.	1910.
	$	$	$	$
Sugar	1,421,295	5,839,279	6,201,128	3,572,112
Molasses	335,543	929,433	362,799	1,413,960
Bananas	89,417	17,400	18,360	139,259
Total	1,846,255	6,786,112	6,582,287	5,125,331

HOMESTEAD REGULATIONS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster) moved:

For a return showing all applications for homestead or pre-emption in the railway belt in the district of New Westminster, with names of applicants, and description of proposed locations pending at the time of the recent suspension of the regulations governing the disposal of these lands; also any order or orders in council by virtue of which these regulations have stood suspended during 1910.

He said: While this motion as offered refers only to the riding of New Westminster, the conditions there indicated are common throughout the whole railway belt in British Columbia and have constituted during the past year a very serious grievance to persons who have approached British Columbia with a view to taking up residence there. I may say that in no other year since confederation have there been so many persons looking towards British Columbia as a place of future residence, and yet we find that in this year, the year of all others when the Department of the Interior and its officers should have been alert in guiding applicants for location in British Columbia towards the land there, the railway belt has been completely locked up without any warrant whatever in law, as I say, after diligent inquiry made of the Department of the Interior. We find the origin of the trouble to be in a new set of regulations sprung upon the public early in the spring without any notification whatever even to the agents of the department in British Columbia that anything of the kind was in contemplation. The result of these new regulations if they had gone into effect would have been to kill every one of the hundreds of applications sent into the department for locations in that province. However, at the time set for these regulations to go into effect an order in council was passed suspending their operation until a time to be stated in the future, a time which has not yet been stated, so that during the whole of the active season of 1910 we have been in British Columbia without any regulations whatever applicable to the land in the railway belt. I say without any regulations applicable but the fact that the administration is paralyzed appears to be due to the personal act of the Minister of the Interior, because when the new regulations were suspended it is quite plain to any one who studies the situation that the old regulations in the absence of any interference with them by law by any other agency than the proposed new regulations must continue in effect. Still while by law they are in effect we find that by the personal order of the Minister of the Interior, I presume, because it is in his department, by some order not communicated by order in council or in any other public manner, the land agents throughout British Columbia were instructed not to receive any applications whatever, not to deal with a bit of land in any way, not to give any

satisfaction to any one of the hundreds of persons who have applications pending before those agents for homesteads, on many of which they have been living but who find themselves now without any warrant that they will at any time secure the patents to these lands. The subject is not one which calls for any lengthy remarks, but I do submit that it calls for the attention of the House in view of the extraordinary condition revealed that by the arbitrary act of one minister the settlement of a whole province can be retarded for a season, and a most active season at that.

Mr. OLIVER. Before the motion passes, I would like to draw the attention of the mover (Mr. Taylor, New Westminster) to a difficulty in meeting the request contained in the motion. The motion asks for a return showing all applications for homestead or pre-emption in the railway belt in the district of New Westminster, with names of applicants and description of proposed locations, &c. There may be record in the departments of applications which have been made, but my hon. friend will be aware that there is a great possibility of very many applications having been made of which we have no record, and, therefore, we are not able to give him the information. In the ordinary course of the transaction of business at the land offices an application would be made verbally and there would be no record of its having been made ; so that, while we are willing and anxious to give the hon. member all information in this connection, I desire to point out the difficulty that there is in giving him a large amount of information on the point that he particularly asks about.

In regard to his remarks on the subject in general, I would like to point out that he has rather misunderstood the question when he says that there has been no dealing with homestead entries in the railway belt for the past year. There has been no suspension of the regulations, and no suspension of activity in dealing with homestead lands in that part of the railway belt known as the dry section, that is to say, in the section of which Kamloops is the centre. In that area there has been a continuous movement in the way of dealing in homestead rights and my hon. friend, I think has been certainly quite misinformed when he gave us to understand that there had been no issuing of homestead rights during the year.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). May I ask the minister whether these dealings were under the old regulations or under the new regulations?

Mr. OLIVER. Under the old regulations. To explain to the House fully, if I may take the time, the reason for the condition of which my hon. friend complains in other sections of the railway belt, the difficulties that have to be met in the administration are these : In the district of New Westminster, as well as in the district eastward of the dry belt, owing to the activity of investors in lumber, not absolutely all, but practically all the land that is suitable for homesteading in those sections of the railway belt has been covered by licenses to cut timber. The general condition in those sections of the railway belt is that in order to give a homestead entry the land has to be withdrawn from the timber berth. There are exceptions to the rule, but my hon. friend is well aware that the exceptions are only exceptions, and do not cover any important section of the conditions existing. As the House is aware, the timber in the railway belt is of very great value, partly because of the great size of the trees, and partly because of the nearness to transportation facilities by reason of the existence of the railway, and for other reasons. When we have to deal with the question of settlers' rights in that way we have to deal with it very cautiously and carefully. While we are anxious that the lumberman shall not hold his license for lands that are proper to be settled upon, at the same time we desire to be careful not to withdraw from him, or to aid anybody else in any action that would result in causing to be withdrawn from him, those rights to the timber for which he has paid, and thereby cause the undue destruction of timber which is a most valuable asset of this country. The difficulties of the situation are such that they have been engaging the attention of the Department of the Interior for several years and, as the result of this consideration, some time in the early part of last summer, certain regulations were issued for the information of the public looking to the adjustment of these difficulties between settlers and limit holders that, it was hoped, would be at any rate, moderately satisfactory, and would tend to the further development of the country without undue trespass upon the rights of any one. These regulations were issued early in the summer time, and were to go into effect, I think, on the 1st July, so that there should be ample notice to everybody before they would come into effect as to what their character was. Not at all unexpectedly, objections were offered to these regulations, and in view of the objections that were made and of the very complicated and difficult character of the question that had to be dealt with it was thought advisable to give the matter further consideration, and to suspend the regulations until that still further consideration had been given and until all interests concerned had been further consulted. That is the matter as it

stands up to the present time. It is not correct to say that the suspension of these regulations has been any serious deterrent to settlement in the railway belt because there cannot in the nature of things be any serious accession to settlement in the railway belt until the question of timber rights, the respective rights of the lumber holders, and of the prospective homesteaders, have been properly adjusted. As long as the limits stay as they are there cannot be any serious amount of homesteading in the sections of the railway belt which have been held under reservation. It may be said that entries might have been given in the small portions of those sections which are not covered by timber berths. It seemed to the government that it was advisable—for it seemed to be necessary to make a radical change in the method of the disposition of rights to settlers—that there should be no distinction drawn between the small area outside of the timber berths, and the large area inside the timber berths ; that is to say if it was sound public policy to enter upon a new system in dealing with homesteads in the railway belt it was right and proper that all should be put upon the same basis. So the matter has had to await further consideration with reference to all the interests affected. My hon. friend is aware, I presume, that we expect to have the opportunity of consulting a very representative delegation of one of those interests in a short time, and we hope after that consultation to be able to take such action as will relieve the present situation of which my hon. friend complains.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). If the new regulations were to be proclaimed to-morrow what would be the fate of the persons whose applications for homesteads are now pending? Would they be dealt with under the old regulations or under the new regulations?

Mr. OLIVER. That is a matter that is the subject of consideration at the present time. If the regulations which were promulgated in the early part of last summer to take effect on the 1st July as they stand were to go into effect to-morrow all applications not already dealt with would be dealt with under those new regulations.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to discuss the motion I would like to point out to the minister one or two defects in his answer. In the first place, what he has said just now in reply to my question touches the crux of the whole situation, that there are in the district of New Westminster alone a great many applications for homesteads pending, and they have been pending for not a few months, but for many years, through no fault of the applicants, but simply because of the dilatoriness which characterizes the conduct of business in the Department of the Interior so far as the Canadian Pacific railway is concerned. Some of these applicants for homesteads have been pushing their claims for from 10 to 15 years to my knowledge. The minister's files are stacked with correspondence from me during the last few months, calling his attention to case after case of this nature, where men have been trying for years to get their papers, where they know of no obstacle except the dilatoriness of the department, and where they are left in this state of uncertainty now; that if the regulations are proclaimed their last chance of securing these homesteads disappears, according to the statement just made by the minister, a statement which confirms the worse fears of these homesteaders and their apprehensions which have been the basis of the many protests delivered to the minister during the last few months. I would like to point out to the minister also that he misjudges the quantity of land available for settlement in the railway belt in the district of New Westminster. In one breath he tells us that the applications are so numerous that he cannot bring down a complete return because there are so many made by word of mouth as well as in writing. I think he will admit that when a man goes into the land office in New Westminster and makes an application for land, that he applies for a definite piece of land. I know of any number of cases where men have gone in with a definite application for a piece of land only to be told that there is nothing doing at all, that the agent will not receive the application for that or for any other land, and that the agent will not give any idea as to when the applicant may come back. I know also that the minister, only last year, gave away by private treaty to a quartette of favourites in Vancouver no less than 6,800 acres in one block in the district of New Westminster; gave away these 6,800 acres available for settlement upon which applicants for homesteads would gladly have gone; gave them away at the ridiculous price of $1.50 per acre, land which could be sold at an instant's notice to-day for $150 an acre or more; and gave those lands away on the sole promise that there was some great dyking scheme in connection with it. I do not know what information the minister had upon which to base that transaction. I made some inquiries last year and was told that the department had no information at all as to the value of land in that vicinity. A short time before that a small parcel of land in the same neighbourhood was handed out to a political favourite at a price much below the market value and inquiry was made in this House as to whether or not there were any more

lands available in that district at less than the schedule price named by the department. The answer was that there was no other land available at any reduced price, which was a warning to all persons concerned to make no application for snaps of that kind. And yet, hard on the heels of that statement that no other land was available at anything less than the regular price, we find this transaction (at a still lower price) with an organization in Vancouver closely identified with the famous Bob Kelly whose name as the head of the British Columbia Tammany is now being heralded in the press of the continent. Now, I ask why the minister tells us today that there is no considerable quantity of land available in the railway belt for settlement for the small man who wants 160 acres, or, the 20 acres or 40 acres to be allowed under the new regulations, when only a year ago he was handing it out in 6,800 acre blocks to the associates of Bob Kelly.

An hon. MEMBER. At how much per acre?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I have already told the House at $1.50 per acre, subject to conditions of dyking, conditions similar to those observed without any order in council or any Act of parliament by every farmer on the delta land in British Columbia; conditions which will bring to this aggregation of favourites from Vancouver a profit which may be moderately estimated at $1,000,000. One million dollars, Mr. Speaker, to be handed out without notice, without competition to a few favourites from Vancouver, speculators in land; while the department does not know of any more lands available there as to which it is worth while to give their attention to satisfy the demands of men who wish to become bona fide settlers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the date of the grant?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The date of the information about no other land being available would be about 1907, the date of the grant was in 1909, barely two years afterwards, and the lands in question are almost adjoining although the answer given to this House was that there was no other land in the vicinity to be obtained at anything less than the price laid down by the department. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the minister should revise his answers and should find some other reason for tieing up settlement in the district of New Westminster; I submit that he should take the House into his confidence and tell who are these fortunate people in the dry belt in British Columbia who had influence enough to cause the suspension of these regulations that were proclaimed early in 1910. He might give us some shadow of reason why conspicious friends of the government in the dry belt should be able to have regulations suspended while their special cases are being dealt with, while at the same time people in the lower mainland of British Columbia, who have no other claim than that they are honest citizens and intending homesteaders, are turned away from his land offices with the statement that this government will not give any attention to their requests.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend asks how it is that, having said to the House that we had no land to sell in the lower railway belt, we afterwards sold some.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Not quite that. The question asked in the House was whether there was any other land in the vicinity of this land on Pitt Meadows, for sale at less than the prices laid down by law or by regulation of the department. The answer was, no, but hard upon the heels of that answer came a sale of 6,800 acres to the quartette of political favourites.

Mr. OLIVER. The question of my hon. friend sounds like an echo of the celebrated Robins Irrigation debate that occurred in this House. My hon. friend asks in regard to the sale of certain marsh lands at a price. We are not selling marsh lands at a price any more than we are selling irrigation lands at a price. It is true that an amount is paid, but that is not the price that we sell the land at. The price is the money that is paid plus the cost of the reclamation of the land. We sold some at the price my hon. friend mentions plus the cost of reclamation. We were asked if we had any more to sell. We had not any more to sell; we have no land to sell for money in the lower railway belt. But we had land to sell for reclamation, and we sold it for reclamation. It is being reclaimed, I believe, and my hon. friend will not deny that the reclamation of that land means a very great increase in the value of the land in his constituency, and is for the benefit of the country as well. If my hon. friend is horrified at the idea of our selling marsh lands at $1.50 an acre plus the cost of reclamation, I will tell him that there is still other marsh land in his constituency, of which he knows very well, a very large area of it, which four years ago we offered for sale—if he likes to put it that way, although I do not put it that way—not at $1.50 an acre, but several thousand acres for one dollar plus the cost of reclamation.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Not to political favourites. That was towards a public undertaking.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely. It was an offer to constituents of my hon. friend or of his colleague for purposes of reclamation; and if he finds fault with us for having sold this other land at $1.50 an acre, in what position must we stand in his estimation for having offered several thousand acres at the price of a single dollar plus the cost of reclamation? And the land has not yet been sold nor the reclamation made.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The conditions were entirely different.

Mr. OLIVER. I will admit that the conditions were somewhat different, but not entirely different. In the one case the land was marsh, in the other case it was partly marsh and partly lake. In both cases it was not land capable of cultivation without reclamation; in both cases large expenditures to secure reclamation were necessary. Because a less cost would be incurred in reclaiming the land in the one case than in the other, we charged $1.50 an acre, in the one case and only one dollar for several thousand acres in the other case. The reclamation in the one case is going forward, and I believe will be successful, while in the other case, although the land was offered practically for nothing, it appears not to be worth the cost of reclamation.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). My information about a month ago on the spot was that the reclamation was going forward.

Mr. OLIVER. The bargain was made four years ago, and the last I heard of it was that the reclamation was not going forward. If the hon. gentleman has knowledge that it is, no one will be more pleased than I.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The minister refers to Sumas lake?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The minister must know that he renewed that last year.

Mr. OLIVER. Under such an arrangement as I speak of the land was for a time in the hands of the strongest financial company in British Columbia, unless the Canadian Pacific railway itself, and yet it has not been reclaimed unless it has been done recently.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The minister knows why that company gave it up?

Mr. OLIVER. I only know they gave it up. But if the company fulfil the conditions required and reclaim that land, I am prepared to defend the transaction in this House or anywhere else, and I am satisfied the House would uphold the action I took.

Motion agreed to.

WESTERN FARMERS DELEGATION.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Before the orders of the day are called, I would ask what progress has been made in the printing of the proceedings of the farmers delegation which met here on the 16th of December last.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will take a note of my hon. friends request and ask the Secretary of State.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. VERVILLE moved third reading of Bill (No. 3), respecting the hours of labour on public works.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I had not the privilege of being present when the amended Bill was discussed a couple of weeks ago, not having returned from the Pacific coast after our adjournment; but on reading the report of the debate on that occasion, I saw some remarks which I think ought not to pass unchallenged. I read for instance, the statement by the hon. gentleman in whose name this Bill stands (Mr. Verville), that he had received from several labour organizations, particularly in Montreal, petitions or memorials or other documentary evidence in favour of the Bill in its present form. At the outset I wish to say, in order to remove any apprehension, that I am not opposing this Bill; because the very smallest movement in the direction of recognizing an eight hour day, is better than no progress at all; but I noticed that the hon. gentleman did not specify what labour organizations had petitioned in favour of his amended Bill and what workmen there were who preferred this amended measure to the sturdy effort made by him in the first place. A great many members in this House have received petitions in connection with this Bill, but, so far as I am aware, these petitions relate solely to the Bill introduced last fall and not to its substitute. I do think that it would have been only just to this House for any representative of labour, who had a mandate from any labour organization to accept this substituted Bill, to have given us the address of the people for whom he spoke. I do not think that it is right that an hon. member should come here speaking as a representative of labour and leave us in any doubt as to the position of the great labour organizations in this country with respect to legislation of this kind; and you must realize that the bare statement by any hon. gentleman that he had received petitions from labour organizations does not carry nearly so much

weight as if he stood up here with the documents in his hand and read them to the House, spread them on the pages of 'Hansard', and allowed us to see by whom they were signed and what class of labouring men were content with so small a measure of justice. I have a number of petitions with respect to this Bill which I shall not present to the House in an anonymous way, but will either read or give the addresses of the organizations which have sent them. In the case of a very few, I shall read the petitions themselves because they are rather important in their nature. I have first one, from the Trades and Labour Council at Vancouver, dated the 2nd of January, which reads as follows:

J. D. Taylor, M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Dear Sir:—I am instructed by the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council to again draw your attention to the fact that this central labour union has repeatedly placed itself upon record as being unequivocally in favor of the enactment of a federal eight-hour day, along the lines of the Bill introduced by Alphonse Verville, M.P. Having this in mind, we will not burden you with further resolutions upon the subject, but desire to impress upon your mind that wage workers of western Canada are deeply concerned in the passage of such a measure. We heartily endorse the expressions and position taken by the members of the executive committee of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada who appeared before this special committee dealing with the subject some months ago. We further believe that the tendency of this day and age is towards a shorter work day; this, because the workers rightly feel that they should participate in some of the benefits accruing from the introduction of modern machinery. In fact, there are so few arguments against the enactment of such a measure that it seems needless for us to go any further into the question at this time. Trusting that we may have the pleasure of a hearing from you at the earliest possible date, with regard to your attitude on this question.

(Signed) R. P. PETTIPIECE,
Secretary.

I have a similar petition from Local Union No. 16, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of British America, dated Vancouver. I have also one from Lethbridge, Alberta, dated December 30th., from the Brotherhood of Painters and Decorators and Paper Hangers of America; also one from Labroquerie, Manitoba, dated December 19th. I have others from Toronto Typographical Union No. 91; the Journeymen Tailors Union of America, dated from Toronto; the Hamilton District Trades and Labour Council; the Hamilton Branch of the Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local Union No. 18; the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Niagara Falls, Ont.; the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paper Hangers, of America. This last is as follows:

Montreal, Dec. 24, 1910.

Mr. J. D. Taylor, M.P.

Dear Sir,—Through a unanimous vote of my local, I have been instructed to ask for your moral support on the eight-hour Bill presented by Mr. A. Verville, M.P. Hoping you will condescend to back this most needed legislation.

J. CORDOVA,
Secretary.

Here is another from the Montreal Union of Carpenters and Joiners of America, No. 178; and still another from the Montreal International Association of Machinists, as follows:

Labour Temple, 303 St. Dominique St.

Hon. Member.

Dear Sir,—The Bill No. 3 entitled 'An Act concerning the hours of labour on public works,' presented by Mr. Alphonse Verville, will soon come before the House for discussion.

We wish to inform you that our union, after carefully studying this Bill, has decided to support it and respectfully ask you to approve of it by giving it your vote.

You probably know that for a number of years the labour movement, not only in the province of Quebec but in the whole Dominion, has demanded this humanitarian and indispensable measure under the existing situation.

The investigation made by your special committee on this important question has proved without a doubt that the objections raised affected principally the contracts for transportation by land or water, on the other hand the evidence given in favour of the Bill were well founded.

Hoping you will accede to our request and we may count you amongst the supporters of the Bill No. 3.

We remain yours,

J. FOSTER.

I have here another from the Journeymen Tailors' Union of America, Local 137, Montreal. The Montreal Trades and Labour Council—speaking, I presume, for the body of labour generally in the city of Montreal—sends the following:

Montreal, January 3, 1911.

To Hon. Members of Parliament,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—At the last meeting of the Trades and Labour Council held on Thursday, December 15, 1910, a resolution was adopted asking your support on behalf of the 8-hour Bill presented by Mr. Alphonse Verville, M.P.

As this measure is of great interest for the public in general, we hope you will give it your hearty support.

Thanking you in advance for your help.

I remain,

G. R. BRUNET,
Sec. Trades Council.

The communication from the Journeyman Stonecutters' Association of North America, Montreal branch, is as follows:

Montreal, Dec. 24, 1910.

Dear Sir,—At a meeting of the Montreal Branch of the Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association of North America, held at Montreal, December 21, the 8-hours Bill introduced in the House of Commons by Alphonse Verville, M.P., was read. By unanimous vote, the branch adopted a resolution approving every clause of said Bill and wishing for its enactment.

Respectfully submitted,
The Montreal Branch of the J. S. C. A. of N.A.
GEO. DURANTAYE,
Secretary.

There is another from the International Union of Working Barbers, Montreal Local. The National Trades and Labour Council of Quebec writes as follows:

Quebec, January 21, 1911.

To J. D. Taylor, Esq.,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that all the delegates of the National Trades and Labour Council, of Quebec, at their meeting held on the 17th instant, have passed a resolution, approving the Bill (No. 3) presented by Mr. Verville, concerning the law regarding the hours of labour in public works.

The eight thousand labour men of Quebec should be happy to have your hearty support to this Bill, which would be of a great advantage to the working class.

Hoping that you will give this request your most serious consideration.

We have the honour to be,
Your most obedient servants,
National Trades and Labour Council of Quebec, by
J. ALFRED MERCIER,
Secretary.

There is another from the Machinists Union of Quebec.

Now, I have one a little more up-to-date, as showing the attitude of labour organizations towards the most magnificent backdown on the part of the hon. member for Maisonneuve. This is from the Victoria Trades and Labour Council, of Victoria, B.C., and is as follows:

Victoria, B.C., January 10, 1911.

Whereas Bill (No. 3) intituled 'An Act respecting the hours of labour on public works,' introduced in the House of Commons by A. Verville, member for Maisonneuve, and read a first time on November 23, 1910, was endorsed by Victoria Trades and Labour Council, and

Whereas, on December 15, 1910, as set forth on page 1470 of 'Hansard,' amendments by the author of the Bill are proposed which utterly destroy the effectiveness of the measure:

Therefore, be it resolved by Victoria Trades and Labour Council in regular session assembled that it hereby expresses its unqualified disapproval of the changes to the measure as proposed by the said member from Maisonneuve; and be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Premier of Canada, the Minister of Labour, A. Verville and to each representative in both Houses of parliament from British Columbia, as well as to the secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress, and to each of the central bodies in British Columbia, urging that their influence be used in securing the withdrawal of the proposed amendments or to wage a vigorous campaign against the adoption of same by either or both Houses.

Several of these communications refer to the evidence taken last winter by the special committee organized by the hon. member for Maisonneuve in conjunction with the Minister of Labour. This committee was appointed, as the House will remember, with the idea that it would bring in a perfect Bill, a Bill free from the defects said to characterize the measure of last year. The desire, at the time of the appointment of this committee, was not only to perfect the wording of the Bill so that it might mean what it was intended to mean, but, according to the minister, it was most desirable that we should learn from the experience of other countries and should know how far they had gone in this direction, that we might be guided by their example and also avoid faults in legislation which ran along channels new to us in Canada. It seems a remarkable thing to me that, although this evidence was obtained by that committee, at very considerable cost, and although, as the hon. member for Halton has pointed out, several cords of that evidence have been printed and are stacked up in the lobbies of this House, yet the evidence has never been distributed to the workingmen of Canada to let them know just what they had a right to expect from any government and from any Minister of Labour, who takes a position entailing upon him the duty of doing his best in the interest of labour. One would think that the Minister of Labour, as chairman of the committee procuring this evidence, would have been exceedingly diligent in this matter and would have seen to it that the evidence was spread to the four corners of Canada, so that every person concerned in this movement might be posted as to how far it would be safe for us to go in following the example of the United States, New Zealand, Great Britain and other civilized nations.

However, this information remains stacked by the cord in the lobbies of the House. It has not been referred to except in the most casual way by any of the hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House who have dealt with this Bill; it has not been analysed by the Minister of Labour in his address to the House; it has been treated, in fact, with a contempt which I submit it does not deserve, because to me this information seems exceedingly valuable. We undertook, last year, to find out what they did in other countries, so

that we might be guided by their experience and go as far as experience had shown it was safe to go. We found no person connected with the Department of Labour, after its five years' study of this question, competent to advise the committee, no person to tell them what other countries had done. So great had been the attention given by this overworked department during five years that when at last, on the minister's own motion, the Bill was brought before the committee the department was found entirely unprepared to give it any information which would have been of value. So they called in a gentleman from a university at Kingston, who seems to be a very wise man indeed, who seemed to have a marvellous grasp of the situation, to have a genius so extraordinary for dealing with legislation of this kind that the question arises more than ever whether the First Minister, when he was seeking for a gentleman to put at the head of a department of this kind, being established in Canada as a separate department for the first time, did not make a grave mistake in making the choice he did when there was available a man who could do in three weeks what our Minister of Labour seems to have been unable to accomplish in five years. Be that as it may, we find Mr. Skelton submitted, in very concise form, the examples of other countries. I find at page 33 of the book:—

Professor Skelton. It was requested at the last hearing that a more detailed statement be given of the scope of the existing United States federal law. It will be recalled that this law passed in 1892, as extended by later declarations, applies to the following main classes:

And you will notice that this is very different from the small category of labourers on public contracts. Here are the classes to whom it applies in the United States:—

1. Labourers and mechanics in the direct employment of the United States or of the District of Columbia; now including men employed in navy yards, arsenals, ordnance factories, in printing bureaus, on construction of buildings, breakwaters, piers, fortifications, on irrigation works, and on Panama canal (except unskilled aliens). For letter-carriers an eight-hour day or 56-hour week is prescribed. It has been ruled that messengers and janitors are not included. 26 Op. Atty. Gen. p. 623.

I have got ahead of my story. I should first have quoted from page 23 of the evidence where Professor Skelton is asked by the Minister of Labour as to the American federal act of 1892. Professor Skelton replies:

I shall read the whole of it; it is quite brief:—

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the service and employment of all labourers and mechanics who are now, or may be hereafter employed, by the government of the United States, by the District of Columbia or by any contractor or sub-contractor, upon any of the public works of the United States or of said District of Columbia is hereby limited and restricted to eight hours in any one calendar day; and it shall be unlawful for any officer of the United States government or of the District of Columbia, or any contractor or sub-contractor whose duty it shall be to employ, direct or control the services of such labourer and mechanic, to require or permit any such labourer or mechanic to work more than eight hours in any calendar day, except in cases of extraordinary emergency.

I would call the attention of the Minister of Labour and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) to the language of this section, where it says: 'It shall be unlawful to require or permit any such labourer.' In the United States, in their experience of 18 years, since the passage of this, they have not found the danger apprehended by our new Minister of Labour in the use of these words 'or permit.'

Mr. KING. Would the hon. member tell the House what has been the effect in practice of having those words in that legislation, and to what extent the courts have found it possible to enforce the Act owing to those words?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am sorry if the minister, having such valuable information in his possession, has neglected the many opportunities he has had of presenting it to me and to this House, so as to enlighten our ignorance on this most important subject.

Mr. KING. The hon. member is trying to evade my question. The information is there, and if he has read the report he will see that the effect of those words has been practically to nullify the legislation. The courts found it so, and I call upon him to deny it, if it is not true.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am making an address now on Mr. Skelton's evidence before a special committee of this House; I am not denying or affirming any proposition put forward by the Minister of Labour, but I do say he has been distinctly derelict in his duty if, having information of this kind in his possession, he has been so careless, so indifferent and so absolutely sure that he can get a majority of this House to do whatever any ministers of the Crown tell them they are to do, that it is not necessary for him to give any reasonable excuse for any course he suggests to them. Section 2 reads:—

That any officer or agent of the government of the United States or of the District of Columbia, or any contractor, or sub-contractor, whose duty it shall be to employ, direct, or control any labourer or mechanic employed upon any of the public works of the United States or of the District of Columbia who shall intentionally violate any provision of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanour and for each and every offence, upon conviction, be punished by a fine not to exceed one thousand dollars or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both, such fine and imprisonment in the discretion of the court having jurisdiction thereof.

The third section provides that the Act does not apply to pending contracts. Mr. Macdonell, a member of the committee, then asks:—

Is there any other exception than the emergency exception.

Professor Skelton—No exception.

The United States, having had experience for some time with this Act, and not having recognized the calamity that the use of the words 'or permit' had brought upon them, according to the Minister of Labour to-day, proceeded to pass supplementary legislation nine years afterwards. But these Americans are slow; it takes them a long time to recognize that this is a misfortune to them. Prof. Skelton, at page 24, reports:

Letter carriers may be required to work as nearly as practicable only eight hours on each working day, but not in any event exceeding forty-eight hours during the six working days of each week; and such number of hours on Sunday, not exceeding eight, as may be required by the needs of the service; and if a legal holiday shall occur on any working day the service performed on such day, if less than eight hours, shall be counted as eight hours without regard to the time actually employed.

This Act was passed in 1901. The following year, that is in the session of 1901-2, the eight-hour law was explicitly declared to apply to all irrigation works undertaken by the secretary of the Interior.

So well satisfied was the congress of the United States with the operation of this Act after it had been in force nine years that instead of weakening it, instead of withdrawing it, instead of whittling it down until it meant nothing whatever it deliberately proceeded to extend it. The report proceeds :

In 1905-1906 when the Panama canal was being planned it was enacted that the provisions of the Act of 1892, the long one which I read, should not apply to unskilled alien labourers and to the foremen and superintendents of such labourers employed in the construction of the Isthmian canal. . . To summarize, the federal government has provided that eight hours shall constitute the limit that may be required or permitted of any workman, mechanic or labourer in its own immediate employment whether engaged in erecting public buildings or fortifications—public works in the ordinary sense—constructing the vast irrigation works which are now being undertaken in the semi-arid west, or if they are citizens or skilled aliens, employed on the Panama canal; they are all in direct government employ. If they are employed in the government navy yards, arsenals or ordnance factories, or in the public printing bureau or engaged as letter carriers—I should omit letter carriers, that is a special provision—they all have the obligatory eight-hour day.

The proceedings of this special committee were carried on during very many weeks and such a mass of evidence was presented by persons for or against the Bill that it was suggested that the committee should call upon Professor Skelton again to help them to come to a conclusion. Mr. Skelton was examined as to the result of the studies which he had carried on independently during the period of the committee's activities. He was examined by a former labour member in this House in the person of Mr. Smith. He was asked about a specific law in Australia, and he said that :

The nearest approach in New Zealand to the legislation contemplated by the Bill before us is the Public Contracts Act of 1900, which provides that in all contracts above 20 pounds in value, for the construction or repair of public works or for any public service in which manual labour is needed, current fair wages shall be paid and an eight-hour day observed. The discussion in the House when this Act was passed showed that it was designed to force on all contractors, particularly in outlying districts, where roads, bridges and culverts were being built, the hours customary in better organized districts. The eight-hour specified was, in view of the prevalence of the eight-hour standard, practically a fair hours provision. Overtime, moreover is allowed.

That is on page 367. Then, on page 373, Professor Skelton hazards this suggestion :

If it is felt desirable that the Dominion should use the means at its disposal——

I would call the attention of the Minister of Labour to this. This is his own witness.

Mr. KING. I think the hon. member is utterly mistaken when he speaks of Professor Skelton as my own witness. Professor Skelton was brought before the committee at the request of the committee itself. The committee was composed of gentlemen opposite as well as gentlemen on this side of the House. He was not in any way the witness of any one particular member of the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). That opens another subject upon which I willingly would not have entered. That opens the subject of the procuring of Professor Skelton, and what I claim to be double dealing in this House in connection with

the procuring. I have the evidence in this book in my hand, and if I wanted to take up the time of the House I could read it, that Professor Skelton was retained three weeks before the Minister of Labour came into this House to ask permission to retain an expert from outside to assist the committee. I have the statement in this book that he was retained in consequence, and as a result of a conference between the Minister of Labour and the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and that the clerk of the House was consulted, presumably by the Minister of Labour, as to whether or not the committee had authority to engage this professor without referring to the House. I have the professor's own statement that he was communicated with by telephone. I would ask whether the members of the committee had a specially arranged telephone with one horn to the ear of each member of the committee, one speaking piece for each member, or whether they jointly spoke to this professor two days before he was engaged, or whether it was some responsible minister, some person with some show of authority, who engaged the professor, who talked with him over the 'phone two days before he was actually engaged, and told him to get busy and prepare for a formal call from this committee. I say it is trifling with the intelligence of this House, it is presuming too much upon the carelessness of the members of this House, this action having been taken in the hope of members not having read the contents of this book for the minister to attempt to lead us to believe that he was not personally concerned in the retaining of Professor Skelton.

Mr. KING. I am sure the hon. member does not intend to be other than fair or that he would not like to have the House feel that he did not intend to be fair. Every statement which he has made may be quite correct, but the implication which he has tried to make, is not an accurate one. I can state the facts to the hon. member, and if I am in error hon. gentlemen who were members of this committee can correct me. Some of them are present and are sitting opposite. It was suggested in the committee before the Christmas recess, that some one should be engaged to compile the legislation of different countries, and advise us as to how this legislation had worked out in practice. An officer of the Department of Labour was not called in, not because there were not men in the department, officers who could do the work, but because it was thought that it might be considered that evidence given by an officer of the department was ex parte evidence in favour of one class. That the subject was one affecting all classes and that exception might be taken by manufacturers or farmers to evidence from such a source. The committee thought, and rightly, I think, that there should be an impartial third person engaged, and a university professor who was interested neither one way nor the other, and who was well qualified for the work, was selected. The situation when the House adjourned for the Xmas recess was that we had either to delay until the House resumed after the recess, or retain his services forthwith so that he might have an opportunity during the recess of parliament, which was also his recess, of dealing with the matter. It was impossible for me as a member of the committee to, on my own responsibility, appoint this gentleman or on behalf of the committee without making sure that his appointment would be confirmed later on. When the committee suggested, so that there might be no delay in a full and complete investigation, that I should try and arrange to have Professor Skelton do that work during the Christmas vacation, I consulted the Prime Minister and the clerk of the House to ascertain whether such would be a proper course, and whether if I acceded to the wishes of the committee I might feel sure that the House would support me. Having consulted the Prime Minister, that right hon. gentleman said, that if anything could be done to expedite the work, and carry out the wishes of the committee it should be done. With that authority I told Professor Skelton that I had assurances which I considered satisfactory to guarantee he would be retained, and that it would meet the wishes of the committee if he would agree to undertake the work forthwith. If the hon. gentleman can find anything not in accordance with the facts in that statement I challenge him to do so. But, the hon. gentleman is acting unfairly when he makes insinuation after insinuation, with the view of misleading every member in this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Labour had better withdraw that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. The last statement made by the minister should be modified.

Mr. KING. If I used language I should not have used I certainly withdraw it immediately.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). To avoid misunderstanding I wish to repeat inferentially everything I have said in this House, and to challenge the Minister of Labour to point to one sentence which I cannot make absolutely good from the records. I have listened patiently to the oration from the Minister of Labour, and I am not surprised that he shows heat; if I were in his position I think I would

show even more heat. But I would like to ask him why he took up so much time to combat the statement I hazarded, that Professor Skelton was his witness, while the result of his effort was only to corroborate that statement in every detail. There is no doubt whatever in my mind that the Minister of Labour was the member of that committee who named Professor Skelton. I think I am entitled to assume that Professor Skelton was his witness, and the Minister of Labour has no right to refer to that as an insinuation. I say it is a fair assumption from all the circumstances. I have no direct knowledge as to whether Professor Skelton was his witness or the witness of the Prime Minister, but I think a fair assumption from this report is that he was the choice of the Minister of Labour, and the Minister of Labour having called him to offer his advice has a right to take that advice. However, this is what Professor Skelton says:

If it is felt desirable that the Dominion should use the means at its disposal, however limited, to set the pace, the path of least resistance it is generally recognized lies along the adoption of the eight-hour day in government employment——

Not mark you only on public buildings under contract, but in government employment.

—and the insertion of an eight-hour clause for contracts on public works. Possibly the adoption of a fair hour's supplement to the fair wages clause might be discussed in that connection.

To that extent, the professor bears out the contention put forward from this side of the House, that if the government really desired to secure an eight-hour day for government employment they could have done it themselves without any of this meaningless parade. Now, then, this witness called by the Minister of Labour proceeds:

If the committee decide to make the application of this Bill——

He was stopped short there. This professor having studied the question, having thoroughly mastered 400 pages of information, being under the impression that he was called in to enable the committee to do something, proceeded to give his advice whatever it might be worth, as to what they might most advantageously do, when he was stopped by the Minister of Labour, the very man who asked this House to submit the Bill to the committee so that the committee might perfect the Bill, and remove the disadvantages which would have arisen. I challenged the Minister of Labour to say whether he would cause that committee to report back the Bill or whether he would not, and he answered me at that time in the most arrogant way that it was an improper assumption on my part that he or any other member of the committee had any other idea than to report back the Bill to the House; and yet, this very man, being offered by his own witness a suggestion as to the kind of Bill he should report, stops him with this remark:

The Chairman. The committee has'nt any decision to make on that point.

Prof. Skelton. You mean as to the interpretation of the term 'public works'?

The professor could not believe his ears; he could not believe he was in the presence of the assassin of the Bill. The Minister of Labour said:

The committee, of course, is simply concerned with this Bill of Mr. Verville's; we have nothing to do with the framing of the law itself, but if you are dealing with anything other than what is included in that Bill——

The meaning of the Minister of Labour was: For goodness sake, Mr. Professor, we are getting along very nicely now, we have got this thing so beclouded that nobody but yourself can make such a summary of all this evidence as you are making; if you present this summary to us, and tell us all what it means it will be incumbent upon us to report this Bill this session, so for goodness sake don't do it, and he did not do it. Mr. Speaker, he was not permitted to do it. Then Professor Skelton said:

'Well, would it be——

He only got this far when he was stopped again by the Minister of Labour so anxious was he that this professor should not give that committee too much enlightenment. Of course the shorthand reporter did not get down the whole dramatic scene; you would need a moving picture machine to do that in detail, but something happened between the pauses, and so the Minister of Labour said:

The Chairman.—I beg your pardon, I interrupted you, perhaps I may have misunderstood what you were going to say.

A. I was going to make some suggestions in the event of the Bill applying to public works, but perhaps that is not needed at this stage.

The Chairman.—That is quite proper; if your observations have led you to believe there are certain features which should be considered in connection with our public works, you certainly should give them.

This professor had been invited to make a recommendation. Not spontaneously invited. This thing did not occur all of itself. The committee were very coy about receiving advice from the professor; but finally they prevailed upon themselves to receive some information from him, and this is what they got:

A. Well, quite aside from the question whether it is feasible to adopt an eight-hour day even on public works, I would like to say, if it were adopted there are some considerations which a study particularly of the American conditions have suggested. So that without prejudice to the question of the advisability of any such law at all I think it is clear that it would be better in framing such a measure to make a positive enumeration of the trades to which it should apply rather than to make a sweeping statement and then to insert exception after exception as to the trades to which it should apply. Again, if it were applied to public buildings I think some such provision should be inserted as that embodied in the Wisconsin law which provides that the provisions of the Act should be confined to work done on the spot, not to the preparation of materials necessary. It would have to be considered, too, whether an eight-hour day meant a 48-hour week or a 44-hour week, that is, the question of the short hours on Saturday might come in. The question of overtime is also a difficult matter. It might be possible to penalize overtime by requiring higher pay for extra hours, but the danger of this, of course, is that with such a provision in the Bill, it becomes not an Act to enforce shorter hours, but an Act to enforce higher wages by beginning the overtime sooner. Possibly the prohibition of overtime except in emergencies would meet the necessity of the case from the viewpoint of its advocates. However, I am taking a very hypothetical case at present, and perhaps there is no need of going further into what might be done if the committee took certain action.

As it turned out, the perhaps was fully justified. There was no need of going further as to what might be done, because the committee made no decision at all, and did not report any Bill last session. At this stage, however, the committee were very well satisfied with themselves. Perhaps I should have said the chairman rather than the committee, because the committee as a whole, do not speak here. However, there are some members other than the chairman who do speak. There is one member whom I used to know as a most enthusiastic advocate of the rights of labour in the part of Canada where I live. At one time he was simply a splendid fellow as a labour advocate. No trouble was too great for him to take, no distance was too far for him to go. So it was only natural on this occasion, when all this mass of evidence, so entirely favourable to the principle of shorter hours of labour had been presented, that the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith), should have been the first to express his appreciation of it. This is what I read on page 380:

Mr. Smith.—I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that the splendid address which Professor Skelton has given us this morning has been of the utmost assistance to the committee.

The Chairman.—Yes, indeed.

Mr. Smith.—His address to-day was simply splendid, and I know from experience that his conclusions about England are absolutely correct. We can rely upon his address, and it will assist the committee very materially.

The Chairman.—Professor Skelton, I think that the members of the committee are very much indebted to you for the thorough and systematic way in which you have investigated the legislation of the different countries on the subject of hours of labour, and given us the benefit of your researches.

Professor Skelton.—It is very good of you to say so. I have enjoyed my brief experience of parliamentary life behind the scenes. It has been indeed a great pleasure for me to assist in the committee's investigations.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was all that printed at the expense of the country?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Surely—a cord of it. Parliamenary life behind the scenes! Why, Mr. Speaker, he was not behind the scenes. He was only behind the first curtain. He had no idea of the operations which the scene shifters would set vigorously in motion the moment they got him off the premises. This recital would not be complete if we did not bring in the testimonial to Prof. Skelton, given by the father of the Bill:

Mr. Verville.—I must say that I consider Professor Skelton's report to be one of the best of the kind I ever heard in my life.

Although these explanations were the best which he, as an advocate of the cause of labour, had ever heard in his life, he asks us to adopt, not the magnificent programme which I have read to you, but something which he knows himself, is utterly meaningless, except as an affirmation of the principle, which has its sole value as an academic affirmation. Here is the valedictory of the chairman:

The Chairman.—I think you will see, Professor Skelton, that the members of the committee are unanimous in their appreciation of your work.

Now, it seems to me that the Minister of Labour has another think coming, because I am satisfied that Prof. Skelton must now realize that the committee have no proper appreciation of his work, or, if they have, that these three gentlemen who heaped this deserved praise upon his last utterance there, would be standing up here vying with each other in urging upon the House that we too should show our appreciation of Prof. Skelton's services by enacting legislation which the experience of all other countries who have dealt with this subject shows to be wise legislation to adopt.

I am sorry to have taken up so much time, but I thought it due to myself, as a supporter of the Bill, to make some answer to the slighting remarks directed against me in my absence, impugning my conduct in common with that of other mem-

bers on this side of the House as not being sincere. I think that, even at this late stage of the proceedings, we ought to have from the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) some reason why he has thought fit to entirely ignore the recommendation of this professor who was called in by himself as an expert witness. When the hon. Minister of Labour and the hon. gentleman who has moved this Bill admitted that the conclusions of this professor were well founded and wise, and were a proper deduction from the experience of other countries, we ought to have some explanation why these conclusions and recommendations were dismissed so ignominiously as they were by the failure of both these hon. gentlemen to even refer to them in this House, and we ought to have some explanation why we are asked to read for a third time a Bill which falls so far short of the recommendations of that committee to which we referred the original measure.

Mr. BARNARD. I am sorry to say that I was away on the last two occasions when this Bill came up for discussion; and while I do not wish to detain the House at any length, I desire to take this opportunity of saying that I was in favour of the Bill as originally introduced. I have followed with very considerable interest, as a new member, the checkered career of this measure. I saw it on the Order Paper the first session I was here and found it quietly shelved; and I saw it again on the Order Paper last year and had a lesson in parliamentary juggling on the part of the government by referring it to an expert, whose opinion they evidently had not the slightest intention of following, and in this manner they succeeded in shelving it another year. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) has quoted the resolution of the Trades and Labour Council of the city of Victoria, in which they declare that the present mutilated measure is wholly ineffective and that the amendments introduced by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) on compulsion—because I leave it to the judgment of any fair member of this House if those amendments were not the price given for the support of the government—utterly destroyed whatever merits the Bill in its original form possessed. I noticed an article in the Victoria 'Daily Times' a few days ago to the effect that the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), when this Bill was in committee, said that he was perfectly willing to withdraw his amendments, and that thereupon those members of the Conservative party, who said they supported the Bill in its original form, became immediately frightened and receded from the position they had taken.

I would like now to ask the Minister of Labour if he would allow the Bill to go through the House in its original form, if the hon. member for Maisonneuve will withdraw his amendments? I have no reply but the answer is obvious. There was no doubt a bargain between the hon. member for Maisonneuve and the government. The hon. gentleman took his Bill to the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), and I have not much doubt, although it does not appear in evidence, that the Minister of Labour drew up the amendments, and that the hon. member for Maisonneuve accepted them. I have nothing further to add except that I regret the Bill has been so mutilated and should be quite ready to support the measure as originally introduced.

Mr. THOBURN. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the discussion; and the question which has puzzled me is why there should be the discrimination we see in the Bill as it is now before the House. Why should the government allow a man working upon a government building have shorter hours of work than upon a canal or railway? Is one man not as good as the other? By this Bill, in its amended form, he is not. But if one man be as good as another, why not give the man working on the government canal or railway the same hours of labour as when working on a government building. I have never yet heard a good reason why the Bill was amended. Has the originator of this Bill received any communications from the workingmen of Canada to the effect that they were not in favour of the Bill in its original form? If he has not, why has he attempted to amend it? Is there any opposition to the Bill? Why was the Bill not presented in its original form? I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to what extent does his amended Bill benefit the workingman? In its present shape would it benefit say 5 per cent of the workingmen of Canada? Would it benefit 2 per cent of our workingmen, or even 1 per cent? I would like the hon. gentleman to answer that question.

Mr. VERVILLE. If the Bill be accepted as it is and the principle adopted, probably my hon. friend will have reason to change his mind in five or six years.

Mr. THOBURN. That is not the answer I expected to get. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman still another question. As the hon. member has introduced this Bill in its present emasculated form, I would like to ask if he has received protests from any workingmen's organizations in Canada——

Mr. VERVILLE. Yes—from two cities out of the whole Dominion.

Mr. BOYCE. What cities?

Mr. VERVILLE. Victoria and Vancouver.

Mr. THOBURN. My question to the hon. member who has introduced this Bill in its present emasculated form is : Has he received any protest from any of the labour organizations of Canada? If he has, why does he persist in bringing forward such a Bill in this House.

Mr. VERVILLE. When the hon. member (Mr. Thoburn) has finished speaking, I will answer him if there is time. But I am not going to answer questions as he chooses to put them.

Mr. THOBURN. Will the Minister of Labour please answer that question? For, I can tell both these gentlemen that if they have not received such petitions, there are plenty of them in circulation. In addition to the petitions presented by the hon. member for New Westminster, I would like to present some that have been sent me from the labour organizations of the county I have the honour to represent and others. The first to be called to my attention was the decision by the executive of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada in session in Montreal. The following is the account of the matter given in the public press :

That it cannot give its approval to the proposed amendments in the eight-hour Bill to be introduced in parliament by Alphonse Verville, M.P., is the gist of a statement made public at 1.30 to-day by the executive of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada after a session at the Windsor hotel last evening, which was attended by the Minister of Labour, and another this morning.

The statement is in part as follows:

'With reference to the eight-hour Bill and the proposed amendments now before parliament, the executive of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, after full and very serious consideration of the whole matter, has determined that it cannot give its approval to the proposed amendments. The amendments, it is true, mean the recognition of the principle of the eight-hour day, but they are but a shadow of what the workers of this country are asking for. The proposed amendments give some benefit to the building trades, but will leave neglected most of those whom we represent. The principle of the eight-hour day has already been recognized by the government in numerous schedules enforced by it. That, impliedly, is a recognition of the principle by parliament which has never protested or objected to those schedules.

'The executive feel that the proposed amendments do not fairly meet the enlightened sentiment of progressive Canada and are but a hesitating and faltering step towards the goal so generally sought in this country. Without further detail at the moment, the Trades and Labour Congress, through its executive, cannot, therefore, approve of the proposed amendments and must stand by the Bill first introduced this session by Mr. Verville.'

I have received a petition from the Trades and Labour Council of the county which I have the honour to represent which reads as follows :

Carleton Place, Ont., Jan. 30, 1911.

At a joint meeting of the trades unions held in Carleton Place on Thursday evening last, comprising representatives of the metal trades council, machinists, boilermakers, carmen, moulders, stove-mounters, polishers, blacksmiths and trackmen's locals, a committee was struck off to draw up this letter to you defining our views on the eight-hour Bill and the amendments thereto.

We ask you as our representative to use your every effort to have Mr. Verville's Bill in it's original form. We consider that the manner in which this Bill has been mutilated by the Minister of Labour, who is supposed to be working in the interests of the workers of Canada, is a direct insult to us as a whole, and to Mr. Verville in particular as our representative labour member of parliament.

It appears to us as if the government wanted to get their caricature of a Bill through the House, in Mr. Verville's name, to be handed down as a specimen of labour legislature by a labour member.

Such legislation as the amended Bill promises to be is disgusting the workers here, and if there is a three-cornered fight at the next election we can thank the politicians who persist in ignoring the rights of the workers, who are beginning fast to realize they are the majority.

Committee, D. A. Bain, Wm. Simpson, John McPhail, George Humphrey.

(Sgd.) W. J. HAMMOND.

Mr. KING. Will the hon. member say who drafted that communication?

Mr. THOBURN. It is drafted by the Trades and Labour Council of Carleton Place.

Mr. KING. I understand that they passed it, but can the hon. gentleman say who wrote out the resolution?

Mr. THOBURN. The names of the committee appear upon the resolution as I have read it. Now, in the face of such evidence as this, I can only say that if the hon. member for Maisonneuve will introduce his original Bill, I shall have great pleasure in voting for it ; but I am bound to vote against the Bill in its present emasculated form.

Mr. COWAN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 2, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE BILLS—QUESTIONS OF ORDER.

Mr. SPEAKER. Upon the motion, yesterday, by the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River for leave to introduce a Bill intituled an Act to amend chapter 139, 4 and 5, Edward VII., intituled 'An Act respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited,' I stated that I would to-day give a more extensive opinion upon his right to introduce the Bill as a public measure.

Upon a careful perusal of the proposed Bill I find that it is composed entirely of amendments to sections of the Act incorporating the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited, the main provisions being as follows :

To compel the company to provide further plans and execute additional work and carry out any new works required by such authority as may have jurisdiction on the Rainy river at or near Fort Frances, and that if, upon the application of the town or otherwise, it appears that the company has executed any work not approved by the Governor in Council the company shall, if directed, carry out any work or make any change required, and also with regard to the flow of water through the works of the company, the supply of power and energy, and the regulation of the methods and conditions under which the same shall be furnished and the prices therefor. And, further, that the company shall deliver, in Canada, a stated proportion of the total power delivered by them, and that the town of Fort Frances may, if a resolution of its council represents that the determination of the quantity of power, prices, conditions and manner of service of electrical power and energy is important in the interests of the town, apply to the Board of Railway Commissioners, which shall determine such application.

As to whether certain portions of the Bill are, or are not, properly the subject of a public Act is not necessary for me to determine, but upon the extracts from the Bill which I have just given I would state the following opinions from authorities. It is stated by Bourinot, 3rd edition, page 706, that:

Private Bills are distinguished from public Bills in that they directly relate to the affairs of private individuals or of corporate bodies, and not to matters of public policy or to the community in general.

And at page 728:

'Bills from the corporations of towns and municipal bodies, generally, are always treated as private Bills when they desire special legislation affecting their property or interests.

And on page 729, Bourinot states as follows:

As a rule, it may be stated that when Bills treat of matters of general policy, such as sanitary, or police, or commercial, or fiscal regulations, they may be considered as public measures. In fact, all Bills affecting the general interests of the community, and involving considerations of public policy, are out of the category of private Bills dealing with the special interests of corporations or associations.

May 6th edition, page 626, says:

Every Bill for the particular interest or benefit of any person or persons, is treated as a private Bill. Whether it be for the interest of an individual, a public company or corporation, a parish, a city, a county, or other locality, it is equally distinguished from a measure of public policy, in which the whole community are interested.

Even in England the most extreme case in which a Bill affecting local interests has been admitted as a public Bill is in the case of the metropolis of London, where such Bills have frequently been held to be public Bills by reason of the large area and vast population and the variety of interests concerned, thus constituting them measures of public policy rather than of local interest.

This cannot be said to be the present case.

Ilbert's Legislative Methods and Forms (1901), at page 28 says:

A private Bill is a measure for the interest of some person or class of persons, whether an individual, a corporation, or the inhabitants of a county, town, parish or other locality, and originates on the petition of the person or persons interested. A public Bill is introduced as a measure of public policy in which the whole community is interested, and originates on the motion of some member of the House in which the Bill is introduced.

And on page 30:

Bills relating to particular localities only are, as a rule, treated as private Bills.

In view of the nature of the Bill proposed by the hon. member, and of the precedents (among which are those which I have already quoted) I must hold that the Bill is a private Bill, and must be introduced as such and must comply with the rules of the House respecting private Bills.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

BRIDGE ACROSS HUMBER RIVER, TORONTO.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Has the Grand Trunk Railway Company submited to the government or to the Minister of Railways and Canals plans for the erection of a new bridge across the mouth of the Humber river at Toronto?

2. If so, is it true that such bridge is only about 19 feet above the water, and contains abutments encroaching upon the river banks, and at least one pier in the middle of the stream, 15 feet wide by 80 feet long, which is said to be more in the nature of a dam than a pier?

3. Is the government aware that such a structure would practically dam up the river and cause water and ice to back up and ruin the banks and trees, &c., thereon?

4. Is the government aware that the Humber river is now a navigable stream from Lake Ontario to Bloor street, a distance of something over 2 miles, and the valley is about to become the site of a system of parks and driveways for the city of Toronto?

5. Has the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries been called to the fact that the erection of such a structure would be placing an obstruction in a navigable stream?

*Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not a written answer to this question, but I think I can give all the information which the hon. gentleman desires. The Grand Trunk Railway Company has applied to my department for the approval of the plans of a bridge across the Humber river, and they have also applied to the Board of Railway Commissioners for approval. From the fact that the company has applied to my department for approval, the application being made under the Navigable Waters Protection Act, I would assume that they are of opinion that the river is navigable. I have a communication from the city of Toronto to its solicitors and also from the solicitors of certain gentlemen who are interested in property along the banks of the Humber river, desiring to be heard. I have an application also from the company asking me to name an early date for the hearing, and I propose to do so and then to notify the city of Toronto and the solicitors for the gentlemen interested, so that all parties can have an opportunity of being heard.

'CANADA'S FARTHEST SOUTH,' PRINTING OF PAMPHLET.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. What was the cost of printing and preparing the pamphlet entitled 'Canada's Farthest South,' as published by the Minister of the Interior?

2. What amount of money was paid to H. A. Kennedy, of the London 'Times' staff for preparing same?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Cost of printing, $974.57. Cost of preparation answered by No. 2.

2. $255.50.

TARIFF ON FISH.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. On tariff schedule A, of January 26, 1911, articles free of duty, item 14, which reads: 'Fish of all kinds, fresh, frozen, packed in ice, salted or preserved in any form, except sardines and other fish preserved in oil; and shell fish of all kinds, including oysters, lobsters and clams in any state, fresh or packed, and coverings of the foregoing,' does the expression 'coverings of the foregoing' apply to and include the cans, packages, cases and coverings in which all classes of fish mentioned are contained?

2. Under item 15 of said schedule, which reads 'seal, herring, whale and other fish oil, including cod oil,' are the containers in which said oils are shipped, free of duty?

3. In a former tariff treaty, made with the United States, affecting Canada, were Canadian fish allowed free admission in the United States, and the cans, packages, cases and coverings, or any of them, containing same, held to be dutiable?

4. Were fish oils allowed free admission to the United States, and the containers thereof held to be liable to duty?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. There was some difficulty in former years as to the taxation of packages when the contents thereof were free.

4. I have not been able to ascertain whether the difficulty of former years applied to fish oil.

KINGSTON MILITARY FEED CONTRACTS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

To whom was the contract awarded for the supplying hay, straw and oats for the batteries at Kingston, and at what prices?

Mr. MURPHY. To Charles Donoghue at: $10 per ton for hay, $6.50 per ton for straw, 45 cents per bushel for oats.

PRINTING DONE BY 'GLOBE' NEWSPAPER

Mr. GRAHAM. I have been asked by the Toronto 'Globe' to make a correction in a matter which somewhat relates to my department, and the briefest way to do so is to read this despatch:—

The 'Globe' has received from the Dominion government, including the Intercolonial railway, during the past three years an average of $8,500 per annum. Three papers

here report Mr. Lennox as stating in the House that we receive $80,000 per annum.
(Sgd.) JOHN F. MACKAY.

APPOINTMENT OF CENSUS OFFICIALS.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to ask the government whether they are now appointing the census commissioners?

Mr. FIELDING. I am aware, from communications which I have had with the Minister of Agriculture, that he is receiving applications for appointment as census commissioners. I do not know whether any have been officially appointed or not, but I know that he is collecting names for that purpose.

SUPPLY—DAMMING THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I would like to call the attention of the government to proceedings which are now pending before the United States Congress for conferring powers upon a company which proposes to construct a dam across the River St. Lawrence near what is known as the Long Sault. We have in Canada what may be fairly described as the greatest system of inland waterways in the world, and every one of us, I think, realizes that the River St. Lawrence is not only an important, but a vital portion of that system of waterways. The Prime Minister is no doubt thoroughly aware that under the treaty between Great Britain and the United States which was negotiated and ratified in 1842, it was provided by article VII. as follows:

It is further agreed that the channels in the River St. Lawrence on both sides of the Long Sault islands and of Barnhart island, the channels in the River Detroit, on both sides of the Island Bois Blanc, and between that island and both the Canadian and American shores, and all the several channels and passages between the various islands lying near the junction of the River St. Clair with the lake of that name, shall be equally free and open to the ships, vessels and boats of both parties.

So that the channels of the River St. Lawrence, from shore to shore, at the particular point which I have mentioned, are, under the terms of this treaty, to remain forever open to both nations. The country was rather disturbed by a proposal which was brought before this House during the last session of parliament, to grant to certain gentlemen authority to construct that portion of the dam across the River St Lawrence which would lie in Canadian waters.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was no such proposal as that before parliament last session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, I have an entirely different recollection in that regard from that of my hon. friend.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend has not read the Bill, I am afraid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I read the Bill and debated it. The hon. gentleman is very ready to rise and interrupt and contradict. He is no more correct on this occasion than he has been on several occasions in the immediate past. The proposal that was laid before parliament last session involved the damming of the River St. Lawrence, according to my opinion of what that proposal really meant. I shall not go over that argument again. I stated my apprehension of what the proposal was at the time. The mere fact that the hon. gentleman entertains a different view of the proposal does not justify him in making the flat contradiction which he did a moment ago.

The legislature of the state of New York passed an Act, I do not know just at what date, which confers certain powers upon a company that had been organized in the United States. I believe that the real promoter of that measure is a very wealthy and powerful company in the United States called the Aluminium Company. The state of New York was not able to give to the promoters the complete powers which they desired, and there is now a Bill before the Congress of the United States which is designed to round out and complete the powers, so that this company may have absolute authority, so far as the state of New York and the Congress of the United States can give it, to dam the River St. Lawrence. I appreciate thoroughly, of course, the fact that we retain jurisdiction over our own portion of the bed of the River St. Lawrence, notwithstanding anything that the Congress of the United States may enact. This company proposes to develop about 500,000 horse-power. That is to be developed for purely manufacturing purposes, and I find in the measure a reasonable enough provision, if it were to go through, that at least half of this power shall be for use in the United States, and that no more than half of the total power generated by the complete works shall be employed or used in Canada. The Bill now before Congress has been opposed by a great many Canadian interests, as I am informed. I find, from a brief which has been filed in opposition to this Bill, that memorials have been filed before the Committee of Congress by the International Waterways Commission, the board of trade of the city of Toronto, the Dominion Marine Association, the Montreal board of trade, La Chambre de Com-

merce du District of Montreal, the Commission for Conservation of Canada, the Ontario government by its attorney I. Hillard, K.C., and Geo. C. Bolt, for the New York Board of Trade, all in opposition to the Bill. The Bill proposes, as I understand from this brief—because I have not been able to secure an authentic copy of the Bill except so far as it has been published in the press of the country—in the first place, a channel and a lock on the American side, and, in the next place, a complete dam across both channels. Of course, it is realized that authority to construct that portion of the dam across the Canadian portion of the channel must come from this parliament. The project includes all that, and this company has obtained from the state of New York and is in process of obtaining from the Congress of the United States the authority that will enable it by and by to come to this parliament and say, we now invite you to give us authority to make this connecting link for the purpose of developing this enormous power. I was rather struck by one sentence in the report of the Committee of Congress which had this Bill under consideration. That committee has favourably reported upon the Bill, and it now stands in Congress upon that favourable report. One sentence in that report I may quote as informing this House and this country of one powerful reason why that Bill has commended itself to the Committee of Congress. That sentence is this; the proposal of the company to furnish a suitable channel for commerce entirely in American territory. The dam will go completely across the river, from shore to shore, and the proposal is that the channel shall be entirely in American territory, the suggestion being that this will be a very much more advantageous situation for the people of the United States than that which exists at the present time.

Now this company undertakes to do very wonderful things. In the preamble of this Bill now before Congress it is said that, among other things, it is for the purpose of improving the navigaton of the St. Lawrence; and in the first section of the Bill there is the declaration that the purposes of the corporation include the permanent improvement of the navigation of the St. Lawrence at above or below such place. The government of Canada up to the present has followed the policy, and I hope will persevere in it, that the navigation of the St. Lawrence is of such paramount importance that it ought not to be confided to private interests, but should be kept absolutely under the control of the people as represented by parliament. But it appears that the navigation of that river shall be confided in a certain measure at least, to the great and powerful company which is behind those proposals. I do not propose to go at any length into the dangers of the Bill now before the American Congress; but I may say, quoting from the brief which has been filed in opposition to that Bill, that Mr. John Kennedy, of Montreal, a very skilful and experenced engineer, appeared as a witness on behalf of the Montreal Board of Harbour Commissioners. Mr. Kennedy is an engineer of very well known ability, character and experience. He lives upon the St. Lawrence and has made it a life study, more particularly as regards its navigation, and he did not hesitate to express the opinion that the project, upon the facts disclosed, would result in an impairment of navigation instead of an improvement. Two captains and pilots, who have been engaged for years in the navigation of the St. Lawrence, both upon freight and passenger vessels, joined in expressing the same opinion. The brief goes on further to state that the experience of the Canadian government in an energetic effort to improve navigation at the Galop rapids, is conclusive demonstration of the fact that it is impossible to tell in advance what effect an obstruction of this kind would have on the navigation of that river:

> The Canadian government, under the advice of its best engineers, expended $1,100,000 in an attempt to improve navigation at the Galop rapids for the last few years.

And I am merely quoting the brief when I say that the experiment has not proved a very great success and has not justified the anticipations which were formed with regard to it. Now it is stated further in this brief, and I commend this to the House as an opinion to which some weight might be attached:

> It is impossible for either engineers or pilots to state precisely what the result of the project would be as to navigation. The probabilities only can be suggested. The project once authorized, the investment once made, if the result is disastrous to navigation, the public will have to bear it, except on the condition of reimbursing the company for its investments.

Further than that, this proposal is said by the report of this commission to be probably subject—in all probability subject—to the sanction of the International Waterways Commission. It is perfectly true that one clause of the Bill does expressly state, according to the press report, that the said Long Sault Development Company, its successors and assignees shall be subject to the provisions of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain relative to the boundary waters between the United States and Canada, proclaimed by the President of the United States on the 13th July, 1910. But is not made expressly subject to the provision of the Ashburton

treaty, and the provisions of that treaty are much more vitally important to the people in that regard than are the provisions of the treaty to which allusion is made in the Bill now before Congress. The danger of ice dams is also pointed out in this brief, but as that was discussed last year, I shall not go into it to-day except to say that it is one which ought not to be lost sight of by the government.

I have spoken so far altogether of the danger which may result to our great system of inland waterways, but it seems to me there is possibly another aspect which should not be lost sight of. We know the importance of our water-powers to-day in Canada, and we shall realize more thoroughly in years to come their exceeding great value. They are not like supplies of coal and iron and other natural resources of this country, which are dissipated in the user. Our water-powers are permanent and enduring, and their value is likely to be much greater in the future. What are we to do with them? Should we preserve them for the benefit of the whole people of Canada or hand them over to the control of a great private corporation and an alien corporation at that? I think it would be madness for this country to consent to the latter alternative. I go further. When a project of this kind has been put forward on the other side of the line and has already received the sanction of the state of New York and is now asking the sanction of Congress, this government, not only on account of the danger of the impairment of the navigation of the St. Lawrence and our system of inland waterways, but for the purpose of protecting the great water-powers of this country and seeing that they are developed in the interests of the whole people, ought to take energetic measures to make known their views in this regard. The development of these water-powers, if ever undertaken, should only be undertaken subject to the paramount importance of our system of inland waterways. If it can be undertaken without the slightest danger of impairment to that great system, it ought to be undertaken by or under the control of this government so that these natural resources of immense value now, and of infinitely greater value in the future, should be conserved for the benefit of the whole people of Canada. Therefore I thought it right to bring these facts to the notice of parliament, even in this very brief and somewhat fragmentary way, and to ask the government whether in the first place they have taken any steps, or propose to take any, to safeguard the interests of navigation, and in the second place to make it perfectly plain that this country does not intend to commit itself to any scheme by which these enormously valuable natural resources shall be handed over to a private corporation?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Every one is aware that this is a subject regarding which, ever since it has been called to the attention of the country, there is quite a serious nervousness in public opinion as to the consequences which might flow from the intended works to which my hon. friend has just alluded. In fact I believe that the nervousness existing has been beyond the cause—natural and legitimate as it was—and what should have been the effect of such a cause. I believe that in many instances it has prejudged the opinion even of members of the House. And in this I would not exclude even my hon. friend, because, if I understood him aright, he has just expressed again the opinion which he expressed last session, that the Bill had the effect of authorizing the damming of the St. Lawrence. My opinion is different from that expressed by my hon. friend. Reading the Bill in cold blood, whatever may have been intended afterwards, it seems clear that the effect of the Bill of last session was simply to authorize a transmission line and nothing else.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am speaking of the Bill as introduced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Even the Bill as introduced, I think I am right in saying, related to a transmission line only. But my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and many other members of the House saw in this transmission line Bill something nefarious, they saw a scheme to block the St. Lawrence. And even in the observations my hon. friend has just addressed to the House, he shows that he still looks upon this measure as implying the damming of the St. Lawrence from shore to shore. Speaking for myself, at all events, before the government of the day would agree to such a proposal there would be very ample discussion in this House and a good deal more information than we have upon the matter at the present time. I understand that the men, especially in the city of Montreal, who are primarily interested in this question, seek to block this measure at every step because they fear that the ultimate object is to throw a bar across the St. Lawrence from shore to shore.

The Bill to which my hon. friend referred a moment ago was first introduced in the legislature of the state of New York and passed. It was afterwards introduced in the federal legislature at Washington and has, I understand, taken its preliminary stages. So far as I am aware—and, at present, my information concerning it is simply from the public prints—it deals only with the southern channel—

Mr. REID (Grenville). The South Sault.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That channel is undoubtedly in American territory. Now, let us take the first step in this matter.

The channel is in American territory; my understanding of international law is that a sovereign power has the right, in the case of an international stream such as this, to place upon its own shore of that stream all works which it deems for its own advantage, being limited alone by the necessity, as in this case particularly, of not doing anything which would affect navigation.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Would not the damming of the South Sault impair navigation?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not the question at the present time; I am considering only the principle of international law. The Americans, as I understand it, have the right to use that stream in any way they please, but they are not to do anything to impair navigation.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Under treaty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. That is the general principle of international law, but is still more true in this case because of the treaty of 1842. But, Sir, if a nation under such circumstances, does anything which, in the opinion of the nation on the other side of the stream, impairs navigation, who is to decide? Under international law there is no tribunal to settle the point whether it is or is not an impairment of navigation; and the only remedy under such circumstances would be for the party who thinks that the work does impair navigation to appeal to the honour and honesty of the other side.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The Ashburton treaty covers that point fairly. It states there must be 'free navigation,' so the sovereign right of the United States is given up.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is what I said. But I was pointing out that if the United States puts up a work on its side of the stream which in our opinion, impairs navigation but in their opinion does not impair navigation, who is to decide? If it were a provincial or national stream in our own territory, the matter would go before the courts. But the hon. gentleman knows that, while we have principles of international law well known and generally recognized by the nations, there is, up to this moment, no tribunal to see to the observance of these principles. The only arbitrament we have is that of war. But we can do this,—we can protest and appeal to the other side and represent that this is an interference with our treaty rights.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would not the Ashburton treaty cover that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is not the Ashburton treaty the last arbitration treaty—yes ; I was just coming, or had just come to that. While nations generally have no arbitrament in such matters we have constituted a tribunal to cover these points. So, this law of Congress, if it passes, would be passed over our protest, and the matter must be submitted to the court we have constituted under the Waterways treaty.

I may say that we on our side of the St. Lawrence have erected works, which, to some extent may interfere with navigation, but not to such an extent as to cause remonstrance on the other side?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Where are these?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that the dam at Sheik island is one. I do not know to what extent it may interfere with navigation, but in some respects, it is beneficial. No protest has been made. I put this by way of illustration. We have taken it upon ourselves to disturb the channel as nature made it.

When we heard of this Bill being introduced at Washington, we put ourselves into communication with the British ambassador to remonstrate; and correspondence is going on now upon the subject. I expect that we shall have an official copy of the Bill at a very early day. I may say that I was informed that the Bill reported from the committee in charge of the same is considerably different from the Bill as introduced. However that may be, we have taken steps to have the whole correspondence laid before us, and as soon as we receive it it will be our duty at once to lay it before the House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Have the government consulted in this matter with the government of Ontario or the Hydro-Electric Commission?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, we have not come to the point of consulting anybody. We have not the measure before us.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the intention to consult——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will decide that when we have the Bill.

Mr. BRODER. Apparently, the International Waterways Commission, under the treaty, will have a great deal of power in deciding this matter. If they decide it, will that put it beyond the power of this House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am afraid that the question of works to be constructed in the United States is beyond the jurisdiction of this House.

Mr. BRODER. But they know that under the treaty they cannot affect the height of the water on the other side without having the approval of both countries. So if they dammed the Sault, and it had the effect of raising the height of water on the Canadian side, we would have something to say about it What I wanted to know is if this

commission took the matter up and decided that a dam there was permissible, would this parliament cease to have any control over the subject?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a question of law. I would not be prepared to say.

Mr. BRODER. A very important question. There is one thing we must consider. There is no American interest that would suffer at all if this approval was granted. The only interests to suffer on either side are Canadian interests. You cannot put your finger on a single solitary American interest but that would gain by damming the river there. Now, look at the condition of things in the New England states. The large manufacturing centres that have been using water-power, and where they have denuded the country of timber, now find that a continuous water supply is failing them. There exists now a great deal of apprehension in the eastern states in manufacturing districts on this very point. The whole object of this undertaking is, if possible, to get control of that river for the development of electrical power, and to transmit that power to all that eastern section of the country, where the larger manufacturing centres of the United States exist. Now, we know that if they get control of that power and transmit it to these centres to build up their manufactories, it will be impossible for Canada ever to get back their share of that power, if they once let it go. Now these are questions certainly of vital interest to the Canadian people. I speak from a local knowledge of the circumstances. We know that engineers, with all their intelligence, sometimes make great mistakes; they have made great mistakes in this country within a short time. No one can tell what effect that dam might have upon the general interest of navigation in this country; we do not know anything about it. It seems to me that if a commission is to be allowed to deal with this matter, they should have at least the most thorough knowledge of the local conditions before they do anything. I live in a locality that will be seriously affected by this dam, at least that is the apprehension, and for that reason I did not wish to allow this matter to pass without saying something.

Mr. TURRIFF. There is one phase of this question that has not been touched on. When it was up for discussion a year ago, it was pointed out that in 1901 this House gave the St. Lawrence Power Company authority to dam the St. Lawrence river at this particular point. That company was partly Canadian and partly American, but afterwards the charter was assigned to a totally American company. All that company require at the present time is the approval of the Minister of Public Works to the plans that they may submit to this government, in order to enable them to build a dam across the St. Lawrence river at this point. It was stated by one of the men interested in the Bill that was before the House last year, that they were going to get the authority, they were going to build a dam, and they would give Canada 90 days in which to take up one-half the power, and if it was not taken up within that period, the whole power would be sent to New York, the idea being to send it to New York city. What I would like to be sure about is that this company cannot get the right to dam the St. Lawrence by getting the approval and authority of the present Waterways Commission. I would like to have the assurance of the Prime Minister that was given last year, that before anything is done on that line to enable this company, or any other company, to dam the St. Lawrence, before any plans are approved, or authority is given, there shall be an opportunity for ample discussion of the whole matter in the House of Commons.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Perhaps we had better get a clear understanding of the position we are in. What are our legal rights in reference to this matter? The hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Turriff) says that in 1901 power was given by this parliament to some company to dam the river. My contention is that under the Ashburton treaty no government in this country can give power to a private company to do anything of the kind; that power must come directly from the parliament of Canada. Have we the right to delegate all our powers to this International Waterways Commission? I saw it stated when the Bill was introduced in the United States that this legislation must be subject to the approval of the International Commission. Have we given our powers to that commission that we exercise under the Ashburton treaty? If we have, then that commission have the power of approval of a project to erect the construction provided for by that Bill. As I understand the agreement between the two governments, they have both given to this International Commission the approval of works of this kind. I need not dwell upon the necessity of this work, I spoke upon it before in the House. I have a strong view that this spot is perhaps one of the most beautiful in Canada, and it ought to be preserved to the people of Canada for all generations. Its value

to Canadians from an aesthetic point of view will be greater than its value as a source of electrical power. How much the proposition will interfere with navigation, we know not. I think perhaps improvements could be made on that stream of such a character that they would not interfere with the use of the river for navigation. But I protest as a Canadian against the damming of the river at that beautiful spot, and using it solely as a purpose of acquiring wealth. My ideas may be perhaps not sufficiently utilitarian, not up to the ideals of the present day, but such as they are I gave them to the House. I did not know that the Act passed by this House in 1901 had the wide power the hon. gentleman says it had. I do not remember any such Bill passing the House, I doubt very much if it gave such power. It may be a Bill empowering them to do some kind of work, but I do not think there is anything on our statute-book transferring this property absolutely to them. The control of that is entirely in our hands. We have not interfered with the navigation in any way on our side. We have improved the navigation. The erection of the Sheik's island dam for the purpose of improving navigation has interfered in no way with any right that the Americans had under the Ashburton treaty. It was improving and utilizing the river for the purpose of navigation and not for the purpose of interfering with it at all. That is a right which we have exercised from time immemorial and can. Finally, let us keep that, one of the beauty spots of the country, for the benefit of the whole people of Canada, not devoting it to the utilitarian purpose of generating 500,000 or 600,000 horse-power, but keeping it to look upon, if for nothing else.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did I understand the Prime Minister to say that he had already protested to British Ambassador Bryce against the passage of this Bill in Washington?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We made representations—yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). With reference to the understanding of the Prime Minister that this is simply to dam what is called the South Sault, I have before me the Bill which was passed in New York state, and which is being confirmed in Washington, and they are asking for power.

To construct, maintain and operate for water-power and other purposes a dam or dams across the St. Lawrence river between points on the United States and Canadian shores of said river near Long Sault island, or Barnhart's island or Sheik's island.

Mr. LENNOX. And to the international boundary.

Mr. REID (Grenville). To the international boundary line. So, it is not through what is known as the South Sault. The Prime Minister also stated that we had practically violated the Ashburton treaty when we had built what is known as the Sheik's island dam.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say that. I said that we had interfered with nature.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Sheik's island dam is below the head of the canal, so that there was no waterway. There might have been a little water running through but there was no navigation of any kind. The Ashburton treaty says that neither government must interfere with navigation between Sheik's island, and the American shore, and Sheik's island is on the Canadian side. If there had been navigation between Sheik's island and the Canadian shore we would have been interfering with the Ashburton treaty.

Mr. GRAHAM. What are the words of the Ashburton treaty?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). They are not just exactly as they are construed in this discussion. The words are as follows :

It is further agreed that the channels in the River St. Lawrence on both sides of the Long Sault islands and of Barnhart island; the channels in the River Detroit on both sides of the Island Bois Blanc, and between that island and both the American and Canadian shores; and all the several channels and passages between the various islands lying near the junction of the River St. Clair with the lake of that name, shall be equally free and open to the ships, vessels and boats of both parties.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is to say that in the Canadian channel the Americans have the right of navigation, and in the American channel the Canadians have the right of navigation.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Ashburton treaty says that the channels in the St. Lawrence river are free to both parties. There is not any channel on the other side of Sheik's island. The whole channel is at Long Sault and at Barnhart's island. This South Sault channel that they propose to dam is a navigable stream, and is used every day. It is the channel that freight boats are going down every day ; not very large freight boats, but steamers 100 feet long and 20 feet wide run down through there. They carry probably 100 tons. Then, the rafts all go down through the South Sault, and they have been running down there for fifty or one hundred years. The smaller pleasure steamers go down there. If they dam that channel, I understand the right hon. Prime Min-

ister believes that the north side would then be all right for those large steamers like the Richelieu Navigation Company's steamers. But the damming of the South Sault is sure to raise the water many feet. I suppose the effect will be to raise it 40 feet. Thus, it will throw the water into the North Sault and spoil that channel. That is the impression of marine men. They have led the Prime Minister to believe that all they propose to do is to erect this dam but, once that channel is spoiled, you might as well let them go on and do as they like.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid, Grenville) understands the local conditions, and I would like him to explain. I understand that the Bill provides that this company shall have the right to extend dams as far northward as the international boundary line?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. That would cross over from the shore to Barnhart's island, and then to Long Sault island.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And then from Long Sault to Shiek's island.

Mr. LENNOX. And the international boundary is north of Sheik's island.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No Sheik's island is on the Canadian side.

Mr. LENNOX. Well, that would extend their dam as far north as Long Sault island before they would come to the international boundary?

Mr. REID (Grenville). It would extend it to Sheik's island dam which would be the international boundary.

Mr. LENNOX. The international boundary is south of Sheik's island.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. In doing that would they not be cutting off the only available channel there is now?

Mr. REID (Grenville). We would only have a small part of the stream. At that particular point where they want to construct the dam practically the whole of the river is on the American side. The South Sault is entirely on the American side.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is a question for the engineers as to what would be the effect of this work. The Bill which is now under consideration at Washington does not, as the hon. gentleman has stated quite incorrectly, provide for the creation of a dam from shore to shore, but only provides for a dam for the South Sault.

Mr. REID (Grenville).

Mr. LENNOX. A dam to the international boundary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps it would be to the international boundary.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I think the right hon. gentleman is mistaken. The Bill provides for a dam all the way across.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Bill as introduced in the state of New York provided for a dam from shore to shore, but we will know only when we have the Bill before us. My impression is that the present Bill which has been reported from the committee, and which has taken its first stage at Washington is for the building of a dam across the South Sault.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It also enables them to build from shore to shore. Here is the original Bill which was passed in New York state.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think my hon. friend is wrong, but we are interested in knowing what would be the effect of the damming of the South Sault, and that alone is quite sufficient to raise a discussion in order to know where we are with reference to it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Exactly, but this proposition to dam the South Sault is certainly a violation of the Ashburton treaty If we do not object to the damming of the South Sault we will certainly be allowing them to violate the Ashburton treaty without protest. I do not think that the United States Congress would pass a Bill which violates the Ashburton treaty if we notify them to that effect, and I think the Prime Minister in the name of Canada should enter his objection at once. If the Canadian government is silent our silence may be taken for consent. The Prime Minister knows that prominent Canadian lawyers have been engaged by this company to appear before Congress and I understand they have represented that this is satisfactory to the Canadian government, so that we should take measures not to leave them under any wrong impression about that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As reported in the press this company is authorized

To construct, maintain and operate for navigation, water-power and other purposes for 99 years a dam or dams in so much of the St. Lawrence river as lies south of the international boundary line between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada, near Long Sault, Barnhart, and Sheik islands either independently or in connection with like works now erected or to be erected in so much of said river as lies north of said international boundary line, with a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto and a lock or locks, a canal or canals, and other structures appurtenant thereto.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then, if that be true it is plain that the Prime Minister misunderstands the nature of the Bill before Congress. I shall send a copy of this over to the Prime Minister and I trust a protest will be entered by him. I am quite satisfied that the right hon. gentleman is as anxious as I am to protect our great waterway system, and if he has been misled as to the intentions of these people he should at once communicate with the authorities at Washington so as to stop this Bill going through Congress.

Mr. C. A. MAGRATH (Medicine Hat). I wish to say a few words in connection with this matter, not from any sentimental reason as expressed by the hon. member for South Lanark, but because it appears to me there is a principle involved in this question which should be settled by the Canadian parliament. I am opposed to the damming of the St. Lawrence river and I believe it to be in the interests of the Canadian people that we should oppose it. Last year we had a discussion extending over several hours on this matter, and it was then stated to the House that certain interests had applied to the government to be permitted to dam the river; that they had submitted certain plans, that the government sent three engineers to the place to examine the situation, and, that these engineers reported against the project. I understand the idea was to build a dam some 50 feet high so as to create about 600,000 horse-power. Then those interests came back to the government about a year afterwards with amended plans and the same engineers were sent to report upon the amended scheme and they reported it to be satisfactory. What struck me in examining the reports of those engineers is that they looked at the matter purely from the standpoint of the feasibility of erecting a dam and creating that quantity of horse-power without doing damage to the immediate neighbourhood, but, what I should like to have seen brought out by the engineers was the economic value of the project to the people of Canada. That point was not touched upon as it should be. I do hope that our engineers when acting for the people of Canada would in dealing with such questions take into consideration the economic side of the question. The question arises: Do we need the development of 300,000 horse-power on the St. Lawrence near the city of Montreal. I say we do not. I believe there is sufficient water-power in the immediate neighbourhood of this city to supply the needs of the people of eastern Canada for many years to come. If we had a proper inventory of our water-powers and if we had any authority who could tell us the needs of this country at the end of the next 100 years, and should it be discovered that we have sufficient power for our own purposes and some to spare, I would be willing to join in obliging our neighbours. But, when we have private interests coming here asking for the right to dam the St. Lawrence river, insistent applicants who will return year after year, it is high time for the government to lay down the policy that the St. Lawrence river is not to be touched so far as the Canadian side is concerned. I should like to hear the government announce that they will not join in any movement to dam that great waterway from the American to the Canadian side. The St. Lawrence river is one of the scenic routes of the world; its scenery to-day is one of the assets of the country, and it will become a more valuable asset as time rolls on. The scenic beauty of the St. Lawrence is now a valuable asset to the cities of Montreal, Quebec, and Toronto, and we should not lose sight of the fact that apparently it is of no corresponding value to cities on the other side of the line. However, that may be, I have never yet heard it stated that the people of Canada need the power which it is proposed to secure by damming the St. Lawrence river at this place. Last year the Minister of Public Works announced that if the river should be dammed he would see that Canada received one-half the power. I go further than the minister; I do not lose sight of the fact that we have 7,000,000 people in Canada as compared with 90,000,000 in the United States, and my doctrine is: Equal division yielding equal benefits. That is the doctrine we should insist upon, and so far as I am concerned, if these very persistent private interests have got the government committed in any way to the damming of the St. Lawrence; then, we should take care that for every 500 horse-power taken out on the American side the same amount should be taken out in Canada and put to beneficial uses here. That is the doctrine I believe in. I submit, however, in the interest of the country that the St. Lawrence river should be left alone so far as Canada is concerned.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I speak with a good deal of hesitation on this question as I cannot attempt to deal with anything that has been said on either side to-day, but I have followed with the closest possible attention everything which, up to the present time, has been said in this House either last year or this year referring to this matter. It is inevitable, I suppose that I should look at this subject very largely from the lawyer's standpoint, but while I know that is so, I am consoled by the reflection that it is very seldom indeed that good law is not good sense; and in whatever I have to say in the matter, I hope hon. gentlemen will do me the justice to believe that I am not trying to lay down the law at all, but that I want merely such

views as I have on the subject to be treated by my fellow members just according to the amount of sense that they think there is behind them. The question here properly concerns our international relations with the United States, and in that sense is one, I take it, of international law. But while we use the phrase 'international law,' understanding very well what we mean by it, I think we ought always to remember that, after all, there is no one competent to say with any authority, what international law is, or what it requires. There are no statutes, no enactments of parliament, defining what is the law of nations; there is no court, no judge, who can authoritatively declare this or that or the other principle to be one which nations must regard; and we are driven, in endeavouring to see what are the rights of peoples as a matter of international law, back to the relations which exist between individuals in the same community and governed by the same law. Now, if you think of the situation of this river, apart from any international agreements, but simply as a matter of what this country could do about it if the United States saw fit to place any obstruction in a channel of the river which is wholly within their territory, I think it is manifest that we should be practically helpless, exactly as, if the facts were reversed and Canada were proposing to erect any dam or obstruction in a channel of the river which was wholly Canadian, the United States would be practically helpless to prevent it. The most that could be done by either nation would be in the way of expostulation to the other —representations that you ought not to do this, that it is not fair or right that you should. As a matter of fact, we have international agreements to which we can refer and appeal, if we can satisfy either ourselves or our neighbours that any transgression of these agreements is being contemplated. But in the absence of such agreements, there would be no security even to what we regard as the paramount right of navigation, much less any means practically existing by which, if a proposed work in the United States were going to damage property in Canada, or a proposed work in Canada were going to damage property in the United States, the country which feared the damage, could prevent that damage being done. But it is always founded upon the circumstance that there will be damage. Suppose this stream were all in one country; suppose that the International boundary had been fixed on the 44th parallel instead of the 45th, so that all the territory in question would be in Canada; and, to avoid any complication, let us assume it all to lie in the one province of Ontario. Now, what would be the right even in law or in equity, of a man who owned property on the north shore of the river as against the people on the south shore, who might be wanting to do the very thing which is proposed to be done in this instance? That right would simply be—in the sense of the thing surely—would be that if the proposed work were going to damage the man on the north shore, the courts would stop it. He has a right to have the natural level of the water preserved as it passes his land. If he is going to be flooded by the proposed work, or if the level is going to be lowered to his damage, he can prevent it if he goes to the court and takes proper steps to do so. So that at the basis of the whole right, in honesty or sense, to make any objection, there lies the hypothesis that damage is going to be done, that the level of the water is going to be changed to some man's detriment. And that is equally the basis of any reasonable ground of expostulation by one country to another, if conditions exist such as are said to be found in this case. If it is reasonably manifest that the effect of putting this proposed obstruction in the United States channel of the St. Lawrence at the Long Sault will raise the level or lower the level on the Canadian side, to the detriment of Canadian property owners, there is a reasonable ground for expostulation; and, happily in this instance, by reason of treaty arrangements, there is more than that. There is a basis upon which objection can be taken on our part that would certainly be effective. But unless there is plainly going to be such damage, there is no ground to object. Nobody is hurt, and there would be no foundation for an objection or expostulation, if we made it.

Now, let me ask hon. gentlemen to think of the situation on the ground at this place. We all know more or less about it, from our general knowledge of the geography of the country. I happen to have the advantage of personal knowledge by having been all over Sheik's island on foot and having examined this very locality. We have the main channel of the St. Lawrence and two islands in the channel—Sheik's island, wholly Canadian, the Long Sault island, wholly in the United States; the boundary running in the main channel between the two islands; the United States island up-stream, but the two islands overlapping each other, for a considerable portion of their length, a channel between the United States island and the mainland of New York state, and a channel, when things were in a state of nature, between the north side of Sheik's island and the mainland of the county of Stormont. Canada has interfered with the natural condition of things at this point. It has not left the natural channel between Sheik's island

and the mainland of Ontario open, as it was in a state of nature. Canada, for its own purposes, has had a dam built at the upper end of Sheik's island, which prevents the inflow into the natural channel of any water from the Long Sault rapids. Canada has appropriated that natural channel between Sheik's island and the mainland of Ontario as a part of its Cornwall canal for the purposes of navigation and incidentally for the creating of water-power, because at the lower end of Sheik's island is another dam and the surplus water forms a mill-pond which is used for the purpose of creating power. I have never heard that Canada consulted the United States before interfering in that way with the natural condition of things at that point. Any one in Canada would have said to such a proposition: What have the United States to do about it? We are not proposing to alter the level on their side, we are not going to do them any harm, we are simply utilizing our own property, and we think we can make better use of it than by leaving it in its natural state.

Have we any more right to protest or expostulate with the United States if they propose to use the channel on their side for their own purposes and in the manner which to them may seem best? I cannot see how, either as a matter of international law, or private law, or reason, or common sense we could do so. Some company, I understand, proposes to build a dam at the foot of the channel on the American side between their island and their mainland in New York state. What is going to be the effect? Of course it will interfere with navigation at once unless, as I understand is intended by the scheme, the interests of navigation are to be protected by the construction in the dam of a lock, making the dam in that way not an impediment, but actually an advantage to navigation. The effect then will be to create a mill pond above the dam between the United States island and the main shore of New York state. If the dam is not constructed so high that it will back the water around the upper end of the United States island, but will still, notwithstanding its presence at the foot of that channel, leave the level in the mill pond not as high as the water at the head of the island, it is surely manifest there can be no effect on the level on the Canadian side. I fully concede that the moment a dam at the foot of this island is made higher than the level of water at the head of the island, it will flood the channel and interfere with the level on the Canadian side. There would be ground for expostulation, for more than expostulation, under existing treaties, if that dam were built high enough to raise the level higher than the upper end of the United States island and thus affect the level on the Canadian side. But are we to assume that this dam will be of such a height? I cannot assume it. On what ground would we have the right to do so? The interest of the parties desiring to build the dam, according to their statement, can be perfectly well served by the building of a dam which is not high enough to back the water around the upper end of the island, and if they are limited by their charter to the construction of a dam which will not back the water above the head of the island, they cannot affect the Canadian shore, and the interests of navigation are the only things to be considered.

That is exactly the situation under the existing treaties. The right of navigation is paramount and that right is secured. That right exists in this United States channel which it is proposed to dam, just as it exists in the old channel between Sheik's island and the mainland of Ontario which is to-day utilized as part of our Cornwall canal. The right of navigation is secured by treaty and is not proposed to be interfered with. On the contrary, it is proposed to be helped according to the plans of the promoters, and unless the right of navigation is interfered with, or the level altered on our own side, we have, under existing treaties, no cause to object.

I do not think much is to be gained by going back to the terms of the Ashburton treaty because we have a new treaty on this very subject which goes further, which governs this very situation, and which has been ratified by both countries and is in force to-day. Under the provisions of that treaty while it prohibits the construction of any obstructions in boundary waters except under certain circumstances, it impliedly gives permission to obstruct boundary waters. The provision of article three of the new Waterways treaty is to the effect that in addition to existing obstructions, no further obstructions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line—and the whole river is a boundary water from main shore to main shore—no new obstruction on either side affecting the natural level or flow of the boundary waters on the other side of the line shall be made except by the authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada, within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval of the International Joint Commission. Now the wording of that exception plainly implies that each country, within its own jurisdiction, has the right to authorize obstructions in waters such as these. No new obstructions, it says, shall be made affecting the natural level on the other side of the line except by the authority of the United States or

the Dominion within their respective jurisdictions.

Mr. LENNOX. Does my hon. friend think that that provision which deals with the question of the height of water only, supersedes article seven of the Ashburton treaty? Does that provision, just read, supersede article seven of the Ashburton treaty? It does not seem to me that they refer to exactly the same thing.

Mr. GRAHAM. What is article 7?

Mr. LENNOX. The article my hon. friend has read, which provides that the channels of the St. Lawrence shall be equally free to the ships, boats and vessels of both parties.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I have no doubt that, whatever I say, I shall see tomorrow that I have not dealt, as I should like to deal, with what has been said by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox). But, dealing with it as far as I am able to do at the moment, I would by no means say that the provisions of the recent Waterways treaty supersede those of the Ashburton treaty. Surely both can well stand together, the Ashburton treaty securing equal freedom for purposes of navigation—that is, freedom equally to the inhabitants of one country and those of the other country—in the river which constitutes the boundary, and the recent treaty providing that no new obstruction shall be put anywhere along that river on either side of the line which will have the effect of raising the level on the other side of the line, except: First, with the authority of the government of the country in which the obstruction is to be placed, and, second, with the approval of the International Joint Commission. Now, that language, I say, implies that the government of each country has the right to authorize, if it sees fit, such an obstruction as will alter the level on the other side of the line, and that obstruction, when it has been authorized by the proper government, must also receive the approval of the International Joint Commission before it can be permitted—the two things must concur. The language implies that there is a right, without any infraction of treaty obligations, on the part of either Canada or the United States, to authorize such obstruction as may affect the level on the other side of the boundary if, in the judgment of the legislature of Canada or the United States, such obstruction is desirable. Now, we have a proposition in the Congress of the United States to authorize such an obstruction. It is entirely within their legal right; they are not infringing upon any treaty obligation by entertaining that proposition. But, if they see fit to authorize it, then, if it will affect the level on the Canadian side of the boundary, it must receive the approval of the International Joint Commission before it can be permitted. That is an additional safeguard which we have secured by entering into this recent treaty. But, without it, if we had no treaty at all, we should simply be in a position where, without anything to rely upon except the natural sense of justice which should be common to all people, we were seeking to protest or expostulate with the United States in what they were proposing to do. In the circumstances which exist, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be difficult for us to frame any line of diplomatic objection or remonstrance which would have any effective foundation. It could at once be answered by the United States that, under the terms of our treaty, we have the right to consider the advisability of doing this, and you are perfectly protected by the creation of this International Joint Commission upon which you are equally represented.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) stated that, under the Act of 1901, we had given the country the right to erect dams and utilize this power. Will the Minister of Justice please say whether he has seen this Act, and whether that statement is correct?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I do not know that I apprehend correctly the point the hon. gentleman from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has presented. There is a statute of 1901 to incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Co. I have not examined it with any care, but, glancing over it as it has been handed to me, it appears to give power to the company to dam the St. Lawrence river—to what extent I am not able to say upon such cursory examination. I think it would be perfectly competent for the United States Congress on the one part and the Canadian parliament on the other, to authorize the construction of a dam in the St. Lawrence, each on its own side of the boundary, and joining at the boundary, if the two legislatures saw fit to do so. But such a structure would at once be obnoxious to the recent treaty, even if it would not be entirely opposed to the provisions of the Ashburton treaty, and such a structure could not have, under the recent treaty, the approval of the International Joint Commission, because not only would it be an obstruction to navigation, but it would have the effect of raising the level of the water on both sides of the boundary line.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What I wanted to know was whether this is merely an empowering Act, granting the company the power to build these works if they secured

the right to do so, or whether it does give them the right to build the works and use the power?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would allow me to call attention to the provision of the Act of 1901, which authorizes the erection of certain dams, but provides that before the work shall be commenced the plans must be submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). My question goes further than that. Has the country passed over to the company the right to utilize that power, or is this merely an Act enabling the company, when they get that power, to construct these works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is correct in the latter statement ; it authorizes the company to construct these works, provided they get the necessary approval of their plans by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There are two distinct things. One is the conferring of corporate power upon the company to undertake this work, in other words, to declare that the undertaking of this work would be within their corporate powers. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) wants to know whether it is merely that, or whether it does not further actually invest this company with the authority of the parliament of Canada to do that work in the River St. Lawrence as far south as the boundary line.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the latter statement would give the authority of the charter correctly. There is no doubt that parliament authorized the company to construct these works in the St. Lawrence ; but it provided that before they commenced any work they must have the approval of the Governor in Council of their plans. I understand, pursuant to that authority, the company did do certain work between Sheik's island and the mainland. I think I may take this opportunity of recalling to the memory of my hon. friend, as well as of other hon. gentlemen, that at the last session of parliament, when a Bill was introduced by my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), a Bill not proposing, as my hon. friend from Halifax seemed to think, to give to the company which was then being incorporated any authority to dam the St. Lawrence, but merely creating a power transmission company, there was some anxiety upon the part of hon. members of this House with reference to the works, which the company incorporated some nine or ten years ago was authorized to carry on. The Prime Minister then gave the assurance to parliament that the government would not approve of any plans for further obstructing the St. Lawrence until the whole matter had first been submitted to parliament, and until the approval of parliament had been obtained. And further, a little later, when the Bill was under consideration, I myself drew an amendment ; I am not sure whether it was moved by the hon. gentleman who had charge of the Bill or not ; but at all events, it was moved and carried, and forms a part of the statute, and it is in these words:

Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to constitute an approval by parliament of any future development of water-power by erecting a dam in or across the St. Lawrence river under the chapter 111 of the statutes of 1901, intituled 'An Act to incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Company,' or otherwise; nor shall the company hereby incorporated be authorized to transmit power generated by the St. Lawrence Power Company other than the power generated by and in connection with the works already constructed by the said St. Lawrence Power Company.

There is a further provision contained in section 12, as if the assurance of the Prime Minister and the section which I have just read were not sufficient, and that further provision sets forth :

The Governor in Council shall not give his approval to the construction of any further canals, water courses, raceways, dams, wing dams, sluices or other works on the River St. Lawrence by the St. Lawrence Power Company, under the provisions of chapter 111 of the statutes of 1901, or otherwise, nor agree to or approve of any terms or conditions respecting the diversion of water or power from Canada, the consideration and rate to be paid therefor, the location of all dams and generating plant, the reservation of power for use in Canada, the safeguarding of Canadian canals, adjacent lands and navigation, the procuring of consent thereto from the British government under the Ashburton treaty or any other treaty, unless and until the plans, specifications and all terms and conditions shall have been first submitted to and approved by parliament.

I think it is, therefore, abundantly clear, both from the assurance of the Prime Minister as to what will be the action of the government, and also by the terms of these two sections which I have read, that no approval of any works upon the Canadian side of the St. Lawrence would be given, or could be given, until the matter had first been submitted to, and approved by parliament. Now, I desire, Mr. Speaker, just to add a few words in reference to the observation of the leader of the opposition with regard to the Bill which was introduced at the last session, and which I have now in my hands. The hon. gentleman stated that the design of that Bill was to authorize the company to erect a dam across the St. Lawrence river. From my seat I ventured to deny that, and the hon. gentleman, departing from that courtesy one

would expect from a gentleman who, I think, is desirous of always being considered courteous, the hon. gentleman said it was contradicting him, as I was in the habit of contradicting, without reason and without knowledge of the facts. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to say that outside of this House certain newspapers, and certain gentlemen have sought wrongfully, most improperly, and I say wilfully, and with a view to injure certain persons to convey the impression that the design of this Bill, as introduced by my hon. friend from West Lambton, that the design of myself, and of certain other members of this House who supported that Bill, was to authorize the damming of the St. Lawrence. I say that you cannot find from beginning to end of that Bill as it was first introduced, any provision, any clause, any word, which would give authority to dam the River St. Lawrence. I desire to make this public statement, and to assert now—this is perhaps the first opportunity I have had during this session—that a gross wrong has been attempted in certain newspapers of this country in seeking to create the impression that the Bill as first introduced at the last session of parliament had as its object to grant authority to dam the St. Lawrence river. I say it was, at the beginning when it was first introduced, it was during all its stages while passing through this House, it was when finally passed out of this House with the amendment, it was simply a Bill authorizing the transmission of electricity. When passed through the House it was neither less nor more than that, simply a Bill authorizing the transmission of electrical power. And, Sir, it is a curious fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, in speaking on this Bill last session, referred to a water-power which either had been developed or was being developed at Waddington, upon the American side of the St. Lawrence, and said that if power could not be obtained from any other source that power might be utilized for the distribution of electricity to the various points of eastern Ontario where people were very anxious to get electrical energy, and, that in certain remarks which were made by Mr. Beck, of the Ontario government, a leading member of the Hydro-Electric Commission, he was reported to have made the statement that the commission were at that very moment negotiating for obtaining water-power from a plant generating electricity at Waddington, upon the United States side of the St. Lawrence, they were in negotiation with the owners of that power for the purpose of obtaining electrical energy, to bring it across the St. Lawrence, and to transmit it to various sections in the province of Ontario. I felt, Mr. Speaker, that in justice to myself, and in justice to the gentlemen who supported the Bill which was introduced by my hon. friend from West Lambton, I should take an opportunity of referring to misstatements which had been made outside this House, and of correcting the error which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, forgetting, as he must have forgotten, the contents of the Bill as introduced, fell into with regard to the provisions of the Bill as first introduced last session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The statement I made was absolutely and entirely correct, and I will take a later opportunity of showing that it was so.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a question which affects the people that I represent directly, perhaps as much as any people in the province. I think I know the local conditions surrounding this question as well, if not better, than any man in the House, outside of the hon. member for Stormont county (Mr. Smith), this region having been my stamping ground as a young man, and I have been on these islands, the Long Sault, North Sault, South Sault, the waters contiguous to them and the land as well. As to the question which came up in the House last session, I was very anxious to have a Bill passed authorizing the construction of a transmission line. I then thought that I would be able, and I am in hopes yet that I will be able, to get power for the town of Brockville and the surrounding districts by a transmission line of some sort. I said then, and I repeat now, that I expected to get it independently of any new development at the Long Sault. There are two powers, as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), has said, in the same condition, except that one is capable of much greater development than the other, on the St. Lawrence. One is at Waddington, opposite the village of Morrisburg in the county of Dundas. The main river runs to the head of Ogden's island about three and three-quarters miles west of Morrisburg. Then it divides at the head of Rapide Plats. The main channel goes on the north side of Odgen's island ; what is known as Little river, goes on the south side between Ogden's island and the state of New York, or the town of Waddington. Many years ago authority was given in the state of New York to construct a dam there, and it was constructed without any reference to Canada, as I understand, it being altogether in United States territory and the entire stream of Little river being contiguous to the state of New York. For some years that water-power was used and then allowed to go into disuse on account of lack of transportation facilities by rail largely, the dam has been destroyed, or nearly so, and there is really no water-power to-day. It is undeveloped and any person who pro-

poses to supply power from Waddington, must remember that there is no power there to supply until it is developed by somebody with cash coming from somewhere. Now, we go down the river and we find Long Sault island. At what is known as Dickinson's Landing, or in the vicinity of it, the main channel of the Sault goes to the north and, just as in the case of Ogden's island, this island separates the St. Lawrence into the North Sault and the South Sault. The North Sault is the main channel. Hon. gentlemen forget, in discussing this question that no steamer goes down through the North Sault or the South Sault carrying any appreciable amount of freight. Large steamers use neither channel. They have to take the Canadian canal, so that, any interference with either of these channels would not interfere one iota in so far as navigation is concerned, with the carrying a large amount of the products of the west to the east, as these products, in the large vessels, have to go through the Canadian canal. Now, we find the South Sault all in American territory. At that particular point at least seventy per cent of the North Sault is altogether in United States territory as well. We perhaps forget in discussing it, that while we have a joint share in it we must not presume at all that at this particular point Canada owns the St. Lawrence river as most of it is in the United States, especially at the point where they propose to construct this dam. All of the South Sault is in the United States just as the Little river is in the United States at Waddington. Opposite Waddington on the Canadian side we have constructed a canal running from the head of Rapide Plats to the village of Morrisburg without the consent of anybody and the government are supplying water-power from the St. Lawrence river to several industries in the village of Morrisburg and also power for the running of the waterworks at Morrisburg. When we get to Cornwall we find the same condition. Those who have not lived along the St. Lawrence cannot have the same feeling. But I have not been able to bring myself to the point where I would care to see a dam stretching across the St. Lawrence from shore to shore at the Long Sault. It strikes me as something in regard to which I would need a lot of convincing before I would consent. I want hon. gentlemen to bear that in mind because I have been criticised for the attitude that I have taken. I took this attitude, thinking that I would be able to help the people I represent to get something that they are very anxious to possess. I have said that the interests of navigation must be kept paramount. No matter what else happens the great navigation and transportation interests of the Dominion must be the first thing that the people of Canada must look to and any power that may be developed, must be subsidiary to the greater interest of transportation. Now, Sir, having that in view, I come down to Cornwall. I find that Sheik's island is in something the same position as regards the Canadian shore as Ogden's island is at Waddington. The small stream between Sheik island and the Canadian shore probably was never navigated except by very small craft, but there was a stream running on the Canadian side.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). You are labouring under the same error that the hon. Minister of Justice was labouring under. There was a dam across. Mr. Snetsinger owned a mill there, and it was expropriated from him before the Sheik's island dam was constructed.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Snetsinger owned a small mill of some kind and he owned a small dam, but it was expropriated as my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart), has said. That bears out what I am saying that the government permitted that to be done by a private company which is even worse than the government doing it themselves.

Mr. LENNOX. Was it part of the St. Lawrence ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Part of the channel of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). It was erected before the canal was there at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, the river was there anyway, and the dam was erected by the consent of some person, showing clearly that it had been always conceded, at Waddington on the American side where the Little river was dammed by a private company and on the Canadian side at Sheik's island, where a dam was erected by a private company, that in Canadian territory, where no interests of navigation were affected, the United States had no rights and that in the United States, where navigation was not affected, the Canadian government had no rights. That has always been conceded.

Mr. LENNOX. The new treaty says that that shall not be done any more.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have made an improvement in that respect I admit. Now, I come to the Ashburton treaty. Just allow me to look at the legal side of the question for a moment. One provision of our agreement with the United States is, that our canals shall be as free to the vessels of the United States as they are to our own vessels. That does not mean that we cannot charge both fees if we like. According to the contention of some hon. gentlemen,

we must at all times, allow their vessels to go through our canals free. It does not mean anything of the kind; it says that they shall be equally free, and if we see fit to reimpose a fee on vessels going through the Canadian canals, United States vessels could be charged the same fee without any infraction of the agreement with the United States. The Ashburton treaty says that Canadian vessels on the one side and American vessels on the other shall be equally free to pass up and down.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). That was extended by the Washington treaty which made all waters of the United States free to Canadian subjects.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, that is what the Ashburton treaty meant. As I have intimated, I had not any idea directly or indirectly of giving any person the right to dam the North Sault by the Bill that was introduced last year. It was merely to get a transmission line by which power that already exists could be transmitted to some of the towns that need it so very badly. Now, the South Sault is altogether on the American side and, reiterating what I have said about the North Sault, I want to say frankly that if the South Sault, which is altogether in United States territory, can be utilized to produce power for the people along the St. Lawrence and for others, without doing damage to property owners on either side of the river unless they are fully compensated or, without injuring navigation, I am in favour of acquiescing in the project to make the proposed improvements at the South Sault.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Could we get a guarantee that we would get half of that power?

Mr. GRAHAM. If we had any right under the law to have it I would insist on getting it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do we give them half the power of the Cornwall canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, we do not give them any of the Cornwall canal power.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the power developed were used on the other side of the line I do not see where our advantage would be.

Mr. GRAHAM. My position would be this: I believe that we would get a good deal of that power on the Canadian side. I am not sure, because it is a matter of law, what rights we would have, but I certainly would use to the utmost any rights we might have to get for Canada some share of the power developed on even the South Sault. And if that can be done, then instead of giving away some of our natural resources we would be getting the people of the United States, to give us some of theirs. If any scheme would injure property or interfere with navigation, mark you, I would vote first, last and all the time against it. But, if it can be done otherwise, then I believe I am working in the interests of the people of the Dominion of Canada, and in the interests of my own constituents, if I could be a party to an arrangement by which it was provided that some of the power developed from the part of the river in the United States should come to Canada. I know the local conditions very well, I know every foot of the ground, and if as has been said power can be developed on the south side without injuring our interests then, if we could get part of that power it would be to the benefit of Canada, to allow that Bill to go through the United States Congress without any remonstrance from us, even if we have the right to remonstrate. What I want in my riding is to get power, I don't care from whom or from where if I get it at a reasonable price, and without doing injury to any interest.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What about the scenery?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have never been able to convince myself that I would allow the beautiful scenery on the north side to be touched; that is the way I feel about it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have taken a great deal of interest in the matter, and I thought that perhaps it might interfere with our canals, because mark you we have a canal on our side and the United States propose to build one on their side. I have a new man on the engineering staff of the department, who is said to be very competent, and two or three months ago I asked him to examine the situation in the vicinity of Waddington and Morrisburg, and also the Little river and the South Sault, and to report to me his candid conviction as to what effect it might have on our canals. I expected to have that report before now, and when I get it I shall lay it on the table of the House. I do not know what this engineer's opinions are or what his report may be, but whatever it is it will be interesting to the House, and I shall submit it as soon as I get it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (Simcoe). In the English House of Commons whenever an international question is discussed the practice is to forget party, and to think only of the welfare of the country, and I am glad to say that this debate so far has followed that practice. As nearly as a layman can interpret the proposition which the Minister of Justice laid down in a somewhat in-

volved way, it is that every country has the right to do as it pleases in its own territory. In this instance the United States and Canada have under the Ashburton treaty surrendered their sovereign rights to permit neither nation navigating in the territorial waters of each and the same privilege is applied to another part of the international waters below Detroit. So far as the consideration of this question is concerned the maintenance of unobstructed navigation should be paramount for the two countries, but when we examine the navigation routes along the Great Lakes we find that wherever there is a strategic point the United States government has endeavoured to short-cut it, create a deeper channel than we have, and so lead the business to their territory. At the Sault on the St. Mary's river the Americans have short-cut a channel through what is known as Mud or Hay lake, and thus diverted the traffic through their territory. All that traffic of ours from Lake Superior comes down through territory over which they have sovereign rights, and which they can close against us whenever it suits them. We cannot bring a vessel drawing more than twelve feet of water from Lake Superior to Lake Huron unless through their territorial waters. On the Detroit river we find that the American government has seized another strategic point, and they have within the last few years proceeded to clear a very large canal at what they call the Lime Kiln Crossing. They have erected large dams there and they have virtually ruined the navigation of the Detroit river in Canadian waters. There is at the present time before the Canadian government an application—which has not been laid on the table of the House, and which I think we should have laid on the table of the House—asking for the right to dam the Canadian side of the river which would stop navigation entirely on the Canadian side, so that all navigation would be in American waters. I ask the senior minister present if that is not so?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not so.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Has not the American government asked this government for permission to dam the waters of the Detroit river at a point called by the sailors Bobalong island?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When I said that it was not so, I understood the hon. gentleman to say that they had asked for authority to completely shut off the navigation on the Canadian side of the river.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The hon. gentleman is a beautiful juggler of words.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has no right to make such a remark. What they had applied for was authority to carry a dam from a point in the middle of the stream down to Bois Blanc island.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). That is exactly what I said. The hon. Minister of Public Works is an adept at making statements to this House which, while we must accept them in the fullest sense, we must accept with a mental reservation. There is no doubt that they did not apply for power to put in a dam which would totally destroy navigation in Canadian waters.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As the hon. gentleman said they had.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I have no doubt that motor boats and canoes could still go down the river, but so far as large vessels are concerned, the work would entirely destroy the channel. No protest was made by this government against that work, which is a work under the War Department of the United States. The greatest danger to this country lies in this, that that channel is entirely in American waters, and they could close it completely to us at that point, just as they could close the channel in Mud lake. Now, what is that sovereign right of ours at the Long Sault which they are attacking? They are attempting to establish a work which will divert traffic from our canal. They intend to put in a dam and a canal with 20 or 25 feet of water, according to the plans which were laid on the table of this House last session by the Minister of Public Works, which plans showed the damming of the river, although the hon. gentleman denies that to-day. His own words at that date also showed that that was the intention of the company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I must correct the hon. gentleman. He is making an erroneous statement. He says that I denied that the plans which had been submitted by the company showed a proposal to dam the St. Lawrence river. I never gave any such denial. On the contrary, at the last session of parliament, I stated that the plans submitted by the company did show a proposal to dam the river, but that the government had not approved of those plans.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I am glad that I am getting the hon. gentleman down to earth in this matter. I will bring him further down to earth, and will quote from 'Hansard' his very words in this House, stating that the intention of the company was to dam the river, although he denies that he said so last session. This is what appears in 'Hansard':

Mr. Emmerson. Were these plans which were submitted by the St. Lawrence Power

Company to your department for approval, plans for the construction of a work to connect with another work that would come out from the American shore?

Mr. Pugsley. Yes, the plans were for damming the river across from the Canadian side to the American side, and also for the building of a lock for the purpose of improving navigation, the idea being to give an additional lock to the one that is already there, and which was constructed and is owned by the Canadian government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman permit me?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). If the hon. minister will wait till I get through, he can answer all I say. When this question of damming the river now comes before this House, the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister state that the first authority was the Ashburton treaty—that was the primary rule with reference to this channel. The Minister of Railways and Canals endorsed that. The inference from the involved sentences of the Minister of Justice was that the new treaty was supplementary to the old treaty—that while the old treaty dealt with the right of navigation, the new treaty dealt with the right of developing power, and that anything done either by this parliament or by the Congress of the United States must be approved by the Waterways Commission. I will ask the House if that impression was not left on the House? But, strange to say, we had that great constitutional authority, the Minister of Public Works, saying last year something different, in answer to Mr. Sharpe:

Mr. S. Sharpe. What power has the International Waterways Commission to deal with this matter?

Mr. Pugsley. They simply advise.

Now, what protection has this country or the United States from the Waterways Commission in this matter, if we are to accept the word of the hon. Minister of Public Works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is speaking of a different commission altogether. The Minister of Justice referred to the new commission under the treaty which was ratified last session—the International Boundaries Commission.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Then perhaps the Minister of Public Works will tell us what authority the Boundary Commission will have in this matter. Will they have a veto on these plans or on the work if it is authorized by this parliament or by the United States Congress? Now, Sir, with reference to this matter, let us be practical and have a little common sense about it. I always like to hear the Minister of Railways talk, because he always takes a broad view, and it took a good deal of worming and twisting to satisfy his conscience that this work would be in the interest of the public or any one else, except the company that made aluminum. If it is necessary to have that work done to develop power at that point, I think the parliament of Canada and the government of New York state or the United States Congress should cause one of their various commissions to consider the matter seriously, and to see that if the power were developed, the rights of the public would be conserved, and we would not be turning over to some corporation a valuable franchise which it would immediately proceed to capitalize for $50,000,000 or $60,000,000. If there be anything to be got out of this, if it be necessary to have this water-power developed, let both countries jointly agree upon a plan upon which the development shall take place and decide the quantity of power each country shall have and the price to be paid. The whole trouble is simply this: Every one knows that an attempt has been made here to rob the public treasury in some way. The whole fight over this question has been due to the fact that a corporation in the United States—one of the most powerful there—which has a monopoly of a certain metal now of very great use in the electrical art, has been endeavouring to seize all the cheap water-powers of both countries for its own use. Let me tell the Minister of Justice that with the increasing use of that metal which that company produces, there will be no hope, should they develop that power, of his having any spare power for Brockville, because the company will use it all for their own purposes in the turning out of aluminum. Would it not be better to keep before the House and country the rights of navigation. The Minister of Public Works has been up to the shoulders fighting for the company which desires to get this water-power. He has resented the imputation that he has been endeavouring to boost this company, and to-day he denied that he ever wished to dam the river or do anything of that kind. Well, I think I could satisfy the House, from his own remarks, that he did, last year, try to have the river dammed, and the company which intended doing this is the same company which is seeking their charter in Washington.

Mr. C. J. DOHERTY (St. Anne, Montreal). The announcement made by the right hon. the Prime Minister early in this debate that the government had taken means to communicate with the American authorities with the view of remonstrating against the adoption of the measure now going through Congress, would justify us

in assuming that the government had taken the position that our rights were being infringed upon, or were in danger of being infringed upon by the proposed legislation. But according to the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) we have no rights in connection with this channel, and no ground upon which to remonstrate or expostulate. That seems to me rather a surprising statement. If the government take the position that even if the channels mentioned in the Ashburton treaty are being closed we have no grounds upon which to remonstrate, I do not think we can expect much advantage from the intervention which the right hon. the Prime Minister told us he was seeking to bring about, through the British ambassador, in this matter now pending before the American Congress. I understand the Minister of Justice to argue that there was no need for us to go back to the Ashburton treaty in order to ascertain our rights, because these were to be found in the later boundary water treaty. Subsequently, however, I understood him to say, in answer to a question, that the latter treaty did not supersede the former, and that the provisions of both are to be taken as equally standing. I submit that in order to ascertain what our rights are with regard to these particular channels, we must go to the Ashburton treaty and we will not find them anywhere else. It is perfectly true that after the Ashburton treaty had provided that the channels in the St. Lawrence on both sides of the Long Sault and Barnhart's island shall be equally free and open to the vessels and commerce of both countries, our later treaty provides in a general way that the navigation of the boundary waters shall remain free for the purposes of commerce and navigation to the inhabitants of both countries. But that general provision in the later treaty does not in any way supersede or affect the clear and express provision of the Ashburton treaty with regard to these two particular channels. If I am not greatly mistaken it is an elementary principle in the interpretation of laws and contracts that general dispositions do not derogate from special provisions made to regulate and govern and determine specific cases. I take it, therefore, that notwithstanding the general enactment contained in our last boundary treaty, that treaty does not in any way modify the provision of the Ashburton treaty with regard to these particular channels. In the face of that provision, I must confess that I heard with considerable astonishment the Minister of Justice lay down the principle that we were not concerned in and would have no right to interfere in what was being done on the American side of the river unless there was a question of raising the level of the water on our side. It is true, he added, that these gentlemen on the other side, who are asking for this power, had declared that they were going to provide in some other way for navigation. They do not deny that these channels, which the treaty says shall be open, are to be barred, but they say they are going to provide for navigation in some other way, and the Minister of Justice, therefore, concludes that we have no ground to expostulate.

Well, in the first place, it seems perfectly clear that what is being done is in violation of the express terms of the treaty. The channels are being barred. I do not suppose that it would be argued that to be equally closed to the people of both countries would mean the same as to be equally open to the people of both countries. I quite agree with the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) that the fact that the canals are to be equally free to both parties does not prevent tolls being charged, so long as those tolls do not discriminate against the people of one country. But, on the other hand, I do not suppose that he would carry the argument so far as to conclude that, provided the channels are equally closed to both parties, the provision of the treaty would be complied with.

Mr. GRAHAM. That loses me in the law.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman mind if I asked him a question? Because, this is a very interesting point.

Mr. DOHERTY. Certainly not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose that, on the Canadian side of the St. Lawrence, there were no Cornwall canal. Suppose we said: We are going to improve the navigation, for there are only rapids there with a depth of six or seven feet of water; so we will make a lock and give a depth of twenty feet, and that lock will be equally open to both countries; would the United States have a right to complain of that? Per contra, suppose the government of the United States says that the South Sault has a depth of only eight or ten feet—my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals says it is not so much as that—and they decide to build a lock that will afford a depth of twenty feet and will leave it equally open to both countries; could we complain of that?

Mr. DOHERTY. Now, with regard to the first question, it seems to me that before there is any occasion to answer that question, one would want to know whether there was a channel, properly speaking on our side. Because that which is dealt with by the treaty is not, in general terms, the right to navigate the waters anywhere. We have particular channels which are indicated as existing, and it is said that

these channels shall remain open to the ships of both parties. That is not a general declaration that the parties shall be free to navigate in any part. Now, I am willing to take the statement as to the fact of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) or the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) as to whether there was any channel on our side which could come within that description. The channels mentioned there, the channels on both sides of Long Sault islands and of Barnhart island, if I understand rightly, are on the American side. The treaty is dealing expressly with channels that are on the American side, actually existing channels, and it provides that they are to be open to us. Now, somebody goes to the American Congress and says: We want leave to close up all these channels, but we will give you something as good. Now—

Mr. PUGSLEY. Pardon me. What the Minister of Justice was referring to particularly was the closing of one channel—not of both—between the South Sault and the mainland. That, as I understand it, is not the main channel for navigation purpose.

Mr. DOHERTY. But I understand that it is one of the channels mentioned. And I am told that the legislation authorizing the making of a dam from the mainland on the American side to the boundary takes in both of these channels mentioned in the treaty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Minister of Justice did not deal with that feature.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, he did.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, he said the channel was between Long Sault island and Barnhart's island.

Mr. LENNOX. And also one to the north.

Mr. DOHERTY. At one stage, if I understood him, he was proceeding to show that the barring was to be done only in the south channel, and argued that unless it was shown that the water would be dammed back so as to raise the level on the Canadian side, we had no standing ground for remonstrance or expostulation. In other words, here it is publicly and openly proposed to close the channels which, under the treaty, are always to be open to us, and the minister tells us that the matter does not concern us, and we have no standing ground if we desire to remonstrate. The Minister of Public Works asks: Suppose they were going to alter one of these channels and improve navigation, should we have the interest to object? Certainly we should not have the interest to object,—whatever our right might be—if it were absolutely established that the change was going to improve navigation.

Mr. DOHERTY.

But that is precisely the matter that the Congress of the United States is undertaking to determine. And we are not concerned—I understand the Minister of Justice to say—if the Bill provides that a channel shall be made for navigation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was dealing in my question, wholly with the South Sault, which, I understand, is not the main channel and not a good channel.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is a splendid channel.

Mr. DOHERTY. Whether good or bad, here is our contract. It deals with the south channel, whatever it may be, and it declares that it shall be equally open to both countries.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Equally free.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not think I made a mistake. No, the treaty says 'shall be equally free and open'. If that is not clear, and if it is not clearly applicable to the south channel, then, of course, I do not understand English. But all this is being done ex parte; and when we ask if the government is doing anything about it, we are first given to understand that the government is doing something about it, and this is followed by a statement of the Minister of Justice that, for his part, he does not see that we have any ground to remonstrate or expostulate. And I ask, what good results can we expect from intervention if the government is going into court with a feeling, and that publicly announced, that it has not a leg to stand upon? I do not think the country will gain benefit from the intervention. But, I say that, far from not having ground to stand upon, we have the prima facie ground that our agreement is being violated. It may be true that these gentlemen, or the American government, are in the position to supply something that will be a remedy of the wrong. But it will only be a remedy of the wrong; they first create the wrong by violating the agreement. And I do not understand that, as between parties making an agreement that a thing shall be done in a particular way, it remains open for one to say: I will not do what we agreed to do, but, without consulting you I will do something contrary to our agreement, but I will provide something just as good. At this stage we are vitally interested in having our rights put before the American authorities in the strongest possible way. And with all respect—and it is with great respect—and with all deference to the opinion of the Minister of Justice on a question of law or a question of common sense (if it can be said that there is any difference between these two) I submit that we have a very strong case indeed to put before that Congress. I would like to point out something further. The Min-

ister of Public Works asked me a question a few moments ago as to whether, if we did certain things on our side of the water, the American authorities could object. Now, I think I could not answer him better than in his own words. The same question came up last year as to the extent of our rights on our side of this water and the Minister of Public Works said then:

I recognized that this parliament could not pass any legislation which would authorize a dam to be constructed in the river without putting in the condition that it should be subject to the approval of the executive government of the United States.

Now, either under this agreement we do not stand on a footing of equality ; or, if the executive government of the United States has a word to say as to our erecting a dam on our side of the river, clearly we must have a word to say about their erecting a dam on their side of the river. There is another consideration. I gathered from what the First Minister said that in this matter we were afforded some protection under the Boundary Waters Commission by reason of the fact that whatever the American Congress did with regard to authorizing works on its own side, it could not be carried out without approval of the Boundary Waters Commission. In that respect I am quite in agreement with the Minister of Justice ; we are afforded, as I understood him to say, absolutely no protection in this matter under the boundaries treaty unless the work that is being done there throws the waters back so as to raise the level of our side. So far as it may be an absolute block to navigation, the Boundary Waters Commission wont have a word to say about it; their powers wont come into play unless the work not only stops navigation, but throws the water back so as to raise the level on our side. I understand that I am not differing at all from the Minister of Justice in that regard. That I think is manifestly clear, from looking at the clause which provides for the intervention of the Boundary Waters Commission, that is clause 3. It is as clear as anything can be, and if it were susceptible of being made more clear than it is, I think the Minister of Justice, in expounding it with that clearness which is habitual to him, has made it so:

It is agreed that in addition to the uses, constructions and diversions heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreement between the parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line——

This is the important part :

—affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions, and with the approval as hereinafter provided of a joint committee to be known as the International Joint Commission.

So that the power of this International Joint Commission comes into play only as far as an obstruction may affect the level of the water or the flow of water on our side. But so long as our objection rests upon a complaint that what has been done already, or may be done under this legislation of congress, is an obstruction of navigation, the Boundary Waters Commission will not have a word to say about it and we are entirely without protection save in so far as we may be protected by expostulation or remonstrance, either before or subsequent to the passing of this legislation. It seems to me, assuming the only injury to be done is to navigation, that this much vaunted treaty with this additional protection, will give us absolutely no protection at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does my hon friend think of article 9? Would not that cover the ground?

Mr. DOHERTY (reading) :

The high contracting parties further agree that any other questions or matters of difference arising between them involving the rights, obligations or interests of either in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other, along the common frontier between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, shall be referred from time to time to the International Joint Commission for examination and report whenever either the government of the United States or the government of the Dominion of Canada shall request that such questions or matters of difference be so referred.

I thought the Minister of Justice had only cited article 3 as applicable, and I still think it is the only article that gives us any recourse in this matter. The general provision here is for submitting all other questions that may arise, ' any other questions or matters of difference.' But article 3 has determined how you will submit questions that have regard to obstructions to navigation, and as the Minister of Justice very correctly said, article 3 necessarily implies that so long as such obstruction does not affect the flow of water, there is nothing to submit to the Boundary Commission. As I said, article 3 settles how and when all matters regarding obstructions in navigable rivers shall be submitted to the Boundary Commission. The other article makes provision that other matters not dealt with in that particular section, may be submitted, but does not affect the express limitation with regard to obstructions in navigable waters. So I think we are more than justified, on this side of the House, in being exceedingly anxious with regard to

the fate of that legislation which is now before the American congress. I do not need to insist upon the immense importance of this matter to Canada as a whole, and particularly its immense importance to Montreal. And after all, what is important to the city of Montreal is important to the whole of Canada, as Montreal stands at the head of ocean navigation, and at the foot of what we have heretofore called inland navigation, which inland navigation, it does seem to me, may be most seriously affected by any interference with the flow of the St. Lawrence at this or at any other point. I would earnestly urge that the government reconsider their view about the helplessness of our position, and that they do give to Canada the benefit of their best endeavours to impress upon the American congress that we have rights, and that they are entitled to be respected.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY—INDUSTRIAL MERGERS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved, in amendment to the motion for supply:

That the recent mergers of heretofore competing industries and the issue of securities resulting therefrom should be the subject of public investigation, with a view of ascertaining how far such mergers or the methods of carrying them out affect the public interest, either as causing continuing high prices for the commodities produced, as damaging the reputation of Canadian securities abroad or further as restricting the banking facilities of the country.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as you left the chair at six o'clock I rose to present an amendment to the motion now before the House for the House to go into Committee of Supply. I did not expect to have to present this motion to-day, but as I was informed yesterday that it suited the convenience of the government to proceed with it at once, I preferred to avail myself of this opportunity rather than to wait and fortify myself with further information upon a question as important as the one which I think this motion presents. Mr. Speaker, there has always been, at least for some time, a very great interest manifested in mergers, in concentrations into one company of various industries hitherto operating independently. What is the reason of that interest? In the first place, stock markets, as a rule, are affected by all movements which lead up to the merger of companies, to concentrations which are generally preceded by variations in the stocks of the companies interested. In the second place, the merging of companies adds new securities to the exchanges and transactions, indeed, are, as a rule, very numerous and extremely animated. Finally, a merger raises always the important question of whether the commodities produced by the merging industries will either increase or lower in price. In fact, as a general rule, as the House is aware, mergers give rise to a very considerable quantity of speculation, and that is one feature of these mergers which I think it is necessary for the House and the country to be informed about. As a rule, they are productive of very considerable profits to the promoters. How are these profits obtained? Generally by the appropriation, under favourable circumstances, by the promoters of what is called watered stock, or shares in the merging company, resulting from over-capitalization, representing in reality no actual value, but, after the merger, indistinguishable from the rest of the shares and consequently having, it may be, a very considerable market value, though behind this watered stock there is no actual value. As I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, this merging of companies is quite a modern feature in our industrial life. The tendency of rival industries to-day is to join their interests and to thus unite in the management and marketing of their products, and this tendency, manifested very intensely in the United States, has now become very general in our own country. In the United States some members of this House have, no doubt, followed the circumstances attending the organization of the great oil merger and of the iron industry, and know what very serious objections have been raised in that country to the operations which attended these gigantic mergers. In our own country, for about ten years, we have been the witnesses of the merging of a number of industrial companies, leading up to the unification, or concentration, of these companies into one single company. I do not wish to detain the House at any great length upon this feature of the motion, because I think that every hon. member must have some knowledge of the extent and magnitude of these merging operations during the last decade. Nevertheless, I would like to give a few facts to the House, a few figures, to justify the proposition made by me that these operations have now reached an extent and a magnitude, irrespective of the consequent good or bad that may attend them, that justify entirely my drawing the attention of the House to their nature and to their possible results. I wish to quote, Mr. Speaker, from the Canadian Annual Finance Review of April 10 a few figures, and in doing so I would scarcely feel justified in fatiguing the House by citing textually all the figures which I have here, and which go to make up a partial

statement showing the immense capitalization of these companies. I will, therefore, with your permission, and, I hope with the approval of the House, give only the leading figures and hand this statement immediately to 'Hansard,' for the reading of the entirety of it would take, I think, too much of the time of the House. The statement is as follows:—

	Authorized.	Issued.
Amalgamated Asbestos Corporation, Limited—		
Capital stock—Com..	$ 8,125,000	$ 8,125,000 00
Pref. .	1,875,000	1,875,000 00
Bonds..	15,000,000	7,500,000 00
Belmina Consolidated Asbestos Co., Ltd.—		
Capital stock—Com...	2,000,000	1,700,000 00
Pref..	600,000	500,000 00
Bonds..	300,000	200,000 00
The Black Lake Consolidated Asbestos Co., Ltd.—		
Capital stock—Com...	3,000,000	3,000,000 00
Pref..	1,000,000	1,000,000 00
Bonds..	1,500,000	1,000,000 00
Canada Cement Company, Limited—		
Capital stock—Com...	19,000,000	13,500,000 00
Pref..	11,000,000	10,500,000 00
Bonds..	8,000,000	5,000,000 00
The Canadian Coloured Cotton Mills Co., Ltd.—		
Capital authorized ..	5,000,000	2,700,000 00
Bonds (authorized and issued)..	2,000,000	2,000,000 00
Canadian Consolidated Rubber Co., Ltd.—		
Capital stock—Com...	3,000,000	2,796,695 00
Pref..	2,000,000	1,959,455 00
Bonds..	2,600,000	*2,541,300 00
Dominion Iron and Steel Company Ltd.—		
Capital stock (authorized)..	30,000,000	.....
Common (subscribed and paid-up)..	.....	20,000,000 00
Preferred (subscribed and paid-up)..	.....	5,000,000 00
Bonds—1st mortgage..	8,000,000	*7,414,000 00
Consolidated mortgage..	20,000,000	†5,840,000 00
Cape Breton real estate..	.....	*17,500 00
Dominion Textile Co., Limited—		
Capital stock—Com...	7,500,000	*5,000,000 00
Pref..	2,500,000	*1,858,113 00
Bonds—4 series..	.....	3,011,941 67
Montmorency.	.....	450,000 00
The Ogilvie Flour Mills Co., Limited—		
Capital Stock—Com...	2,500,000	2,500,000 00
Pref..	2,000,000	2,000,000 00
Bonds..	1,750,000	1,750,000 00
The Montreal, Light, Heat and Power Co.—		
Capital authorized and paid up..	17,000,000	17,000,000 00
Bonds—4½ per cent..	7,500,000	6,787,000 00
5 per cent. ..	4,000,000	3,355,000 00
Quebec Railway, Light, Heat and Power Co., Ltd.—		
Capital..	10,000,000	9,500,000 00
Bonds..	10,000,000	4,945,000 00
Quebec Railway, Light and Power Co.—		
Capital—Com..	2,500,000	2,500,000 00
Pref..	1,000,000	750,000 00
Bonds..	2,500,000	2,500,000 00
Totals..	$214,750,000	$168,076,004 67

* Outstanding. † Issued.

Thus we have for these twenty companies or so an authorized capital of $214,750,000, of which there has been issued over $168,000,000. This shows the extent of the interest involved; and had I pursued this inquiry further, I have no doubt that I would have been able to extend the list and bring up the capitalization of these special companies to about $300,000,000. Indeed, in an exhaustive and very interesting speech which the hon. Minister of Labour delivered on the 10th of April last, when he moved this House into committee on his Combines Bill, he himself enumerated a considerable number of companies which are not mentioned in this list. So that it is proper, I think, to say that the interest involved in these mergers amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars, and therefore it is very interesting to the public, and particularly to us in this House, to become cognizant of some of the details connected with the organization of such immensely capitalized companies. When an industrial enterprise is in the hands of a firm, and the capital of the firm has been partly lost, it is written off. On the other hand, if the capital is increased, it is because the partners in the firm have left their earnings in the business. The claim of such businesses to special protection, as a rule is, or ought to be, founded on the actual cost of the production of their product. The loss of capital on the part of firms doing business is never admitted to the consideration of parliament when parliament fixes the protective duties. The case of a joint stock company, however, is manifestly a different matter. It is the opening of the capital account which settles the amount on which dividends are expected. As the actual capital in the business goes up or goes down, it does not as a rule bear a relation to the real capital in the business. And the balancing of the books of such companies is in a sense false. By that I mean that the nominal capital of the company as a liability has to be balanced by its assets, and these often include the good-will of the business and other fictitious items. Consequently while these companies claim protection upon the cost of production, this cost is

always made to include interest on the capital, though this has sometimes in part been lost or has been issued for good-will, and very often also for tangible considerations and at a very large discount.

Having drawn this distinction between firms entering industrial life, and joint stock companies, let us view for a moment how new enterprises enter into the industrial field. Is it not a fact that, as a rule, on account of the risks involved in a new enterprise, it is often necessary that those who run these risks should get their interest in the enterprise at somewhat less than the nominal value. In some way or other it is arranged to issue stock at a discount. This is frequently done. In some cases there seems some justification for such a proceeding. It may be a proper proceeding on account of the risks involved, or the temporary condition of the money market, and the difficulty of procuring the funds necessary to start the enterprise. There is therefore some justification in the apparent values being in reality greater than the real material assets of the company at the time of the starting of the enterprise.

The case of mergers of existing enterprises is somewhat different. There can be no objection to a fair conversion into capital of the value of trade-marks and patents, which is often the object of the merging of different companies. But when you come to consider the fixing of a protective or customs tariff, it would seem that we should adopt as a measure the percentage which is necessary to insure the maintenance in activity of only the real actual capital involved in the enterprise and also the maintenance of the labour necessary to carry it on, which has been created by the industry. In fixing that protective or customs tariff, you are surely not to consider in any way the payment of dividends or returns upon a fictitious capital which has not been at any time really invested in the business.

Now, what happens at the time of the creation of an industry in our country, and of the willingness on the part of parliament to give it some encouragement by a protective tariff? This happens, that a protection is given slightly in excess of what is absolutely necessary—why? On account of the risks involved in the starting of a new enterprise, in order to induce people to go in, and, instead of provision being made for a gradual reduction of the protective duties necessitated by the starting of the enterprise, the duty is kept up. Then, what happens?

Earnings are considerable; the industry becomes prosperous and generally affords ample dividends. In the face of these earnings, as a rule, competition is provoked. But the capital is increased, and so there is a reduction of the rate of dividend from ten or eight to five or four, and it is expected in that way to avoid competitions. Nevertheless, competitors will enter the field if they are aware that conditions are such that with keen attention money may be made. If, in cases of that kind, protection diminished by degrees, this probably would not happen, or else these competitors would, under the necessities of the case, either drop out or diminish their output. But the maintenance of the protective duties tends to increase and intensify the conditions I have described. The next stage is that arrangements are made for fixing prices. But, as you are aware, under legislation passed last session, to do this directly has become difficult if not impossible, and certainly exposes those who enter into such arrangements to prosecution under the law. Other devices are resorted to. You have a common sales agent, which diminishes the expense of placing the products upon the market. Or you have division of districts. But in spite of these methods to protect profits, competition goes on, new competitors crowd into the market; and then the temptation to merge becomes very great. Mergers in themselves, per se, are not to be condemned. They give good results in many respects. They give to the industries concerned one management; they concentrate; they enable the companies that are brought together to secure the best officers by spending very considerable in that direction and the best experts to work the industry; they simplify the marketing; they result in many other economies which in themselves are not to be condemned. It is to be noted also that not a single company is exposed to the operation of the law passed last year by this parliament. There can be no charge of combination amongst traders to fix prices where there is only one company. In such cases the operation of that law becomes impossible. And, indeed, I would, at this stage, call this to the attention of the House, that, in these very considerable mergers that have lately taken place, you do not find anything upon which you can base a suit or prosecution under the Act against combines. They have evidently carefully guarded against that. But there would be no necessity for it, since a merger is not a combination of companies for the fixing of prices. Now, the necessity or utility of a merger having become apparent, what is the next proceeding? As a rule in these operations—I am speaking of the facts as we learn them from the public prints and from what we hear on the street—those who are engaged in the industries themselves are the first to see in the transactions which will tend to a merger the opportunity for very profitable speculation. Mergers, under the conditions under which they are affected cannot be efficiently carried out without the assistance of institu-

tions that command large capital. It is found necessary in many cases, by the promotors of these mergers, in order to overcome the objections of those who are interested in these different industries who are unwilling to see the combination effected, to operate upon the market and depress the securities of existing companies. It is also necessary, sometimes, in order to overcome opposition for the promoters to win over, with some generosity, those opponents who threaten to impede the evolution of the companies into one company. In spite of these obstacles, there remains still opportunity of very large profit. In what? In the issuing of common stock. Let me give an example illustrative of what I have been describing. Take, for instance, a group of concerns worth, let us assume, exactly $1,000,000, irrespective of protective duties, the existence of which might enhance the value of a concern as their reduction would diminish it. These concerns are in the condition to which I referred a few moments ago. They have been organized; they have lived; competition has come along. But the profits are considerable. They would be capitalized, on the institution of a merger, at, say, $3,000,000; you would have $1,000,000 of bonds secured by mortgage; $1,000,000 of preferred stock, and $1,000,000 of common stock. These securities being provided, how would they be handled? As a general rule—I speak subject to correction by those who know more, perhaps, about these operations than I have been able to learn—to settle with the holders of the existing concerns you would have to provide cash or its equivalent, a first mortgage, bonds, or preferred stock. It is necessary to carry on considerable dealings with the individuals who are holders of the original concern, and with groups in order to get control, for without control it is impossible to finally carry out the merger. It is here that the large financial institutions come in. They underwrite the bonds, we will not say at par, but, in this instance, let us say at 95.

If the bonds are not disposed of otherwise, they are placed with the bank which underwrites them to say at 95. But there are sub-underwriters, men behind who are the promoters, who sub-underwrite the issue at a slight advance over the bank's figures, and it is this slight advance which constitutes the bank's profit. In many instances, the directors of these banks and the directors of the companies that are about to be merged, form themselves into a group or syndicate, and it is this syndicate which sub-underwrites the bonds. Common stock is offered to the bank in order to induce it to underwrite the bonds. The bank, therefore, in return for 95 per cent which it pays for the bonds, gets $100 bonds and say 75 per cent of common stock. What becomes of these securities? The sub-underwriters take over the bonds and common stock at a slight advance and endeavour to dispose of the bonds and naturally keep as much as possible of the common stock. Then how will the vendors, the original holders, be settled with? How will you provide the working capital? That is provided out of the preference shares which are not wanted for the vendors. Out of the money produced by the bonds you pay the vendors, you pay then with preference shares, and out of what is left you provide working capital. Take the illustrative case just referred to. We will take $250,000 of preference stock for the vendor which will leave $750,000 preference stock for the immediate needs of the new company and which will leave $250,000 of common stock. This common stock is gradually disposed of by the underwriters and mostly by the sub-underwriters. It is hawked about and given as a bonus. Three shares of preference stock and one of common stock are given for $300. Let us look at the result. Out of an issue of securities of $3,000,000 there is realized from the bonds $750,000, from the preference stock $250,000 for the vendor and $750,000 for working capital, and the common stock is given as a bonus for distribution among the promoters. I am not here to offer any opinion upon the moral aspect of a transaction of that kind. Indeed most of those who carry on these operations are looked upon as men of strong moral views in business matters. They are generally philanthropists, interested in good works and are pillars of their churches; but I must say I do not see anything particularly wrong in the operation if you leave out of consideration the duties that must be kept up. I see no particular harm except that it results in a number of people acquiring, under the auspices of powerful institutions that lend their aid to these transactions, securities behind which there is no real value. From the point of view of public interest, which is the one I desire to urge here, there are two serious objections. One of the results of this system of carrying on a business is the creation at once of a strong interest for the maintenance of duties in such a way that dividends will be insured upon all this watered stock which represents in reality no real value. There is a strong interest created among people of powerful influence to see that the duties should not be reduced to the absolute real value and need of those industries, but to keep them at such a figure as will insure dividends being paid upon merely apparent values. Another public interest is this? Our banks, which are engaged in these large operations, are obliged necessarily to tie up a considerable share of their funds. Why? In order to furnish these advances which are always large, and is it not apparent that they ne-

cessarily are obliged to tie up these large advances over a period of time necessary to get rid of these securities so as to insure a profit upon the transactions and make sure for the promoters of these mergers whoever they may be—the directors of the merging companies and banks or other promoters—as large a profit as possible. These will require to distribute the stock to sell the bonds at a good figure and distribute as little of the common or bonus stock as possible. Is it not evident that these funds of these large financial institutions tied up in this way are kept away from the usual channels where they might benefit trade and fulfil the object of legitimate banking?

I have endeavoured as briefly as possible to describe how these operations are carried on. One word respecting the company law as we have it in this country. Does that law tend to encourage or discourage these operations, whatever may be good or evil in them. Our present law is to be found in chapter 79 of the revised statutes.

That section reads:

'The company shall not under any circumstances use any of its funds in the purchase of stock in any other corporation, unless nor until the directors have been expressly authorized by a by-law passed by them for the purpose and sanctioned by a vote of not less than two-thirds in value of the capital stock represented at a general meeting of the company duly called for considering the subject of the by-law. Provided that if the letters patent authorize such purchase it shall not be necessary to pass such by-law.'

That provision in the existing law seems to favour the operations I have referred to. In no other statute previous to that was there any such provision as we find in section 44. It is new law; I have not been able to find any section of the old company law expressly authorizing, as this does, the purchase by a new company of stock in other companies. I have not been able to cover completely the field of investigation with regard to the English law, but so far as I have been able to find such acquisitions are absolutely prohibited under the company law there. In view of the magnitude of these operations in this country it is for parliament to consider whether that provision introduced into our law is a wise one, and whether it would not be proper for us to follow the law in England and to return to our former legislation. I shall allude briefly to some litigation we have had in this connection in the province of Quebec. I had intended to make a resumé of that litigation in order to uphold my view that these merging operations are sometimes carried on under circumstances approximate to fraud, but while these reports are most interesting, I have not had time to make a digest of them, and I shall merely submit the references. In the case of Amyot versus the Dominion Cotton Mills Company, the judgment of the Superior Court is reported in 36 S.C. (Quebec), p. 35, and the judgment of the Court of Review, confirming that judgment is reported in 38 S.C., p. 457. There is another very interesting case of Angers versus the Dominion Textile Company, which is one of the recent mergers in the cotton industry. The judgment of the first court is to be found in 30 S.C., p. 56, and the judgment confirming the original judgment in appeal in 18 K.B., p. 63. The case of Amyot, after going through the court of appeals is now before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. In the case of Angers the judgment of the Superior Court, confirmed in review, was upheld in the Supreme Court, and is found reported in 41 S.C.R., p. 285. I give these references because I do not wish to go into any analysis of the cases. They were decided principally on questions of law involving the legality of the formalities and proceedings under which the mergers were effected, but there is considerable evidence, and it is interesting to read the remarks of the judges upon that evidence, which show that in many cases it is the directors of the merging companies who, by representation, reports, actions of different kinds that are not of a commendable character, succeeded in forcing the shareholders into the merger. The evidence of the witnesses in these cases is severely commented upon by some of the judges, and from these comments it is conclusive that there is urgent need for the government to inquire more closely into the particular circumstances occupying these mergers, and which tend to interfere considerably with the proper carrying on of our industrial life. One word as to present legislation. It might be supposed that we have laws enough to meet the object which is aimed at by this motion, but I wish to say at once that there is no doubt whatever that the existing laws have no application to what is sought by the very general terms of the motion I have the honour to present to the House. The object of this motion is to obtain a very general inquiry in the public interest into all the circumstances under which these mergers are put through. We have some legislation bearing upon this subject but it is not pertinent. We have the Customs Tariff Act, assented to June 20, 1887, as amended by the Act respecting the Duties of Customs, assented to in April, 1907. There is an Act of a similar character to amend the Inland Revenue Act, assented to August 10, 1904. All these enactments are intended to enable the government to handle the customs duties

in the interests of the public, and in special cases under peculiar circumstances, without the authority of parliament, but they have no reference, even in the most distant manner possible, to a general inquiry into mergers. There is nothing in existing legislation which would give any relief in the condition of affairs I have brought to the attention of the House. Then, there are articles 496, 497 and 498 of the Criminal Code against combines, but I can give no better appreciation of this legislation than by quoting the remarks of the Minister of Labour with regard to these criminal enactments. I quote from his speech of the 10th of April last:

> In regard to this measure, it is to be noted that in reality it enacted nothing new, but was merely declaratory of the law as it stood, and had stood for years before the question had ever been one of concern to the administration.

Then the Minister of Labour goes on to point out that according to the judgment of the Hon. David Mills when this criminal law was enacted against combines (a judgment in which concurred the then Minister of Justice and Prime Minister, Sir John Thompson) very far from having a deterrent character the very nature of this enactment was rather a shield to those who entered into these combines. At any rate, no results have been produced which have an application to the demand for a general investigation which is made here.

I will not refer at length to the third source of legislation upon this subject. It is to be found in the Combines Investigation Act, brought about by the efforts of my hon. friend, in 9 and 10 Edward VII., chap. 9, section 5. It is no doubt, familiar to the House, and I will not read it. It is clearly not applicable to the object of this motion, nor do the circumstances under which these great mergers have been effected disclose any intention to combine in regard to prices. The object of that legislation was to bear down upon individuals or companies who enter into a combination with the object of fixing or raising prices. There is no trace of that here. You must have a clear, concrete case. You make complaint before a judge of the Superior Court in the manner indicated in the Act, and this brings about an investigation into the individual cases brought up. Therefore, the House must see that that particular relief is of no use whatever in the circumstances under which this motion is presented. Now I think I have established that these operations are carried on in the commercial and industrial world on a very large scale, that they are carried on in a way which would certainly justify the government in making an investigation to ascertain, not what we hear on the street or read in the newspapers, but to ascertain in an authentic way the exact facts connected with these mergers.

We are soon to legislate for a long period of time respecting banking. Surely if the circumstances and facts I have disclosed to the House have any foundation, we are not in a position to make that legislation unless we know exactly what share our great financial institutions take in those mergers, and whether it is necessary to amend in some important particulars the statute which refers to that. I express this in a tentative manner, and as having reference to possible remedies, to a state of things which I think invites urgently the attention of the government. It seems to me that with regard to directors in these companies, if we are to protect the weak against the strong, and if we are to prevent abuses, it would be necessary to alter the law and to place these directors in the position of trustees towards the shareholders, with all the consequent responsibilities which attach to that position. That, I think, would prevent the abuses which have come to light, and which have been pointed out in the cases I referred to a few moments ago.

As regards banking, the question is perhaps even more serious. A remedy has been suggested in the inspection of banks by an independent authority. For my part, it seems to me a very difficult matter in our country to establish that inspection because of the multiplicity of branches belonging to the banks. It is evidently impossible for the government itself to inspect all the branches. Inspection is an easy thing, for instance, in a country like the United States, where there are a large number of banks, but where there are no branches. But here, where there is a multiplicity of branches, it is difficult to inspect them. With respect to operations of an objectionable character it is easily conceivable, if they are either illegal, or it is desired to take them out of the purview of an inspector, they may be put through at the branches, it seems to me, rather than at the head office, which alone can be inspected. It might be possible, I suppose, for the bank to name its own inspector, and to have also to make of the Bank inspector himself an official inspector charged with all the responsibilities which would attach to his position, to inspect the principal offices. However that may be, it seems to me that some change in that direction is necessary. Possibly also it would be a wise provision to oblige the directors, the officers of the bank, in their returns to the government, to point out the loans carried on under the circumstances of the underwriting of bonds which I detailed a few months ago. In that way

the government and the public would know what amount of the bank's capital has gone into these special merger operations. As I view it, these operations are not in harmony with the operations generally contemplated for banks. Banks that are forbidden by the banking law to loan or advance on mortgages, by the interposition of trust companies that hold these bonds, in reality make advances which are secured by a mortgage, an operation which is forbidden by their charter. It is a singular thing that money has been easy in all the countries of the world this year, but in Canada the market has been tight. Has this been caused by the amount of capital involved in these operations? Some people who know, are inclined to think so. Money has been tighter here than elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House for the time I have taken in exposing this matter, which I consider very important. From words which have fallen from my right hon. friend the Prime Minister upon another occasion, one would suppose that a motion of this kind is a want of confidence motion. But surely that interpretation, with all respect, is not a proper one. The term 'want of confidence motion' is not properly applicable to a motion made on going into committee of supply; that is to say, it does not apply, in my estimation, more to such a motion than to any other motion. Want of confidence attaches to any motion the result of which is to prove that the government has lost the confidence of the House. It may occur on a private Bill, it may occur on any government measure, it may occur on a motion apparently indifferent, but the result of which is to express to the government that the House has no more confidence in them. It may result without the expression of any vote at all. Motions made at this stage of the proceedings are always made for a redress of grievances, and it is quite open to the government either to accept these motions and to redress the grievance, or to express its own opinion that a grievance has been made out, and that it will entertain the demand without their being such fatal results attached to the motion. Upon one occasion in England, if my memory serves me right, Mr. Gladstone, when Prime Minister, resigned upon an insignificant vote in Supply, where the committee refused to grant a small sum of two hundred pounds in the army estimates. Why? Because Mr. Gladstone considered that it was, on the part of the House, an expression of want of confidence in the army reforms which his government had undertaken. In 1896 the government of that day resigned without the House meeting. I insist upon this, because I did not present the motion as a motion of want of confidence. I present it at the proper time for the redress of grievances before we go into Supply, and I would be very glad if the government, in view of the importance of the matter, would state its willingness to entertain the proposal and to make the investigation which is called for by a large number of people—not perhaps influential and powerful people, but people who have been affected by these operations and who think that an investigation is necessary. Upon that assurance from the government I would willingly withdraw the motion. I insist upon this, because I do not wish to be reproached with having presented this motion at this stage, taking the view of our parliamentary practice which I do.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). Mr. Speaker, before attempting to reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) I would like to ask him just what form of investigation he has in mind when he speaks of the desirability of the subject of recent mergers being publicly inquired into.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that a Royal Commission composed of competent men would be the proper way to make a public investigation.

Mr. KING. In proposing to the House the appointment of a Royal Commission, or the appointment of any body, to conduct an investigation into such a large question as that of mergers, it is rather important that the reasons which are given in support of a suggestion of this kind should be made apparent. I have carefully listened to my hon. friend during the course of his remarks and it seems to me that he has succeeded admirably in disclosing to the House the intricate and complicated methods by which mergers are brought into being, by which they are financed and by which their operations are carried on. But the admirable speech which the hon. gentleman has made, it appears to me, has given us the best of reasons why it is not necessary to hold a public inquiry in order to disclose these complicated methods. He has taken one of the most difficult of modern problems and he has shown, I think clearly to everybody, that it is a many sided question and that there are many considerations which have to be taken into account in dealing with a subject of that kind. He has done this so well that I think his own speech is sufficient to obviate the necessity of conducting an inquiry to discover these methods and to ascertain the possible effects upon all concerned. However, in the motion which has been put forward the hon. member has given three reasons in particular why he thinks a public investigation of this kind should take place. He suggests that it should take place, first, in order that the government or the country may ascertain to what extent these mergers are responsible for causing continuing high prices for the commodities

produced; second, to what extent they are responsible for damaging the reputation of Canadian securities abroad and, third, restricting the banking facilities of this country. In asking the government to appoint a royal commission of this kind it seems to me that the hon. member should have presented some grounds on which the House would have reason for believing that to some extent mergers had been responsible for injuring the reputation of Canadian securities abroad, for restricting the banking facilities of the country and for the continuation of high prices. While he has spoken at length with regard to the methods of the organization of these mergers, I fail to gather from his remarks anything in the way of what one would regard as prima facie grounds affording justification for a public inquiry. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that during the course of his remarks my hon. friend made a single reference to the reputation of Canadian securities abroad. I may have failed to hear all he said, but I followed him very closely and a perusal of his remarks in 'Hansard' to-morrow will show whether I am right in that or not, but I did not hear a single reference to the reputation of Canadian securities abroad, and yet, that is one of the grounds which he gives why the government should appoint a royal commission to inquire into the effect of mergers in this particular. But, although my hon. friend has not put forward any reason in support of this clause in his motion I cannot help feeling that he has not done so because of the difficulty he would have had in making out a case in that connection. I think my hon. friend will be the first to admit that there never was a time in the history of the Dominion when Canadian securities stood so well or so high as at the present time. If the existence of mergers is one of the factors entering into the reputation of Canadian securities abroad then, judging by the position at the present time, we would be led to conclude that mergers were a good thing rather than a harmful thing in that particular. One of the most prominent of modern financiers is Sir Edgar Speyer. He will, I think, be acknowledged in this House as being one of the foremost financiers in the British Empire. Giving to one of the leading papers of this country an estimate at the close of last year of the financial situation, Sir Edgar Speyer used the following words:

Just as Canada suffered in the nineties through no fault of her own, in common with the rest of the world, through the series of economic misfortunes which affected so many countries at that time, so the good credit which the world at large now enjoys is shared by Canada in an exceptional degree. It is, indeed, of vital importance to Canada to know that the condition of credit generally has been rarely higher than it is to-day, and that Great Britain may be expected to lend freely in 1911. The indications are that trade will be more active than it has been ever before, and that Great Britain will continue to supply capital to Canada with a generous hand for the development of the great natural resources with which she is endowed so abundantly.

So, we have the testimony of this leading financial expert in London to the effect that during the past year, during the time when these recent mergers have been formed, the credit of Canada stood higher in Britain than it has ever stood before. And yet the hon. gentleman suggests that because of the alleged damage done to Canadian securities by mergers, this House should appoint a royal commission of inquiry.

Mr. MONK. I did not allege such damage ; I asked for a commission to ascertain how far these mergers might have an effect upon the reputation of our securities.

Mr. KING. In answer to that I might quote the very words of the motion given notice of by the hon. gentleman :

That the recent mergers of heretofore competing industries and the issue of securities resulting therefrom should be the subject of public investigation, with a view of ascertaining how far such mergers or the methods of carrying them out affect the public interest, either as causing continuing high prices for the commodities produced, as damaging the reputation of Canadian securities abroad.

I would submit that neither the remarks of the hon. gentleman or the situation as it is known to be in the financial world, afford a reason why on this ground at least the government should appoint a royal commission. My hon. friend further suggests that a commission should be appointed to inquire into the effect of these mergers as restricting the banking facilities of the country. Again, I fail to find that my hon. friend was able to show that the banking facilities of our country had been restricted in consequence of mergers. He did say that it was possible that because of these large financial transactions the banks would possibly be prevented from loaning money in other directions, but such evidence as there is does not appear to support his contention. At the close of the last commercial year loans were made by the banks in Canada amounting to approximately $677,617,000 which was almost $20,000,000 more than the commercial loans by the banks a year previously. During the same time the banking capital increased by about $14,000,000 as an indication of greater activity in trade, and it may be remarked that in that period when the greatest volume of business was being done, namely, the month of September, the note circulation of the banks was $99,400,-

000. So, in the case of banking facilities as in the case of securities abroad, my hon. friend has failed to give any evidence to this House in support of his motion for a royal commission of inquiry. Far from finding any restricting of banking facilities we have the strongest evidence of the greatest expansion yet known in the banking history of Canada.

The last reason given by my hon. friend for the appointment of this commission is that the commission should inquire into the effect of the mergers in causing or continuing high prices for commodities produced. That brings us to the question of prices. If the hon. gentleman would refer to a resolution passed in this House last session he will find there almost the very words he has put into his motion. On the 12th of April last year this resolution was adopted by the House :

Resolved, that it is expedient, in connection with Bill (No. 101) now before this House respecting the investigation of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers, which may enhance prices or restrict competition to the detriment of consumers, to provide for the appointment of Boards of Investigation for the purpose of inquiring into alleged combines causing enhanced prices or restricted competition, for the appointment of counsel to conduct investigations before such boards, and for the payment of the members of such boards and of counsel, and of witnesses appearing before the boards, and of all expenses of boards, including transportation expenses incurred by the members thereof, or by persons under orders of such boards, in making investigations under the Act, and salaries of employees and agents and the payment of clerical and other assistance.

Mr. MONK. Does the Minister of Labour find that that resolution would authorize the carrying on of such an investigation?

Mr. KING. Certainly, and what I want to point out at the moment is that to the extent to which my hon. friend asks this government to appoint a commission to ascertain the effect of mergers on prices, the very object aimed at by him was obtained by parliament last year, and on the strength of the resolution then passed, was founded legislation which now exists. Let us see for a moment how the legislation of last year is likely as respects effectiveness to compare with what is now suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk). His motion comes down to a request that the government should appoint a royal commission to investigate these various mergers in order to ascertain their effect upon prices. In 1897 the Minister of Finance introduced a Bill giving the government power to conduct an inquiry where there was reason to believe a combine existed for the purpose of enhancing prices, and, notwithstanding that the government were willing to concede that such an investigation should take place before a judge, hon. gentlemen opposite entered the strongest objection against it. They claimed that to put in the hands of the government the power to appoint men to investigate any merger or combine was to give the Governor in Council a power that was well nigh inquisitorial, that would enable them to harass individual concerns, and for political or other purposes to promote their own ends. I imagine that if my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) were to press his motion he would meet to-night amongst his political friends precisely the same objections as were then advanced by them. For example, the hon. member for East Grey as reported in ' Hansard ' said :

It puts in the hands of a few men the power to harrass or annoy or interfere with the operations of business men in the country . . . to put the traders and manufacturers of the country under the control of the government to such an extent as to keep them in perpetual dread of being attacked under this law. It might be used as a means of levying on men political contributions or blackmail to any possible extent.

That is the view of one of my hon. friend's best friends on the other side of the House, and when my hon. friend's suggestion is met with that kind of argument on his own side of the House, he can expect but slight support for his motion.

Now, I differ with my hon. friend altogether when he says that the existing legislation is not sufficient for the purpose he has in view. I doubt if it is possible for more effective legislation to be devised than that on the statute-book at the present time, known as the Combines Investigation Act. Who knows better than the consumer whether or not he is being affected adversely by a combination? Who under my hon. friend's proposal is to be the judge as to what industries are to be singled out for investigation? Does he propose that this royal commission shall investigate every merger in the Dominion? If he does, the work of that commission is going to be very large and extensive. If he does not, who is to determine which merger is to be the subject of investigation in the first instance? Under the legislation on the statute-book, if any body of consumers have reason to believe that trade is being to some degree restricted by a combination, they have power, if they can make out a prima facie case, to secure an investigation; they have also power to put on the board of investigation one of their own number; and, in order that the investigation may be carried out in as fair a manner as possible, opportunity is given to the other side, namely, to those interested in the merger, also to name a member of the board. These two, agreeing together if they can, upon a judge, name him as chairman. They failing to agree, it is left to the government to appoint the third;

and these three gentlemen are given all the powers of a court—the power to compel the production of documents, the power to summon witnesses, the power to take evidence under oath. In other words, all the powers a royal commission can possibly have, are given by the legislation we already have, to deal with this very question which my hon. friend suggests should be dealt with by a royal commission. So I say there does not appear to be any reason for appointing this commission on the grounds he has named in his motion, while legislation which is more effective than what he proposes already exists, and exists in a form which is likely to be of greater service to those who are being adversely affected by any of these alleged combinations.

My hon. friend and some of his friends on the other side may say: we know of the existence of these mergers, but what investigations have taken place? And I suppose that because there have been no investigations under that law up to the present time, they will say that the law has been ineffective. If my hon. friend has that thought in his mind, I would ask him how he tests the effectiveness of other legislation. To take a very obvious case, we do not estimate the effect of the death penalty by the number of death sentences passed or the number of hangings in a year. If the number is few, we believe the legislation is effective. If there are none we regard it as a most effective deterrent. The strength of life-saving apparatus is not measured by the number of drownings that take place, but rather by the lack of number. So it is with legislation of this sort. The knowledge that the power exists on the part of any six men who can make out a prima facie case, to obtain a commission of inquiry, has a tendency to make men careful in their actions; and one of the most forceful illustrations of the effect of the legislation passed last session is the very circumstance that since that legislation has been put on the statute-book we have not had the outcries against mergers and combinations that we heard before, and that it has not been found necessary up to the present time, except in one or two cases, to endeavour to start proceedings under this statute.

But, Sir, even if my hon. friend had made out a case as to why the government should appoint a royal commission for the purpose suggested, I would contend that he has chosen an inopportune time for his proposal. At this moment this country is engaged in a consideration of one of the largest commercial transactions which it has ever had to consider. Any proposed change in tariff arrangements is always viewed with a good deal of anxiety by all classes in the community. At the present moment the United States and Canada are each considering what legislation they shall pass in respect to a number of commodities, some of which are being produced by these very mergers to which my hon. friend refers. Now, I ask him, as a man of wide public experience, whether he thinks that at such a time it would be a wise thing for the government of this country to announce to the public that it proposed to appoint a royal commission for the purpose of making an inquiry into various business interests in this country. I am afraid that the effect of adopting the course which my hon. friend suggests would be to bring about a condition of affairs diametrically opposite to that which he himself desires. What could more affect the securities of some of the large business concerns in Canada than an announcement to the public to-morrow, or the day after, that the government of this country, for reasons which had been disclosed in this parliament, had found it necessary to appoint a royal commission to investigate some of these large industrial establishments? Would it not have a baneful effect upon the securities of this country abroad? I think that when my hon. friend considers the matter carefully, he will come to the conclusion that it would; and if he looks more carefully at the effect of the legislation which is at present on the statute-book. I think he will see that that legislation is one of the strongest safeguards this nation has for the reputation of its securities. The fact that it is known throughout the world that if our large industrial concerns seek to do what is not proper, seek to take an unfair advantage of the consumers, seek to unduly enhance prices or restrict competition, any six persons may start the machinery of government at work and secure a full and complete investigation into the business of such concerns the knowledge of the existence of such legislation has an influence abroad which tends to give the securities of these companies a value they otherwise would not have. In the reasons my hon. friend has urged, he has failed to make out a satisfactory case why in the public interests the course he has suggested should be taken; and I am convinced that on further reflection he will agree that it would be very much against the public interest to adopt that course.

In conclusion let me say that I hope none of the remarks I have ventured to make will be construed as in any way minimizing the importance of publicity in the work of these large organizations. I feel that in the public interest too great facilities for reasonable investigation at any moment cannot be afforded, I agree entirely with my hon. friend as to the importance of public investigation of mergers, and it was in that view that we put on our

statutes last year the Combines Investigation Act; but where I disagree with him is with regard to the case he has made out as affording reasons why a public investigation should take place, and as to the opportuneness of such an investigation at this particular time. My hon. friend referred to the number of combines or mergers which have taken place recently. Well, this is an age of combinations. Not only do we see large combinations in matters commercial, but also in other directions. Even the churches have begun to combine.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. gentleman think it is very proper for him to designate the movement for church union as a combine?

Mr. KING. It was with no invidious intention that I used the word 'combine,' and certainly I did not use it in the sense the hon. gentleman indicates. I certainly would regard the proposed union of the churches as a consolidation, and I was pointing out that this was an age of great consolidations in all lines, and in that connection I alluded to the church union movement as one that might possibly be more remote from the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite than the others I have named. We have large organizations of capital and large organizations of labour.

Speaking with regard to the merging of capital, we have to recognize that this being an age of competition, consolidation is in some respects very desirable. As my hon. friend has said, mergers in themselves are not necessarily a bad thing, and I think he will agree with me when I say that large consolidations in this age of competition are sometimes necessary, because the competition is not merely between one industry and another, but frequently between the industries of one nation and those of another, even the industries of one continent and those of another. The fact is that economic conditions have so developed that these large consolidations are becoming essential to the industrial expansion of a nation, and just because large consolidations are becoming more numerous inevitable for this very reason there should be a means of investigation at hand all the time, as afforded by the legislation enacted and not investigations for a special occasion only, as is suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the hon. gentleman's opinion that these mergers and combines tend to reduce prices or increase them to the consumer.

Mr. KING. That is a very debatable point. It ought to be possible under these large organizations, for prices to be reduced. These large organizations should make possible certain economies of which the consumers should be able to get the benefit. I must confess, however, that I fear that has not always been the case, and that sometimes the economies thus effected have accrued rather to the advantage of one particular group than to the general public. But one of the effects of the publicity or investigation provided by the legislation which we put upon our statutes last year will be to disclose to the general public the nature of the economies effected and secure to the public some of the advantages that flow from them.

I would like to say in conclusion if I do not mistake the purpose of my hon. friend's remarks when he closed, that I hope he will not think it necessary to press this motion to a division. I think he was desirous of laying before the House some of the phases of this most important question which he thought should receive consideration, and I think he has rendered the House and the country good service in so doing, because he has brought out points which unquestionably will receive consideration by the government. But I think he should be content with this, and not ask the House to pass this resolution, and to pass it for the reasons assigned by him. I do not think the House would be justified in voting for it in the form in which it is put. In the first place my hon. friend has not shown that the reputation of Canadian securities abroad is suffering. On the contrary the facts go to show that they were never held in better esteem than at present. Nor has he shown that our banking facilities have been restricted. As far as we can judge by the banks statements, these facilities have been greater in the past year than before. And as regards investigation from the point of view of the effect of these mergers on prices, I think the House will admit that legislation effective for achieving the object he has in view exists on our statutes at present. In view too of the nature of the important transactions before this country and parliament at present, I hope my hon. friend will see also the advisability at this moment of not pressing upon the government the appointment of a commission for the purpose he has named.

Mr. SPROULE. Have there been any investigations under this Act to which my hon. friend refers or applications for investigations?

Mr. KING. I might say that at present there is an application pending before Mr. Justice Cannon in Quebec for the appointment of a board to inquire into an alleged combine in the case of the United Shoe Machinery Company. That application, I believe, is under consideration, and we are likely to hear any day

whether it has been granted or not. There have been a large number of inquiries as to proceedings under the Act. But I am a little afraid that many persons have not as yet come to know the full significance of that measure, or to understand its completeness. It may be that some of the representations made by gentlemen opposite while the measure was under discussion in the House, as to its possible limitations has had an influence on the minds of some. But I think it is quite true that, once the measure is tested, it will be found effective. And, as I have already said, the absence of cases under this Act does not by any means prove that it has not been of efficient service in restraining large organizations from taking a course that otherwise they might have been tempted to take.

Mr. SPROULE. Was a registrar appointed under the Act, and if so, who is he?

Mr. KING. Yes, Mr. Acland, the Deputy Minister of Labour, was appointed registrar.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (York). Had I not known that it was the Minister of Labour who was speaking I would have thought it was the minister of combines. Practically, his speech is a defence of these mergers. I would also make the criticism that he has evaded the question presented here to-night, the question of regulating the capitalization of public companies, which is one of the pressing questions of the day. I had intended to take up that question this afternoon in connection with the railways, and I will take it up at the first opportunity. The disorganized condition of affairs in the United States to-day is largely due to faults in connection with the securities issued in that country. But a commission, exactly equal to a royal commission, has been appointed by President Taft to ascertain how the capitalization of railways is to be regulated. That commission is made up of most eminent men, headed by Prof. Hadley. If our securities to-day are good in the markets of the old country, and they are, and if the securities of the United States are not marketable in Europe, as is the case, what is the reason? It is that Americans have overworked the market; they have issued so much watered stock, they have capitalized their great trusts and railways to such an extent, that they can no longer market the securities. And if we pursue a similar method our securities will be in disrepute in Europe in a short time. You cannot have the flotation of securities referred to by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), you cannot have 'high finance' without damaging the credit of the country. See what the late Mr. Harriman did in connection with the railways in which he was interested. He suddenly became the greatest railway man in the country. And he attained that position by manipulating the securities of the railways. One of the great grievances of the state of California is that a wholly unnecessary $10,000,000 a year has been added to the freight rates of that country in order to pay dividends on watered securities issued by Mr. Harriman. When a Minister of Labour says that the Anti-Combines Bill meets the case he himself does not meet the case, for the Anti-Combines Bill has nothing to do with regulating the issue of securities. When I come to discuss that, in connection with the railways I think I shall be able to make out my case.

Referring to the banking system, which was mentioned by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), I will deal with that more fully when we take up the banking law. But it is evident that some of our banks have become what may be called flotation banks—they devote their resources more to the flotation of companies than to giving accommodation to the public. One of the dangers of our banking system is in the flotation of these securities. But that subject will come up in connection with the banking law. It is a fact, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) said in introducing his motion, that the rate of interest has gone up because of these new methods of finance. You cannot get anybody now to entertain an ordinary mortgage as security. The investor is looking for bonds or preferred stock accompanied by these free gifts of common stock as a bonus. And all this new trade of promoter and promotions is based on the idea of the over-issue of securities to be loaded on the public, the interest on which is transferred to the consumer, whether a customer of the railway or a user of the goods produced by combines. And it is a fact that combines to-day are responsible for the increased cost of living now complained of in the United States. I think nobody will deny that. And reciprocity, or anything else, will not reduce prices unless you control and regulate the capitalization of mergers. This will have to be done by some public law, and such a law can be drafted only after investigation. The Minister of Labour told us that our trade was increasing and the banks had more deposits than ever. But that increase is no greater than our increase of population. The need of the country is more capital. When the Minister of Labour says that the law to regulate combines is a cure for the great public grievance of over-capitalization of companies that exists he evades the issue that must be faced. Canada, if she would avoid the evils of high finance and

the condition of affairs in the United States, must regulate the issue of securities by all public companies. Promoters will—as I have known in some cases—take a concern of $500,000 and capitalize it at $3,000,000, and put the stock on the market, making a large profit out of it, though, eventually, those who buy the securities may not get their interest. In the meantime, the public is loaded with the stock, and there is a tendency toward combination in order to increase prices. We boast of our Companies' Act, but nearly all the iniquities in connection with financial affairs, whether in America or Europe, grow out of the Companies' Act and the right it confers to issue shares. And, unless there is the strictest regulation by law of the issue of securities, the same kind of injury to the public and to the credit of the country is bound to follow. Therefore, I would like to see in this country the same kind of commission appointed as in the United States to investigate and bring out the facts. I am awaiting with great interest that report, which will be made some time next summer by Prof. Hadley and his associates in connection with the capitalization of railways in the United States. In a little while it is probable that the United States will take up the question in a wider aspect, and will devise some way to bring out the facts and secure regulation. When Governor Woodrow Wilson made his inaugural speech the other day in New Jersey he said one of the principal objects of his administration would be the regulation of the issue of securities, and that he intended, if possible, to put a stop to the discredit that had come upon that state by the result of the issue of powers of incorporation of all kinds, which he declared was a crying evil, not only in the state, but in the whole nation. So the question is before us, it must be dealt with, and it cannot be handled by a law that is merely directed against combinations.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It has long seemed to me that one of the greatest problems with which this parliament has to deal is this very question. Whether we will ever reach the day when parliament will be able to devise laws to control these combinations, I am not prepared to say. At any rate, there is great need for some other legislation on the subject, it cannot come an hour too soon, and in my judgment we have already delayed too long in finding a solution. We see the evil in the financial world, we see it amongst manufacturing corporations, we find it in these large trusts. Other countries appear to be troubled with it as well as Canada and the United States, and they have endeavoured, but very ineffectively so far, to provide a remedy for the evil. At one time I had great hopes that President Roosevelt would break up many of these combinations. He started an action against the Sugar Trust, and he certainly woke them up pretty well. The publicity which he gave to their nefarious transactions, partially at least restrained that trust in its operations. The Oil Trust was another combination of a similar kind. He attempted to attack them, but unfortunately, owing to his presidential term expiring, he was unable to do the good work which he would undoubtedly have done if he had remained longer in office. I felt sure from his conduct that he would not be re-elected, because I believed that the trusts and combines, and mergers, and railway corporations he was attacking would be too powerful in their opposition to allow him to be re-elected. I regret to notice that his successor, President Taft, is not following in the lines of President Roosevelt, although he declared that he intended to pursue his policy. I am afraid he has already been restrained, and I do not expect henceforth to hear of him accomplishing much.

Now, the hon. the Minister of Labour praises his combines law. At first glance it seems to be very well designed. But I think our experience since it was enacted proves the correctness of the predictions that were made at the time the Bill was discussed, namely, that there would be very few applications for investigation under it. Why? Because, as the old saying is, what is everybody's business is nobody's business. If you leave it to six independent citizens of this country to put the law in motion, knowing as they must know, the trouble they will bring upon themselves by becoming practically the prosecutors, knowing as they must the risk, the danger and the abuse they will bring upon themselves in attempting to prosecute a combination, there is probably not one case in a hundred where the men can be found to undertake the task. I believe that has been the trouble. The minister said no investigations have taken place. There is one pending somewhere down in Quebec, he said, but he did not tell us where it was, or what it was about.

Mr. KING. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I said it was against the United Shoe Machinery Company, and the application had been made in the city of Quebec. The application was presented at the close of last year, there was an appeal, and judgment was reserved on the 1st of February, and may be given out any day now.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not hear the name of the case. But the Minister of Labour

said that this government had been striving to stop the nefarious operations of these combines. He said other methods that had been adopted up to the present time were not successful, therefore they were obliged to devise some other means to battle with these evils, and that was the combines law. He mentioned first that the Criminal Code was amended so that they might be attacked, but that was not effective. I would like to ask him why it is not effective? Because, after the Bill was put through in this House it was amended in the Senate until it was of no use. It was introduced a second time in this House and amended so as to make it valuable, but it dropped out because there was not time to put it through that session. It was introduced again and passed as amended so that would make it useful and so that it could be enforced.

Mr. KING. What year was that?

Mr. SPROULE. I think it was about 1900. The law then could be put in force, and under it convictions could be secured against parties who were violating it. But what does the government do? They amended it the next session, by reenacting the words struck out which left it as it originally was, and thereby made it worthless. That was the opinion of the late Sir Oliver Mowat, and he was regarded as a very able lawyer; he gave that as a reason why the law was of no avail. For what purpose? I honestly believe and I always did believe that it was at the instigation of these people who are carrying on their improper dealings that the then Minister of Justice when amending the Criminal Code put it back again. Now the Minister of Labour says that it was of no use. They made it of no use. They made it so that practically it is impossible for it to be of any value.

Mr. KING. Did the Minister of Justice of that day—I think it was Sir John Thompson—express the opinion in regard to the legislation to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) now refers that parliament was not enacting anything new or anything which was not already law, that they were not providing any penalty that did not already exist in the common law; in other words, that the whole legislation that they proposed really amounted to nothing? Was not that opinion then expressed?

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all. He said that he did not think it went much further than the general law went at that time.

Mr. KING. What was the object of introducing this legislation at all?

Mr. SPROULE. It was to focus public attention on these particular Acts and to provide a remedy and a punishment. It was because an attack was made upon this law that Sir John Thompson gave the opinion that under the law of the time you might institute a prosecution and probably carry it on as effectually to the end as you could under this amendment but owing to the fact that nobody ever pretended to put the criminal law in motion for that purpose. This law was specifically providing a penalty for certain offences which were enumerated. I would further say that what always attracted my attention was the fact that the law was amended so as to make it of no value because the government immediately amended it, put it back again, left it absolutely useless and it has remained so from that day to this.

The Minister of Labour said: We have another provision; we have a provision in the Customs Act, and the present government put it there in order to show their desire to control these nefarious combinations and trusts. That was to the effect that with regard to any article that was the subject of a combine or a trust to the detriment of the consumer or producer, and it might appear so to the government, they could take the customs duty off that article, let it come in free and thus punish the parties in that way. I have several times in this House heard members of the government eulogize that law and say what a wonderful thing they had done in that they had made it so simple, so easy for the government to set the law in motion in order to punish parties who committed this offence, and in order that the consumer might get his goods at the least possible price. Although their attention was drawn over and over again to certain articles that were the subject of such combines, and an appeal was made to them to take these cases up, they absolutely refused, year after year, to move. Judge Garrow prepared a case and presented it to the government before he was put on the bench, and afterwards placed it in the hands of others who presented it in this House, and although their attention was drawn to it not once or twice but many times and many respectable firms in this country were being injuriously affected and the government were asked to apply this provision of the customs law and punish the parties they absolutely refused to put the Act in motion and it remained a dead letter. They did it in one instance with regard to paper and that is the only time they ever put it into motion. Had it not been for the fact that this happened to be something that was pinching the press, and they were afraid of the power of the press I believe they never would have touched it. So, that law has remained a dead letter up to the present time except in that one instance. Then, the Minister of Labour introduces his

Combines Act, and he eulogizes that to a certain extent. The minister referred to a speech that I made away back in 1898 with regard to the danger of putting it in the power of the government to send out a commission in these cases. I always thought there was a great deal of merit in it but that there was a good deal of danger also, and when I came to see what the present government did in other lines I frankly confess that I felt it would not be a safe thing to do in the interest of the people because I would be very much afraid that they might throw out threats, if they wanted to control certain great corporations in their own interests, or that there would be some intimations given that they might look out or there would be danger ahead for them. If it should turn out that they would take the law up and enforce it honestly and properly, I think it would be valuable, but from what we have seen with regard to their conduct in other lines in my judgment the public of this country would have no confidence in their desire to put that law into force honestly and properly.

Mr. KING. Does not the hon. gentleman approve of the suggestion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that a commission should be appointed?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not talking about the proposal of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier at all. I am talking about the quotation which the hon. Minister of Labour made from what I said in 1898.

Mr. KING. The proposition we are considering is as to whether the same course suggested then should be adopted now.

Mr. SPROULE. I am giving my reasons why the people distrust the government. I have given the various powers that they have had in their hands, and which they have never used, and I have said that I would be afraid that they would use the one I referred to either not at all or for blackmailing purposes or probably for the purpose of raising subscriptions to run elections.

Mr. KING. Does the hon. gentleman approve of the appointing of a royal commission for this purpose?

Mr. SPROULE. I have not said whether I do or do not.

Mr. KING. Will you please say?

Mr. SPROULE. The minister may or he may not be a lawyer. Lawyers always want one to say 'yes,' or 'no.' I could put a great many questions to the hon. gentleman. For instance, I might ask him if it is true that he has stopped beating his wife.

Mr. KING. Unfortunately, I have no wife.

Mr. SPROULE. I was attempting, in answer to the comment of the hon. gentleman, to give the reasons for the position I took on this question. I am not dealing with the motion before the House so much as referring to the quotation which the minister made from a former speech of mine, and I am saying that the government have not honestly, in my judgment, taken any action for the purpose of punishing these individuals or stopping those combines. That is the reason I am referring to the quotation which the minister made from my remarks in 1898.

Mr. KING. Apart altogether from the past, would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him one question? Does he approve at the present moment of the government appointing a royal commission for the purpose of inquiring into mergers as moved for by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk)?

Mr. SPROULE. I have not read the motion close enough. I read it very cursorily, but it does not commend itself strongly to my mind because I do not think that it goes far enough in its scope. But, I would like to see some independent commission to take up these subjects with authority to deal with them, and not leave it to a private citizen to do it at great trouble and expense to himself for which he is not indemnified. If I were to talk about my views on a royal commission it would require a much more lengthy explanation than I desire to enter upon with reference to this motion to-night. I have always thought that the government were not serious with regard to this matter. I think still that they are not serious about it. It is like their eight-hour labour day, it is a gold brick handed out to the people to deceive them. I said so about that Bill when it was enacted, I think so about it yet, and until the government show some desire to put the law in motion I shall continue to think so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). It is apparent to every one who has considered the subject that there may be combinations for business purposes which are entirely legitimate and which are not attended with any improper or injurious consequences to the community as a whole. Of that we can see examples around us every day in Canada. On the other hand there is not only in Canada, but in other countries, a tendency to combinations of a character which are not for the advantage of the community or of the country. These combinations may be roughly divided into two classes: those which are created for the purpose of excluding competition and raising prices, and those the capitalization of which is very exaggerated. We know of cases where a great deal of the

capitalization does not represent any actual investment or anything in the nature of tangible value, but merely what might be called potential future profits. When a country is carrying on its affairs under a protective system, it is easy to see there may be evil in that because when stock representing no actual investment reaches the hands of bona fide holders for value, there may be a demand more or less insistent that the people who paid money for this stock—which originally represented no money at all—should have some claim on those in charge of the fiscal system of the country, so that dividends may be earned upon this stock. On a recent occasion outside of this House, I stated that I believed a good deal of injury had been done to the industrial development of Canada by some transactions of that character, and, gentlemen who are interested in manufactures afterwards said to me that they realized that there was a good deal of truth in my statement, because, as I said then and as I repeat now, when retribution comes for practices of that kind the punishment is apt to fall upon the just and the unjust alike. Combinations, even of the character to which I first referred, do not always have the absolute result of raising prices. One of the world's greatest combinations, the Standard Oil Company, did I understand reduce prices. I am not justifying the existence of that great combine; I am merely citing it as an illustration of the possibility of having perhaps an improper combine and at the same time a reduction instead of an increase in price. It is abundantly evident, not only in Canada but the United States, that combinations created for the purpose of doing away with competition do increase the price of commodities beyond what it should be. These two evils; the attempt to shut out competition and the capitalization of future possible profits are evils to which the attention of parliament may very well be directed. The Minister of Labour is perfectly satisfied with the existing legislation, but I am not sure that it meets the case at all. To be perfectly frank I do not think it does. In the first place, even if it were effective there is no provision which imposes upon any particular authority the duty of enforcing it. In the words of the homely adage quoted by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) what is everybody's business is nobody's business and, a private person in this country will not take upon himself the odium and responsibility, not to speak of the expense, of enforcing such a law. It is idle for the government to place such a measure upon the statute-book and not to provide for its enforcement. I would dismiss altogether from consideration the operation of that statute, because I am of the present opinion that it would never result in coping with the two evils I have pointed out.

There is another thing that should not be lost sight of—we have absolute power in this parliament, if we exercise it, to enact legislation which will make the continued existence of these two evils impossible, so far of course, as that can be attained in view of the infinite resourcefulness of the men who are creating them, and in view also of the enormous complexity of business transactions in these later days. We may not be able to provide an absolutely perfect remedy but this parliament can at least provide a reasonable remedy. We are face to face also with the existence of these great combines in the United States upon a scale much larger than has been attempted in Canada. The combination of business interests in the United States at the present day, was undreamed of 15 years ago, or even 10 years ago, and their influence is making itself felt in Canada. There are in Canada at the present time several branches of industry the output of which, and the prices at which the output shall be sold in Canada, are absolutely regulated by direct and positive orders from great corporations in the United States. I am not speaking from personal knowledge now, but from what has been conveyed to me by men who ought to be in a thoroughly good position to know what they are speaking of, and as to whose absolute truthfulness I have not the slightest shadow of a doubt.

My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), says the same thing is true of combinations in Canada. I was not aware of that, because my attention has been directed to the remarkable circumstance that there were combines in the United States regulating, by direct and positive orders, the amount of output of Canadian factories, and the price at which that output should be sold. If that is the case, it seems to me that that subject, although it may be a very difficult one to deal with, and one that possibly can only be dealt with by means of the tariff, is a subject that requires the consideration of this parliament, and that ought to be taken up in connection with the evils resulting from combinations having their origin in this country. I think my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has done no more than his duty in bringing this subject to the attention of the House. Whether or not we agree with the remedy he proposes, whether or not we agree with the terms in which he has couched his resolution, I think we all must admit that he has done a public service in bringing the subject to the attention of parliament. For my part, I am inclined to think that instead of investigation we want some legislation. I am inclined to think that parliament is at the present time possessed of about all the information necessary to enable us to put some legislation on the Statute Book of Canada.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton), Mr. Speaker, from listening to the various opinions that have been expressed regarding the Combines Investigation Act, it becomes apparent what a difficult subject this is to deal with. Nobody will deny that under existing conditions in many lines the combines are an absolute menace to the people, having the effect of enhancing prices. The prime object, therefore, of any measure that may be brought into force should be to remedy that evil. The hon. leader of the Opposition has said that there is now sufficient machinery, irrespective of the Act at present under discussion, to get at the basis of the evil. If that is the case, I am bound to say that I am quite ignorant of it. I have given considerable attention to this matter, having taken some interest in the passing of that Act, and up to the time that Act was passed, I did not see any remedy for the evil complained of. It is true, the Act is not perfect, but what I would like to know, is how it can be made more perfect. It has been said that there is no way of enforcing the penalties that may be incurred under this Act. The ordinary way I understand, is simply by suit. In what other way can it be done?

Mr. KING. I might call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that the Act makes provision that the Governor in Council may enforce the penalties.

Mr. PARDEE. I did not know that that was provided in the Act. The hon. leader of the Opposition speaks of the expense required to put the Act in motion; but one of the strongest points in favour of the Act is that the expense is borne entirely by the government.

Mr. MONK. I think the initial expense must be borne by the complainant until the case goes from the hands of the judge into the hands of the Commission.

Mr. PARDEE. That is merely the making of the motion. If the motion is successful, the costs are borne entirely by the government. The fault found by the farmers with the old procedure was this: It is very well to say that there is at present a provision in the statute whereby we may attack combines, and if certain things are shown certain remedies will be given, but how is it possible for us to get together and put up the whole cost of what may be a very expensive investigation, as was shown by the paper combine investigation. That is almost an impossibility for us. Therefore, it was that section 41 of the Combines Investigation Act was adopted, which provided that all the expense connected with the investigation should be paid by the government, and not a single dollar is to come out of the complainant.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Mr. MONK. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. If the judge orders proof or inquiry on the first motion, the expense of it has to be borne by the complainant, and it may be quite costly.

Mr. PARDEE. Only for the prima facie case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If this is a public evil, why should any responsibility of that kind be imposed upon private individuals? If this is a good law why should not public provision be made for its enforcement?

Mr. PARDEE. That question was brought up at the time this Act was under investigation. It appears to me to be self-evident why. I think it would not be wise for this House to put into the hands of any one, perhaps an irresponsible person, and without the slightest ground of complaint, the means of coming day after day and setting all the machinery of this Act in motion on an ex parte motion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But all that is not necessary. If there is a great evil of this kind, surely you can appoint an officer or form a tribunal, who will not be called upon to act upon the initiative of any person, but who will be bound and responsible to take the initiative and deal with this evil wherever reasonable evidence exists that an inquiry ought to be made.

Mr. PARDEE. Practically we are agreed upon that. That is practically the same thing as now exists. Their complaint and evidence before any commission that might be appointed. Surely the commission could not investigate holus bolus without having some evidence on which to base its action.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Railway Commission of Canada can, upon its own initiative, make any investigation it sees fit, wherever in its opinion, an evil exists, and I see no reason whatever why the same principle might not be applied to such a case as this.

Mr. PARDEE. I can hardly agree with my hon. friend as to that. It would be giving a commission too great power to allow it, on its own initiative, to walk into the office of any business concern and examine its books and go into all the details of its transactions. To grant such a power to any body of men, which they might put into effect whatever they chose without even any demand being made upon them, could not fail to work injustice in some cases. As concerns the argument of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), what he desires is an independent commission and not have the onus put upon private individuals, because these individuals who would lay a complaint might be made to suffer in many ways. But sure-

ly no commission could be more independent than the one intended to be created by the Act now on our statutes. Those who complain appoint a representative, those who are complained against appoint a second, and a third is appointed by the courts. Surely no commission could be more independent than that. Each side is entitled to employ its own counsel. I fail to see why any six farmers should have any reason to bear persecution in any way because they happen to lay a complaint, and I do not think there could be any doubt about their readiness to prosecute their complaint if they thought they could make out a prima facie case. Therefore I do not see how we could create any commission more independent than the one contemplated by the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman were one of the six farmers he would think differently.

Mr. PARDEE. I do not see why I should. I have talked to a good many of the farmers on this matter and my information from them differs from that of my hon. friend. But so far as my hon. friend's remarks go, he is distinctly not in favour of the resolution of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) because he said very frankly—and I admire him for his frankness—that he does not think this government could appoint any commission which would not in some way do something wrong, and consequently could not be depended upon to act justly.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say that as far as my recollection goes, and I certainly did not intend to say it. What I intended to say was that if any commission were directly under the control of the government, the government could make that commission act or refrain from acting, and I would have very grave suspicion that the evil would not be effectively dealt with.

Mr. PARDEE. Well, I take it that the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, if it means anything, means that the commission should be appointed by the government. I cannot see any other way in which the commission he recommends could be appointed. I am not here in any way to defend combines. To my mind they are a menace. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has pointed out in his resolution that very frequently they raise the prices. That no one can doubt. But the sole point to my mind is this What is the best way to get at the evil and stamp it out? This resolution, to my mind, is certainly not sufficient, and I have failed to hear any one propose anything that would provide a more effective remedy than the one we have on our statutes. But should a better remedy be found than is on our statutes, I am prepared to support it. As I have said however, the opinions expressed to-night as to the regulation of capitalization and various other things only go to show that so far nothing more effective has been proposed than we already have. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) has himself said that the legislation he evidently had in his mind might not be perfect because of the many devious ways of these combines which might render it unworkable. That is only another argument to show that in any new legislation such as now proposed, the House will not get at the root of the evil, and the only thing to do is to put in operation the legislation we have. What is there to prevent, under the existing statute, an application being made and a commission or board of arbitration being appointed? Under that statute the various parties to the dispute can have their own counsel and thresh the matter out. The Act goes so far as to say that the books of the corporation may be examined into by the board of arbitration, and this board of arbitration may be started practically without a single dollar of expense to the parties complaining. The chief objection I have to the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is this, that having spent the time we did on the Combines Investigation Act last session and that, in so far as we can judge at present, that legislation is better than any yet proposed, I can see no reason why we should devise some new tribunal and appoint another commission to examine into the very thing covered by the present Act. If any legislation can be shown which will more effectively reach the object which it is intended to reach I shall be only too glad to support it, but I do not think that any has been proposed so far. As the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said these combines can be waked up just as well by our present Act as by any other legislation and therefore the resolution of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is simply a surplusage; and before deciding any other remedy, we ought to give fair opportunity to test the one we have.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). The speech of my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) is a confirmation of the general opinion that the government is unable to reach these combines. I am sure nobody in Canada will think for a moment that we have not sufficient legislation on our statutes.

Mr. KING. The hon. leader of the opposition did.

Mr. BLAIN. The complaint about the country is that the Minister of Labour is devoting altogether too much time in the preparation of legislation and fails to enforce the legislation already on the statutes.

The reason there is so much talk in the country about combines is because of the introduction of the national policy many years ago and the attacks my hon. friends opposite made on that policy. My hon. friends opposite taught the people of Canada that combines were introduced by the policy of the Liberal-Conservative government. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) was one of those who went about telling the people what a wicked policy the Conservative party had created, and that it was the prolific parent of combines, and that these combines had unduly enhanced prices to the consumer, and when the Liberals came into power of course these combines would be immediately got rid of. The people are to-day asking how is it that this government does not enforce the legislation it has and break up the combines which are unduly enhancing prices. It looks as if my hon. friends opposite, by their tariff reform and by sitting in their offices preparing legislation, were trying to reach this great question when they are well aware that all that is wanted is some activity on the part of some officer who should be appointed for that purpose, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition suggested when this matter was up for discussion last year. The Minister of Labour had a year of trial of his new legislation, and he acknowledges to-night that it has done nothing except create one case.

Mr. KING. If I may interrupt my hon. friend, I did not acknowledge that the legislation has done nothing; on the contrary, I say it has done everything. The very fact that there are no investigations under it shows that these companies are held under restraint by it.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman seems to say that because the legislation has done nothing, therefore, it has done everything. Because there is only one case under the law, the hon. gentleman tells us that peace is abroad, and there are no combines.

Mr. KING. I would remind my hon. friend of the illustration I used: He would not estimate the effect of the death penalty by the number of hangings, but by the fewness of them.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to hear the hon. gentleman explain how this law has kept down combines. Only in one case has any action been taken under it. And the hon. gentleman admits that he and his department, and the government have taken no action at all. If inactivity will reach difficulties of this kind, it is the only case in which difficulties are to be dealt with in that way. The people will not be satisfied, and are not satisfied. The defence of existing legislation by my hon. friend is practically a plea for combines. Take, for instance, the situation in relation to beef. This session, and more particularly last session, complaint was made from this side of the House that in western Canada there is a great evil that is hindering the agricultural interests there, and that in sections of Manitoba, and the other provinces where, years ago, a large number of cattle were raised by the farmers, these people have gone out of the cattle business for the reason that there are low prices for their beef because of the operations of a combine. And it is proven that in the province of Ontario the price paid for beef to the farmers is not an excessive price; no one can accuse the agricultural interest of charging too much for the beef produced upon our farms. The difficulty arises after the beef has been sold by the farmer and before it reaches the consumer. There are combines in that business; the Minister of Labour himself understands that. There has been discussion in the public press, and, no doubt, the Department of Labour has received considerable complaint from the people of the country that this legislation does not cure the evil. There has been legislation on the statute-book for a long time. There is a law that was placed on the statute-book at the instance of the late Hon. Clarke Wallace. I am not saying that it was well enforced; it is not necessary that I should discuss or defend it. But when the present government came into power they promised that better legislation would be passed and enforced. But the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) of course, sits quietly by and you do not get a word against combines from him. All that he does is to reform tariffs——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. And he could not reform tariffs if he had not supporters like hon. gentlemen opposite at his back. He does not have to consult them ; they will vote.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL. Perfectly satisfied.

Mr. BLAIN. I have listened for some years to my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) talk about the importance of stability of tariffs in this country. Yet when all interests are doing very well, the government take up the question of tariffs.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was in the National Policy too.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will endorse it, because it contains a sort of balm of Gilead for every part of the country. However, we are not discussing the tariff question just now. I point out that there is a strong feeling in this country against combines, that enhance prices of staple com-

modities to the consumer. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), has pointed out that there are great combines already in existence in Canada, combines that are provincial and combines that are national also. And there are combines from the old country, huge combines such as this country never heard of. There would be no need of the resolution of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) if this government had been doing their duty to the people on this line. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) would support the government, and this side of the House has supported the government, in legislation proposed for the purpose of preventing the formation of these combines. The Minister of Labour in his Bill of last session had the united support of both sides of the House. I pointed out at the time that I did not think this legislation would reach the case. I do not think the Minister of Labour himself thought it would reach the case.

Mr. KING. Certainly, I did. Why did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) support it if he thought it would not reach the case?

Mr BLAIN. I pointed out that it would not reach the case.

Mr. KING. Why did my hon. friend support it if he thought it would not reach the case?

Mr. BLAIN. I take the ground that the government in power are responsible to the people for the legislation of this parliament. Whenever there is anything good, my hon. friend says: See what we have been doing for Canada! But whenever there is anything going wrong he says: Oh the opposition are as much responsible as we are, Sir, I do not think the people will be satisfied with that kind of argument. I want to point out that this question is one that should receive the energetic attention of the government; it is their duty to look into it seriously. It is not enough for the Minister of Labour to say, as the hon. member for West Lambton did, that five or six farmers could join together and make a complaint, and that if the machinery of this law was put in force under this complaint these combines could be reached and the government would pay all the costs. That is not sufficient. If the government believe that this law is able to reach these combines, it is their duty to appoint somebody whose business it will be to enforce the law, otherwise the legislation is a dead letter. Why does not the hon. gentleman accept the suggestion of the leader of the opposition, and appoint an officer in his department to enforce the law?

Mr. KING. The reason why I think such a course would hardly commend itself to the House is that when a similar line of action was recommended once before it was pointed out that the government would use such an officer for its own purposes; they would send him as an agent to further political ends. To follow the argument used by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), this officer would oppose those interests which the government might think it desirable to oppose, and refrain from opposing favourable interests. The legislation which has been put upon the statute-book removes the possibility of anything of that kind, and leaves the initiative in the operation of the law to those who are likely to be affected adversely.

Mr. BLAIN. If my hon. friend's suggestion has anything in it, it is that there cannot be found in his department any one to enforce this legislation because there is too much politics in it. That is a strange condition of things. That rather suggests that my hon. friend knows that he is possibly surrounding himself in his department with politicians rather than with men who will enforce the labour law. I am not saying that is the case, because I accept his statement. He says it would not do to accept the suggestion of the leader of the opposition, for the reason that if such an officer was appointed he would be charged with enforcing legislation against one class of people, and leaving another class go free. Does the hon. gentleman think that is a sufficient answer to the suggestion made by the leader of the opposition?

Mr. PATERSON. Would you not be rather apt to make that charge yourself.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has been guilty so long, in his early days, of looking after the interest of his party rather than the interest of his country, that I fear his vision is not very clear on a question of this kind. I want to point out that there is a feeling abroad in Canada that combines are in active existence. That feeling disturbs commercial conditions, and agricultural interests as well. If the people could be convinced that where combines are proved to exist this government would scatter them; that where it was proved that prices were enhanced unduly in consequence of these combines the government would suppress them; then the people would be satisfied and content, instead of being suspicious and discontented as at present. When people are paying too much for their goods at any time they want a government in power who will break down the combines, and who will see to it that the manufacturers shall not be permitted to charge more than a fair and reasonable

price for their goods. But so long as the government allow these combines to continue their operations, with the effect of unduly enhancing prices to the consumer, there will always continue to be these discussions, and these unsettled relations between the manufacturer and the consumer. That is a point that ought to receive some attention at the hands of the Minister of Labour, and that is what I had understood his department was for. When I open the 'Gazette,' published by the Department of Labour, and look over the difficulties that occur between capital and labour I find that they are mainly settled by themselves, not by the agency of the minister's department. My hon. friend seems to think that when he has put a law upon the statute-book his work is done, and that somebody else must enforce it. A law of that kind will not be satisfactory. I am in accord with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) when he directs attention to the condition of things that exists in this country at the present time. I say that if the Minister of Labour hopes to reach these difficulties that exist in Canada he must be more active, not in putting legislation upon the statute-book, but in enforcing the legislation that is already upon the statute-book.

Mr. MONK. I confess I had expected that a question of this importance would have received more attention from the government. I am very much disappointed with my hon. and young friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), because he does not seem to have accomplished the results in his department that we had a right to expect. No doubt the hon. gentleman is very busy in his department, and I can understand that possibly questions of this kind do not absorb so much of his attention as they do outside the House. But, really, some of the motives given by him for not accepting the prayer of this motion seem to be trivial. He suggests that it would be most untimely for us to investigate mergers at this moment, because negotiations are going on with the United States for a reciprocity treaty. Surely my hon. friend is not serious. What possible relation is there between a proposal to investigate our economic conditions in Canada and the negotiations for a modification of our tariff with the United States?

In order to give some color to my hon. friends suggestion, he says that we would have to investigate the businesses of these companies. My hon. friend is not serious as to that. This motion calls for the investigation of the circumstances attending the merger, the influence that it has in connection with prices and the influence in our standing in foreign markets and banking necessities. We have nothing to do with the details of the businesses of these companies. Not at all, but a Royal Commission, formed under the terms of this motion, if it were passed, would not be called upon to look into the details of any business whatever, or I much misunderstand the purport of the motion. My hon. friend seems to think that the object of this motion is to complain of the price of certain commodities, such as is contemplated by the Combines Act, to complain of the increase in the price of say, butter, or any other such necessities of life. There is nothing of that kind in the motion, and I think it would be sufficient for me to mention that any lawyer would see that the combine Act does not apply to an object of this kind. In order to be able to assume that that is proven it is sufficient to read section 5 of the Act passed last year under the leadership of my hon. friend, because you will see that it merely applies to certain specific cases of arrangements between producers as to the prices of their products, There is nothing of that in this motion. While I am speaking of that, I may say that I was amused to hear the minister say that the passing of this Act had stopped combines.

Mr. KING. No, I beg your pardon.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, the hon. gentleman compared it with the death penalty.

Mr. KING. No, my hon. friend is mistaken. I spoke of its adverse effect on combinations. I did not say that they had at all ceased because I believe that combines will continue to increase during the coming years. But, I did say that it had had a restraining effect upon combines using their power in a manner detrimental to the public.

Mr. MONK. Surely my hon. friend knows that these combines have been continuing during the whole year, that regularly, manufacturers and wholesale and retail dealers have been meeting as usual, fixing prices and violating the terms of the Act. There is no doubt that the Act applies a remedy, but as the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), said, it is a useless remedy, because nobody will employ it. In truth, no government, as my hon. friend from Grey says, will take up this question seriously and directly. Why ? Because it affects great interests and governments are afraid to touch these interests. There is no doubt about that. Why, if the minister instituted the inquiry that is suggested in this motion great, powerful men would be affected, there is no doubt, but we would have an immediate cessation of the operations which lead to these mergers where these men make enormous sums of money and less powerful men and groups of poor people lose their all. That is what

I find in connection with this. My hon. friend stated that there had been no proof made in support of this motion that the banking facilities of the country had been injuriously affected.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), knows that he has no right to reply without the consent of the House, as this is an amendment to go into Committee of Supply. I have no objection if the House consents.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. King), knows that it would not be proper to state certain particular cases here, but surely my hon. friend is aware of the details of most of these mergers, where they were engineered, what banks carried them through, and who were the individuals interested. The members of the government are supposed to know all that, the public generally know it, and it is a matter of notoriety. I think I have said enough to establish the fact that the creation of this commission would be a very useful thing.

Amendment (Mr. Monk) negatived on division and House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had finished, when the House was last in Committee of Supply——

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley), is not suggesting that we take up estimates to-night ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we are going on with the Manitoba items—public buildings.

Mr. STAPLES. These items largely concern the city of Winnipeg and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart), has gone home. It is now a quarter past eleven. and I think it is about time to discontinue work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is one item for Winnipeg, a military item, which I propose to allow to stand. That only leaves one item of $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. The government are proposing an eight hour Bill and they should not ask us to work twelve hours a day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope my hon. friend will not press the objection because we can get in an hour's work. The first item is.

Dominion public buildings—renewals, improvements, repairs &c., $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister would be well advised to let us adjourn.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STAPLES. I have been in this House for many years, and I have noticed that the Manitoba items usually come up almost at midnight with the result that they are rushed through and do not get the criticism they deserve. I do not think we should be called upon to sit around here till this hour of the night waiting to have a right to protest against any of the estimates dealing with Manitoba. It is true that there are only a few items, it is true that Manitoba gets very little consideraion from this government and the least consideration the Minister of Public Works might give to Manitoba, is to take up the items earlier in the day.

Mr. SPROULE. On days when we have set questions to be disposed of and where notice is given in advance that one of these days is intended to be used for the purpose of discussing a question, it is not the usual custom nor is it part of wisdom to start to do a day's work when we have reached a quarter past eleven at night. We commenced this morning at eleven o'clock with the committees and we have put in over 12 hours' work to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. member for Macdonald desires to have the Manitoba items stand over I will be willing to take the items for Saskatchewan and Alberta. The hour is quite early. I am surprised at my hon. youthful friend from East Grey wanting to go home so early.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister is getting along with his estimates much more rapidly than are the public buildings in Manitoba.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The sooner we get through with the estimates the more rapidly we can do the work.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is not my experience, the rush with the estimates is in inverse ratio to the hurry with the public buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will let the Manitoba items stand and take up Saskatchewan and Alberta. The hon. member for Macleod is here and he will be delighted to see the Macleod item go through.

Mr. HERRON. Personally I do not object, but I do not think it fair to proceed in the absence of the other members from my province.

Battleford public building, $33,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site has been purchased for $3,000 and the contract let. The building is for post office, &c. The contract, exclusive of heating and electric wiring, is for $26,785, and the estimated expense, including everything, is $41,-310.40. Battleford, formerly the capital of the Northwest Territories, is in a fine section of country which is growing rapidly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is this new Battleford or old Battleford?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Old Battleford.

Mr. LAKE. What is the population of North Battleford, and why is old Battleford chosen in preference?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Old Battleford is a considerable distance from North Battleford, and a branch line of the railway has been constructed from the main line to it. Of course a public building in North Battleford would not suit Old Battleford, and vice versa.

Mr. LAKE. Old Battleford is an important place but New Battleford has also claims for a public building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At some no distant date in the future, my hon. friend may be able to so press the claims of New Battleford that it may have a public building.

Mr. SPROULE. When was the contract let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the 29th of October last.

Mr. MEIGHEN. When were the plans approved?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me over a year ago.

Mr. SPROULE. How many tenders were received?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders were called for by public advertisement. One tender was received, that of M. H. Piggott & Son, of Hamilton, for $26,735, which was nearly $12,000 below the chief architect's estimate of the bare cost of the building. That is for the whole contract, outside of heating, lighting, fittings, lock boxes, &c.

Mr. STANFIELD. When did this item first appear in the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1907-8.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was that before a general election or since?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My recollection is that it was before the general election.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Had it anything to do with the result?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who is the representative in this House?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Champagne.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Would it not be a good thing to have the representative of the district here when such an important matter as this is being discussed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think it is essential.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Has the minister received petitions from the city council of Battleford or other public bodies urging the speedy construction of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The only record I have is that application was made by Mr. McCraney as long ago as January, 1907, requesting the erection of a public building in Battleford. He made out a very strong case as to the inadequacy of the present accommodation. One strong point he made was that for the offices for the different departments, the Dominion lands office, the telegrah office, the immigration hall, and the post office we were paying rents amounting to $1,536 a year.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the minister explain how it is, then, that without any particular urgency, except what is represented by the member for the constituency, he has given this building, while he postpones many others which were in the estimates of the same year, but which are represented by members of the opposition?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One strong reason was that the accommodation for the various offices was wholly inadequate.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The case I have in mind has no accommodation at all.

Mr. SPROULE. If the accommodation was so inadequate in 1907, how is it that the work remains undone until 1911? There was urgency for the building in 1907, but there was no urgency for the next three years, and now it is getting to be urgent again.

Mr. BLAIN. Is my hon. friend paying the same rents now that he did in 1907?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume the same.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What was the population of Battleford at the time Mr. McCraney first made the suggestion?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 1,800 or thereabouts.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the minister read to the committee the letter of recommendation he received from Mr. McCraney?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the letter, but only an epitome of it. It is dated January 19, 1907. It sets forth the rents paid for the various government offices, the amount of revenue received, money orders, &c. He states that Battleford stands tenth in the province of Saskatchewan for gross revenue, and third for money orders paid, that each of the buildings now occupied is inadequate for the requirements of the public service, that a considerable saving in fuel and caretaking could be effected by having all the offices in one building. He also points out that Battleford is the oldest established town in Saskatchewan,

that it is a post of the Northwest Mounted Police, that it has a land office and an Indian agency, that it is destined to be a town of considerable importance, and is the centre of a fine farming country.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is there a branch line running into old Battleford now?

Mr. GRAHAM. You can go into both old Battleford and new Battleford by train.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the minister send any representatives of his department to visit these places and advise whether or not a building should be erected?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we sent a representative to chose the site.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Was he instructed to ascertain whether Liberals or Conservatives were to be served?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does he know, as a matter of fact, that his representative makes a practice of so inquiring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have never heard it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Then I will give the minister an instance. Not longer ago than this summer there were certain residents of a locality not far from the city where I live who came to me with respect to certain difficulties they were in caused by floods in the Assiniboia. I am not referring now to the improvements made by the government during the month of the last election, to improvements of a similar kind undertaken by this government about 28 days before the election; but I refer to a point further east where some difficulties occurred by reason of the flooding which could be remedied. At the request of these gentlemen I wrote the department and urged that a representative should be sent to the locality to ascertain whether or not it was the duty of the government to make similar operations in the bed of the river and thus avoid the disasters they were subject to. A petition, I believe, was also sent in. The department did send out a representative. The petition was headed by the name of a gentleman who turned out to be a staunch Liberal. The representative notified the man whose name was at the head of the petition and was met by him at the railway station and they drove together to the scene. On arriving there the representative of this government inquired what were the political complexions of those who would be benefited by the proposed alterations. He was informed by this gentleman that when they called on the representative for the constituency he made no such inquiries, but did seem to consider that the public were entitled to equal justice, no matter of what political complexion. That, however, made no impression on the representative of the Public Works Department; and having ascertained that mostly Conservatives would be benefited, he recommended, so far as my information comes from the department, that the undertaking was not such a one as should be contemplated by the department at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Might I ask the name of the representative of the government?

Mr. MEIGHEN. His name was Stevens, and if the hon. gentleman or the gentleman himself disputes my statement, I am prepared to give evidence in support of it at any time. I have no doubt whatever that the same practice is very rigidly adhered to in the department.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In what papers were the tenders advertised?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very sorry I have not got the list, but would be glad to get it, and give it to my hon. friend.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think this item should stand. We have not got the information we are asking for, or the population of the district in which this building is to be erected. It is now a quarter to midnight, and I think that after the effort of the ministry with regard to the eight hour Bill some attention should be paid to the comfort of the committee.

Mr. CROTHERS. Was a contract entered into and at what price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, at $26,735.

Mr. CROTHERS. But we only voted $10,000, so that the department has entered into a contract $16,000 in excess of the vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Subject to the vote of parliament.

Mr. CROTHERS. Is there a provision of that kind in the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS. It seems to me that the best reason this item should be allowed to stand is the absence of the member representing the constituency. The minister has not told us the grounds upon which he proposes to put up a building there at all. I assume he has never visited the little old village himself, and does not deign to tell us what information he has from any public official or whether he has any at all as to the necessity for this building. From the information we have, all that the minister knows in this matter he got from the gentleman who at one time represented this constituency in this House and not from the hon. member who represents it now. Hon. members on this side have the right to have the gentleman who represents the constituency here so that

he might be subjected to cross examination regarding the statements contained in the letter which the minister says he received from the gentleman who represented the constituency at some day long past. The minister knows nothing about it himself, and the hon. member who represents the constituency now (Mr. Champagne) is not here. If the minister has no report from the officials of his department as to the necessity for a building there or as to the character of the building, he ought not to press this item.

It seems to me that in all these cases the minister should afford members of the House information of the grounds on which he is proposing to erect a public building. In this case, the only ground the hon. gentleman gives us is a letter from a supporter and that letter is four years old. The minister has told us that circumstances change very rapidly in that new country, that cities spring up in a few hours. Four years ago there may have been need to put up a building of this kind in the place proposed, but that does not show that it may not be expedient now to expend twice as much as was then proposed. We on this side have a right to have some one here who knows the circumstances of these places, and I know no one better qualified than the gentleman who represents the constituency. But he is not here. The minister does not even tell us that he consulted the gentleman who represents the constituency.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crothers) now, if it will satisfy him, that on many occasions the hon. member urged upon me the need for this building.

Mr. CROTHERS. I have no hesitation in accepting the statement of the Minister of Public Works. But the fact that the representative of the constituency urged the construction of this building is the very reason why that representative should be here. The minister is not prepared to answer questions on cross-examination, for he has never been there, and knows nothing about it at first hand, but all his information is at second hand from the representative of the district. But this is not the first time when the minister has asked a large sum to be spent on public buildings or on harbours and rivers when the gentleman who instigated the expenditure was not here. The minister comes forward knowing nothing about it, and the member who does know about it keeps out of the chamber and gives us no opportunity to cross-examine him. I submit that this item should be allowed to stand until some one is here who is prepared to answer our questions.

This expenditure was first proposed in these estimates in 1907-8. It appears to be another of the innumerable cases provided for shortly before the last general election. I have been looking up some of the old estimates, and I find that in Nova Scotia we have had very rank illustration of that sort of thing. In the main estimates of the session before the election, the vote for harbours and rivers for Nova Scotia was about $373,000. A few months after that, it was determined to have an election; and on the 9th of July, 1908, supplementary estimates were brought down for no less a sum than $448,000 for the same purposes. Taking the two together, we find that, three months before the general election, they were giving an average of about $45,000 for each constituency of Nova Scotia. That is a nice way to endeavour to purchase a proportion of the electors in the different constituencies of that province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is an item for Battleford.

Mr. CROTHERS. Yes, and I am asking whether or not the same motive induced the putting in of this item just before the election as induced the other. And I am illustrating the evils of that system, or want of system, and would like to ascertain, as I started out by saying, from the member who represents the constituency, whether or not similar conditions exist there to those that existed in Nova Scotia, but we have not the advantage of that information, for the member for that district is not present. It is a very nice thing for the government to say, in substance, to the people of a province: We propose to spend $800,000 on harbours and rivers in your province before 31st March next. We are putting our candidates in a position to say to the electors of each constituency: Here is an estimate in print. The government have promised to expend, during the year ending 31st March next, in the improvement of harbours and rivers in Nova Scotia, no less a sum than $813,000. Now the election is coming on next October. If the government is sustained, these sums will be expended, if the government is not sustained, well, you take your chances of getting this money.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I admit that there are hundreds of thousands of voters in every province of this country who are not influenced by anything of that kind. I understand the answer that hon. gentlemen opposite will sometimes make: You are accusing the whole people of that province of being purchasable. Nothing of the kind. Thousands of men in the province of Nova Scotia, as in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, are uninfluenced by any such improper motives. But I am sorry to say that in almost every constituency,

whether it be in Nova Scotia or any other province, there is a sufficient number of voters who are influenced by such improper motives to change the result of elections in that constituency. Now I would like to know from some one capable of telling us, the conditions out at Battleford. There is no one here, and we are asked to vote away $33,000 without having all the information, without being in a position to cross-examine the informant. Just fancy a minister of the Crown coming before this committee with a letter written by some one who is not here, with the person representing the constituency out of the chamber, nobody who knows anything about the conditions to answer our questions, and he asks us to vote away $33,000 for the construction of a building up in that part of the country. I do not know whether the hon. members sitting behind the minister would vote for it if it came to a vote. We have often been asked the question: If it were proposed to erect this building in a constituency represented by the gentlemen on this side of the House, would you oppose it? And they seem to think that there is no answer to that question. Well, Sir, if you will pardon me for referring to a personal matter, I will tell the minister that during this very session I have been requested by a number of influential electors in my constituency to try to induce the Minister of Public Works to erect a public building in a certain village. I wrote back very emphatically to them and said, I shall do nothing of the kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the name of the village?

Mr. CROTHERS. I am not giving any names just now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman wants to keep that dark too.

Mr. CROTHERS. I distinctly told those gentlemen that I would not be a party to asking the government to expend public money in that place, because there are many other places throughout the country very much larger and much more entitled to an expenditure of money in the public interest. I have no doubt that there are dozens of other gentlemen on this side of the House who have refused to ask the government to expend money on public buildings at places where they think it should not be expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not found many of them.

Mr. CROTHERS. Well, I have told you the fact in regard to myself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman wont favour me even with the name of the place

Mr. CROTHERS. No, you are not entitled to the name just now. When my hon. friend comes to vote away public money he will then be entitled to the particulars; and if he comes to vote away any public money for the construction of a building anywhere in my constituency, and I am in the House, he will have a right to cross-examine me as to that town, just as I have a right now to cross-examine anybody who lives at Battleford. We do not know, for instance, whether this public building is intended for post office accommodation, or whether it is intended for a custom house.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman must have been out when I stated what it was for. I said it was for Dominion lands office, telegraph office and post office.

Mr. CROTHERS. The minister has told us on other occasions the exact reason why he did not put a public building in a certain town with 4,000 or 5,000 inhabitants—the post office there is now being carried on in a very commodious building, convenient to the public, for $5 a month, or $7 a month, at a much lower expenditur to the government than there would be if we were to expend $15,000 or $20,000 in putting up a public building. But we have no information touching that matter here. We do not know where the post office is in the old town of Battleford, we do not know how much rent is being paid for it, we do not know whether it is in a convenient position, we do not know, in a word, the very facts we ought to know, according to the minister himself, before we vote away this public money. According to his statement made on other occasions, if they have a commodious building there now, if that they are able to get at a reasonable rental in a convenient locality, then this money should not be expended. Now we have no one here to tell us the facts of the case. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that as we have already put in three quarters of an hour, and that it is past midnight, the minister ought now to accept the suggestion we made an hour ago, and not attempt to proceed with any of these items until he has some one here qualified to answer proper and legitimate questions submitted by hon. members on this side of the House.

Mr. RHODES. I must submit with the utmost deference, that I do not think the minister has given us reasons why we should vote this sum of money. I find in examining the report of the Postmaster General of last year some rather interesting facts. For example, I find that the postal revenue for the town of Battleford was the sum of $4,246.81. Upon looking at the return for the town of North Battleford, which I believe is at a distance of some seven miles away, the postal revenue was $5,226.97, or something like one-fifth more. Then of money orders issued in the

town of Battleford, the return is $3,078; in the town of North Battleford, $5,604. In the next column I find that the total amount of money orders issued was for the town of Battleford, $33,900.36; the total amount of money orders issued to the town of North Battleford comprised the sum of $71,351.80, or in round numbers more than double. Again, the total commission received from the public in the town of Battleford was $213.08, and for the town of North Battleford, $425.85. Again, in the next column the number of money orders paid shows a slight increase in the case of North Battleford. The same with the total amount of postal notes paid. Again, the compensation paid to the postmaster in the town of Battleford was $137.69, that is, I believe, his percentage in addition to the salary; in North Battleford it was $238.81. Now all these instances go to show that in North Battleford you have a larger and more flourishing town, but you give the public building to Battleford. Take, for instance, the volume of the money orders in Battleford, $33,000; in North Battleford, $71,000. It would be only fair for the Minister of Public Works to take us into his confidence and tell us why it is that old Battleford has been chosen for the site of this post office, rather than North Battleford. It would be doing simple justice to the citizens of North Battleford to let them know why old Battleford is chosen in preference.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should be very glad indeed to give my hon. friend that information, but if we had to let items stand because the member for the constituency did not happen to be present, we would not be able to get on with the business. It does not make any more difference to me than hon. gentlemen opposite whether they talk against time or whether they do not, but I think it makes a little difference to the people of the country. I want to congratulate my hon. friend in my eye on talking against time while apparently conveying the impression to many who listened to him that he was not doing so. I have heard a great many public men in my day in the legislature where I attended for a number of years doing the same thing, but I have never heard one who does it more admirably than my hon. friend who is just in front of me. But he ought to remember that it costs a little, that every half hour that we take up unnecessarily here costs something to the country and I do not believe my hon. friend will approve of it. The question is simply whether we shall vote an item to enable the department to pay the contractors for this building to which parliament has already committed itself. Is it worth while to waste time simply for the sake of wasting time? With regard to the reason asked for, very courteously, by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), with whom I have no fault to find, because he did not follow the example of the hon. gentleman who preceded him, the reason why we selected Battleford is, that this is an old town and it is growing, not rapidly, but it is growing very well indeed. While the main line of the Canadian Northern railway passed it by, it has now been connected up with a branch line and I believe both the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific railway have Old Battleford in view and are seeking approval of routes by which they propose to reach that town. Battleford, according to my own observation, is in the centre of a magnificent, a beautiful farming country, first class settlers have gone in there and it happens that in old Battleford we have several departments of the government. We have the Immigration Department, the Mounted Police, a telegraph office, a Dominion Lands office, and for all these we are paying a pretty heavy rental. The accommodation is not what it ought to be and it will be very much better to have these different departments housed in one building.

Mr. DANIEL. What rental does the minister pay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are paying $1,536. Surely it is better to pass this item, and I will only ask for two or three more, including Macleod. Then, we will be able to go home to our comfortable beds and have the consciousness that we have done some actual work.

Mr. CROTHERS. I desire to say one word in reply to the minister. If I had not sat here for two sessions and listened to his persuasive and comforting voice I would be amazed at the courage he has displayed on this occasion in charging me with talking at this hour of the night and wasting time. I want to resent that statement with all the seriousness and indignation of which I am capable. Members of the House know very well that I very seldom take up any time in addressing the House. I think I may fairly claim credit for that. I never take up any time unless I feel that I have something to say. Every hon. member present I think, will admit that while I have had the honour of a seat in this House I have taken up comparatively little time in discussing public matters. But, it does not become the hon. minister as a member of this House to accuse any other member of talking against time. I desire anything I have to say in this House to be adjudged upon its merits, and in my judgment hon. members who heard what I said a few minutes ago will agree with what I say.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The majority would be against you now.

Mr. CROTHERS. When the minister was requested at half-past eleven to adjourn he refused to do so and now talks about hon. members wasting time. He ill-estimates the opinion of the people of this country when he does not know that the universal opinion is that we are putting in too much time after twelve o'clock, that honest and virtuous men ought to be in their beds before twelve o'clock and that the business of this country would be better performed if we concluded at ten o'clock at night, if we should go to bed at that hour and come back next day and work in daylight and not at night. It has been said by members of this House and by hundreds of people outside of this House, that the sittings of the House are too protracted during the night. They are surprised at the hour at which these estimates are going through and especially on Friday night, when a great many members are away. The general opinion is that these estimates go through at these late hours with the deliberate intention of putting them through the House when hon. members, exhausted by the long hours, have gone home. That is the opinion of the public outside of this House and yet the minister has the courage to get up at a quarter-past twelve and accuse an hon. member of wasting the time of the country by talking about these expenditures and insisting upon the committee adjourning that we may go home and go to bed like the honest, virtuous politicians we all claim to be. The minister would stand higher in the estimation of the electors of the country if he came before this House in daylight and asked for these estimates then instead of coming to the House at twelve o'clock at night, or one, two or three in the morning, and getting estimates through after the members of this House, by reason of these long hours, have become exhausted and gone home to recuperate in order that they may be enabled to fight next day. The attack which the hon. gentleman made on me was entirely uncalled for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was congratulating you.

Mr. CROTHERS. You cannot—I was going to say—humbug me, as the minister attempts to humbug others by any such sweet words as those. I submit that at this hour the committee had better adjourn.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was surprised to hear the minister state in one breath that from personal observation he could assure the House of the character of the country around Battleford when in the next breath he told us he had never been there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said I had passed through North Battleford, and that I saw there one of the most beautiful sections of country my eyes ever rested on.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then his eyes deceived him. The soil there is so sandy that when portions of the Moosomin reserve within a few miles of the town were put up at auction they could not get a bid at any price, and yet the minister tells us from personal observation it is the finest country his eyes ever rested on.

Mr. BLAIN. I submit that the sitting member of the county should be present when an important item as this is being discussed. I make that submission because on one occasion I remember a supporter of the government condemning the government for uselessly voting public money in his constituency, and perhaps the member for this constituency would do the same thing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend need have no fear of that.

Mr. BLAIN. You never can tell. The sitting member for the county on that occasion condemned the government for the expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who was the member?

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. McEwan who represented Huron some years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been no such member since I have been here.

Mr. GRAHAM. And there is no such disposition now.

Mr. BLAIN. I have no doubt that such a thing would surprise the Minister of Public Works because he has educated his followers in a different method. But the fact is that Mr. McEwen denounced an expenditure on a wharf at St. Joseph in his county, and refused to be held responsible for it, and $15,000 were wasted there, and all you can see to-day is a few posts sticking out of the water, and no sign of a wharf. In view of such an incident as that surely the sitting member for the constituency ought to be here. I would like to know whether there has been any correspondence between the sitting member and the minister with respect to putting this item in the estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have given a summary of that correspondence.

Mr. BLAIN. My complaint is that my hon. friend, instead of bringing down to the committee the letters recommending this building, leaves them in the department. I take the ground that all the correspondence respecting an item of this

kind ought to be forthcoming. My hon. friend refused to bring down original documents. If he brought them down, I am quite sure there would be less criticism, and he would be able to get his items passed through the committee much more quickly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am so much impressed with the forcible argument of my hon. friend, and his thirst for information that I feel disposed to accede to the very strong desire he has expressed that the item stand over till to-morrow ; and when that thirst is satisfied by the production of the letters, I understand that he will assist me in getting this item through.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.32 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 3, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Conmee.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Peoples' Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 111) to incorporate the Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Carvell.

STORAGE OF FOOD SUPPLIES.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 112) respecting the storage of food. He said: The Bill which I desire to introduce to the House, in amendment to the Cold Storage Act, has reference to the greatest question now before the people of this country, the cost of living. The need of something of this kind has been brought forward with great prominence in the last few days in connection with the question of the right to destroy $100,000 worth of eggs which have been in cold storage in the vicinity of Montreal. In the United States there has been so much interest in this matter that one of their most prominent men, Henry Cabot Lodge, has introduced into the Senate of the United States a Bill dealing with it. Mr. Sulzer has also introduced in the House of Representatives a Bill to prevent the sale or transportation in inter-

state or foreign commerce of articles of food held in cold storage for more than one year, and Mr. Moore, of Pennsylvania, has introduced a Bill to regulate the storage of food supplies in the District of Columbia. The Bill which I introduce differs somewhat from these Bills. Section 11 of the Bill, amending the Cold Storage Act, provides:

11. That from and after the passing of this Act it shall be unlawful in Canada to keep in storage in any warehouse or other place of deposit for a longer period than one year any meat, fish, poultry, game, butter, eggs, oysters or other food products intended for sale or distribution.

Section 12 provides:

12. That whenever it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Dominion medical health officer or food inspector that any meat, fish, poultry, game, butter, eggs, oysters or other food products kept in storage for a period under one year, may not be sold or distributed without prejudice to the public health, the said medical health officer or food inspector shall cause such products to be seized and destroyed.

As hon. gentlemen are well aware, there is a prejudice against the cold storage system, but that is a mistake. There is no doubt that, as Mr. Wilson, the secretary of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, says, that system is one of the greatest blessings to mankind. It started in the cold spring house or the cold cellar of the farm and the refrigerator or ice box of the home. In old days the storage of food products in the time of plenty for use in the time of need was practised. The object of cold storage is to lay up food in time of production for human consumption when the time of production is over. While that system may be used to the public disadvantage, it will, if properly regulated, tend to the balance of prices. It enables poor people, or people of moderate means to procure the ordinary necessaries of life at a time when they are not being produced. But the storage system should be guarded. In inquiries made by our neighbours to the south it has been proved that certain articles kept for six months deteriorated. Butter can be kept much longer than eggs. Eggs kept for three months or more will deteriorate, while poultry taken out of cold storage at the end of three months can hardly be distinguished from fresh-killed poultry. After three months, however, there is a gradual change for the worse. I consider, from the information which I have obtained, that the keeping of food products after the time of the year when they can be reproduced is deleterious. Dr. Wiley, chief of the Bureau of Chemistry of the United States Department of Agriculture, gives a list of different foods which can be kept without deterioration for different periods,

according to the nature of the food. I do not claim that this Bill, which I desire to introduce, will cover the whole case. I merely wish to introduce it, as I think it is the duty of an opposition member to bring to the notice of the government any desirable legislation along this line, and I ask the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Inland Revenue to take up this matter either by introducing legislation of their own or by having this Bill sent to a committee.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). I think that the hon. gentleman perhaps is mistaken somewhat in speaking of the time in which food is left in cold storage. The time has not so much to do with the deterioration of the food as the regularity or otherwise of the temperature of the cold storage in which it is kept. Cold storage being carried on under the supervision of private individuals is frequently badly managed and the temperature allowed to vary. Therefore, if we had a law compelling cold storage companies to keep the food under proper temperature that might be better than to enact a time limit. Different products require different temperatures, and when all are kept in the same temperature, some are bound to deteriorate and be spoiled. I do not object to this Bill going to a committee, but I would object to a time limit being fixed altogether irrespective of consideration of temperature, and accommodation. Much also depends on the condition in which the food is when placed in cold storage. To destroy food on a certain day irrespective of its condition just because it had been kept a year would be not only unjust but foolish and useless.

RECIPROCITY ARRANGEMENT.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when we may expect the tabulated information which was referred to the other day in connection with the reciprocity proposals now before the House? I think that should include all the information furnished congress to which allusion has already been made, and also contain any definite information as to the extent to which the proposals would affect other countries. That subject was alluded to in the speech of my hon. friend. I would also suggest the desirability of having this in printed form as nearly as possible because it would be only proper and fair that we should have it in our hands for, say, a week before the debate.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not agree with my hon. friend that he should have this information in his hands a week before the debate, but I do agree that we should have it at the earliest possible moment. I hope by the beginning of Monday's session, at the latest, that we may have it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want any unreasonable delay in entering on the debate but the information required will involve a good many considerations which cannot be digested in an hour or two, as the proposals are exceedingly comprehensive and the information afforded in the documents submitted to congress is rather voluminous.

Mr. FIELDING. I hope to-day or perhaps to-morrow to receive some additional copies of the American information, but I thought it well also that we should have information from our own officials, and I hope to have that in the hands of hon. gentlemen with very little delay.

Mr. FOSTER. So that we may avoid having insufficient information when it does come down, through any mistake in our not understanding one another, let me again point out what we would like to have. I presume the Minister of Finance knows pretty well what we do want, and as I explained the other day we want everything concerning which there may be interests affected by this proposition. It would be very convenient to have a table of the varies duties on one sheet such as was furnished by the minister when he made his statement. This would give the different duties on the same sheet, and we would not have to turn from one sheet to another in order to make comparisons. It would be much better to have them on the one sheet so that we could see exactly the differences in the schedule. The other information required is what my hon. friend spoke about, regarding the British preference, whether it applies to Great Britain or the overseas dominions, also to the articles to which reductions apply as between ourselves and Australia, with which country we are in communication for a preferential arrangement also a list of the articles affected by this agreement in which all favoured nation exchanges should be given. That is the kind of information we want, and no doubt the hon. minister knows exactly what it is.

Mr. FIELDING. I gave instructions to my officials to read my hon. friend's observations and endeavour as far as possible to cover the ground he presented. The statement brought down, and which is in 'Hansard,' I have given instructions to include in the printed form so that it may be accessible. Whether it will be in one form or another I cannot tell, but no doubt it will be in the most convenient form. I hope to have that down to-day or Monday at the latest, and it will cover all the points raised.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another point I wish to mention. I asked for a return of

the correspondence with reference to the reciprocity negotiations—correspondence with the government or any member of it in favour of reciprocity, documents, petitions and the like. Also correspondence, petitions, and other documents opposed to reciprocity. It would be important as well to include any correspondence between the government and any member of the government, and outside parties either in favour of or against reciprocity.

Mr. FIELDING. Has my hon. friend examined the return brought down to-day—a supplementary return.

Mr. FOSTER. No, but I will examine it.

Mr. FIELDING. With regard to correspondence respecting reciprocity with the government there is practically none. Many people made representations to the government but beyond a polite acknowledgment of their letters, there is no correspondence. In some cases these representations, although not marked confidential, are such as I would hardly feel free to bring down because they relate to particular interests that might be, or thought they might be affected by the negotiations, and I could not without their consent publish these. So far as the government is concerned, we have no correspondence on the subject. I have had correspondence with individual members of the House in which they have given their views. My hon. friend would not expect me to bring this correspondence down. And, of course I would not, anyhow.

Mr. FOSTER. It is evident that this arrangement deals with sectional interests and what you might call private interests, that is, in fact, one of its great characteristics. And what I wanted to get at as far as possible, was what these interests felt on the subject, and what information they had given to the government with respect to it. It seems to me that you could easily stretch the view expressed by the Minister of Finance so as to cover the arbitrary exclusion of most essential information. I do not concur in the idea that it is private correspondence that goes on, for instance, between a man interested in fruit growing or dairying, and the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Finance on these subjects, if it is not marked 'private.' I think the minister takes a great deal upon himself when he undertakes, in effect, to put the mark 'confidential' upon it. This is information that ought to be made known in the interest of the country, it seems to me.

Mr. REID (Grenville). May I ask the Minister of Finance if he had correspondence with every member of the House or only with a few?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know that my hon. friend (Mr. Reid, Grenville), was good enough to write to me on the subject; but if he did so, and his letter was not marked 'private,' I would feel free to bring it down.

Mr. LENNOX. I would suggest that what the hon. member for North Toronto has said in regard to other correspondence applies with still greater force to correspondence from members of the House addressed to the Minister of Finance. Each member of the House is a servant of the people, he does not act in a private capacity when he writes to the Minister of Finance, and every scrap of correspondence of that character is essentially of a class of correspondence which we have the right to get. I hope the Minister of Finance will reconsider his statement concerning correspondence with members of the House, namely: that he certainly will not bring it down even if it is not marked 'private,' or 'confidential.' I submit that when a member of this House writes to the Minister of Finance, he is discharging a public duty, and acting in a public way, and the people have a right to know what their representatives are saying to the Finance Minister, and what the Finance Minister is saying to them.

Mr. FIELDING. I regret that I am not able to revise my judgment on that point.

Mr. LENNOX. We will have something to say about it later on.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am surprised that the Minister of Finance should say that he has no public correspondence on the subject——

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I understood the Minister of Finance to say so.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is wrong.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). While I am on my feet, I may say that that was my understanding. Having that understanding, I rose to remind the Minister of Finance that he had a formal protest from the fruit interests of British Columbia against any proposition which would reduce or interfere with the duties on fruit. That, I think, is most important to produce to this House, together with any reply made by the Minister of Finance to these people who foresaw what would come upon their industry if this proposal were carried into effect.

Mr. FIELDING. If there is any such document—and I am not saying there is not, for I have received many papers on the subject—and if it is covered by the re-

turn, I have no objection to bringing it down.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I understood the Minister of Finance to say, in answer to the question of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) that, had there been any communication from him in reference to this matter, and not marked 'private,' he would bring it down.

Mr. FIELDING. I would be free to.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. And I understood him to say that if there were communications from hon. members on the other side he would not bring them down even though they were not marked 'private.'

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I have listened to the hon. gentleman carefully——

Mr. FIELDING. What I said was that business men had written to me on matters relating to the negotiations and covering matters connected with their own business. Even though these letters were not marked 'private,' yet, if I thought the gentlemen did not intend them to be made public I would consider I had not the right to bring them down. If the tenor of the letter indicated that the writer would not want it to be made public, even though it were not marked 'private' I would not bring it down without consulting him. As to members of parliament, if any hon. member on the other side wrote to me and did not mark his letter 'private,' he would no doubt, expect me to bring that letter down. As to gentlemen on this side of the House, surely we should exercise our own—

Mr. FOSTER. The rule is that when a letter is not marked 'private' it should be brought down.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If there are letters from representatives on either side of the House which do not relate to their particular industry or business, but refer generally to the question of reciprocity, does not the Minister of Finance think that these should be brought down, that the House generally may receive the benefit of the advice?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not consider it within the privilege of my hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) to inquire as to any letter passing between a member of this government, and a member supporting the government in this House, unless the member in question desired to have the letter made public.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the Finance Minister think that a letter received from a member on this side, not referring to his own industry, but referring to the general question of reciprocity should be produced under these circumstances?

Mr. FIELDING. Everything would depend on the contents of the letter. If it contained anything which I thought the hon. gentleman wrote it would not wish brought down, I would not bring it down without consulting him.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It seems to me that we are entirely in the hands of the Minister of Finance to say whether it was confidential or not.

Mr. FIELDING. In the matter of bringing down public documents, things are always in the hands of the government of the day, who must be permitted to exercise discretion whether or not, in the public interest, any papers should be brought down.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not heard, and do not now recognize such a rule as that put forward by the Minister of Finance. I venture to say that no such rule can be found—I mean to say, a rule which discriminates between gentlemen on the other side of the House and gentlemen on this side. It seems to me utterly absurd and preposterous to propose that one rule is to apply to correspondence from gentlemen on that side and a different rule to the correspondence of gentlemen on this side.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry to differ with my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) as I very often do—to my very great misfortune I suppose—but this question is to be judged by the tenor of the letter, whether it comes from one side of the House or the other side. If I had a letter from my hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) which seemed to me to be private or confidential, whether it were so marked or not, I would treat it as confidential. Every minister has done that from time immemorial. If a letter were written to me which I thought from its tenor was of sufficient importance to be placed on file, I would bring it down in response to an order of parliament.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood the hon. gentleman to say that any letter written by an hon. member on his side of the House he would bring down at once, but as to a letter written by an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, he would exercise his discretion. If I misunderstood him, I am willing to accept his statement that he did not intend to say so.

Mr. FIELDING. What I did say was that, whether the letter came from one side of the House or the other, I would judge by the tenor of the letter as to whether it was intended to have publicity, and that would apply to one side or the other.

Mr. FOSTER. I might ask what would be the opinion of the Finance Minister if it were marked private, would he then be justified in bringing it down in answer to a return for information, or by a member of parliament?

Mr. FIELDING. I think in no instance did I ever bring down a letter so marked.

Mr. FOSTER. The government stands in a very different position from my hon. friend. One of his former colleagues, Mr. Mulock, not only brought down what was not marked private, but he rummaged the files of his department and brought down every letter he could find, relating to a certain subject, and published it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Did my hon. friend approve?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not asked for private correspondence. I protest against any minister being the judge of what should be considered as private when written on public business, and what should not be so considered if not marked private.

CANADA MEDICAL COUNCIL.

Mr. BLACK. With your permission I wish to draw the attention of the House to an article which appeared in yesterday's 'Globe' having reference to the evidence of a special committee of which I was chairman. It says:

> There will be no free trade in doctoring between the Canadian provinces for some time. A Bill by Dr. Black to give effect to the Dr. Roddick plan of having a physician licensed to practice in any province, giving liberty to practice in any other, was severely amended by a special committee of the Commons this morning. It was supposed that the medical men of all the provinces had been brought to agree to the plan, but this morning Dr. Neely, M.P. of Humboldt, filed a protest from the Saskatchewan doctors, and the universal practice provision had to go.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no truth in that paragraph. Not only the 'universal practice provision' did not have to go, but it was approved of without a dissenting voice. Every paragraph, every clause of that Bill was approved of without a dissenting voice, except a paragraph relating to the representation on the council from a university. In that case the member for Saskatchewan expressed an opinion that there were too many representatives from the universities. I thought it desirable to make this correction, because the paragraph, as it is headed, was likely to cause disappointment to several thousand medical men in Canada who were looking anxiously for the passage of this Bill. It was also likely to prejudice this House in considering the Bill when it is reported. I want to say that the utmost unanimity prevailed in that committee among the members from every province of Canada with regard to this Bill. There were no dissenting voices in it whatever.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LAND GRANT TAXATION.

Mr. BRADBURY. I desire to ask the government whether they have any information regarding a decision by the Privy Council on an appeal regarding the matter of the Canadian Pacific Railway and unsettled lands in Manitoba and the Northwest. I have a wire from Manitoba informing me that they understand there has been a decision in favour of the Canadian Pacific railway to the effect that unsettled lands are not taxable. Have the government any information on that question?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. The matter to which the hon. gentleman has referred, while of great interest of course to this House, and to all parts of Canada, arises in a litigation between the company and the local municipalities or the provinces concerned. I had not been aware, not having seen the telegram which the hon. gentleman has received, that a decision on the subject had been given by the Judicial Committee. I presume it is only to-day, upon the opening of the February sitting, that such a decision has been announced. The matter has not been in any way considered in the Department of Justice, nor has the department been directly interested in the litigation in question.

RECIPROCITY—CANADIAN FRUIT GROWERS.

Mr. SCHELL. I rise on a question of privilege to draw attention to an article that appeared in the 'Mail and Empire' of yesterday. It is headed 'Champion of Reciprocity. Simcoe man testifies before Agricultural Committee. Objections raised to method of spreading the propaganda'. The article is somewhat lengthy, and I will only read the concluding paragraphs:

> By this time the members of the committee began to inquire why it was that Mr. Johnston had journeyed from his home to preach reciprocity in Ottawa. It finally transpired that Mr. Schell, the Liberal member for Oxford and chairman of the committee, had arranged for his appearance before the committee. Several of the opposition members protested vigorously against what they thought was an effort on the part of the government to promote its reciprocity propaganda at the expense of the public. The matter may yet be brought to the attention of the House.

I wish to say that this article is entirely misleading, to say the least. Knowing Mr. Johnston as I did, knowing him to be possessed of expert knowledge in the matter of growing fruit, and knowing that he had a very large practical experience

in connection with a successful co-operative association in the county of Norfolk, an experience in these lines perhaps not equalled by that of any other man in Ontario, I thought he would be able to give valuable information to the Agricultural Committee. I spoke to the hon. member for Norfolk county (Mr. McCall), who occupies a seat on the opposite side of the House, and asked him if he thought Mr. Johnston would consent to come before the committee, and whether he thought it would be wise to have him come. He concurred heartily in the proposition, and said he would see Mr. Johnston and find out whether he would be willing to appear. This was before the holidays. Mr. Johnston consented to come. This article implies that I brought him here to preach the propaganda of reciprocity, an absolutely incorrect imputation. The discussion of reciprocity in the committee was started by a question asked by an opposition member, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). I do not, however, take the full responsibility of bringing Mr. Johnston here. I told the committee about him and his qualifications to appear before them a week ago last Wednesday, and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Thornton), an opposition member, moved that he be invited to appear before the committee. Mr. Johnston was instructed by me by letter as well as in person not to touch upon any question that could be construed as a political question or that would be liable to promote a political discussion. What I said can be confirmed by the hon. member for Norfolk.

As there seems to be a desire to cast a reflection on me as a Liberal member for Oxford, that I had some motive other than the country at heart in bringing Mr. Johnston to appear before the committee, I wish to say that Mr. Johnston is a Conservative in politics. Thus the article throughout seeks to convey an impression on these several points that is entirely misleading.

Mr. McCALL. I wish to corroborate the statement of the hon. member that Mr. Johnston came here at my invitation. He is a townsman of mine, he occupies a high position in the county and in the province of Ontario. He made no reference to the question of reciprocity, but was drawn into a discussion of it by questions asked him by members of the committee. He has strong feelings on reciprocity, which he expressed, but he did not come here for the purpose of discussing that question, as was alleged by this newspaper correspondent. I say this in justice to the hon. member for South Oxford and also to Mr. Johnston, who is doing a great work for the country in building up the fruit industry.

SUPPLY—ORDER IN WHICH ESTIMATES ARE DISCUSSED.

Mr. PUGSLEY moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I wish to speak of the manner in which the government has brought on the estimates for consideration during the present session. Formerly the custom was to consider a part of the estimates of each department at the commencement of the session, so that members had an opportunity to discuss before the House matters connected with each department. We have now been in session nearly three months and we all expect to be here at least two months more. We have had no estimates before us for discussion except those of the Public Works Department. We would like to discuss every item of this and every other department as it is brought before us, but under the present arrangement that is an impossibility. There are other departments in connection with which very important matters in the interests of the country should be discussed before the House. The Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Marine and Fisheries, Railways and Canals, are very important; many members from the west would like to discuss subjects connected with northwest lands, members from the coast provinces desire to discuss fishery questions, while the farmers in the House have many subjects of great importance connected with the administration of the Department of Agriculture which they wish to bring to the attention of the House. If we continue the present system, at the end of two months, when the close of the session is approaching, we will have to rush all the estimates of all the other ministers through after a discussion of perhaps one or two days. I protest against the manner in which these estimates are being taken up, which I think is unjust to the members on both sides of the House and to the people of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am endeavouring to meet the views of my hon. friend by hurrying through my estimates as rapidly as possible, consistent with proper care. Last night I was very anxious to proceed with the work but hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to be sleepy and wanted to adjourn at a comparatively early hour. The sooner I get through with these estimates of course the sooner we will take up the estimates of the other departments. I assure hon. gentlemen that no time will be lost in disposing of these estimates.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I claim that not one item has been discussed any longer than was necessary. I also wish to state that the items remaining will require just as much discussion as those that have been passed, but there are other items in the other departments that require discussion, and my claim is that if any items are to be left and not discussed until later in the session, some of the Public Works items might be left, so that we can discuss items of other departments.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no need of any estimates being rushed through.

Mr. SPROULE. As to what occurred last night the minister started his estimates at 11 o'clock. The House was very thin, most of the members had gone home, thinking there would be no Supply, after we had disposed of the question that had engaged the House most of the evening. We thought that from eleven o'clock in the morning until a quarter past eleven at night was a sufficiently long working day and that it would be only justice to the members representing localities where the appropriations were to be expended, that they should have an opportunity to be present. The Minister of Public Works in keeping with his usual courteous disposition refused to allown an adjournment and he continued until 12.30 a.m., when he was obliged to reconsider his decision. There is not another minister except the Minister of Public Works who would have refused the reasonable request made from this side of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I protest against the statement of the Minister of Public Works that the Opposition is sleeping. I object to be called sleepy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a harsh word to apply to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I accept the apology.

Mr. CROSBY. It is apparently the custom to bring down the estimates for Marine and Fisheries within eight days of prorogation and have them rushed through, generally between midnight and three o'clock in the morning. That occurred one session when most of the members were having a good time at some ball that was going on in the city. The Minister of Public Works says that the sooner we pass his estimates the sooner we will get to other estimates, but I would remind him that the convenience of the members on this side should be suited as well as the convenience of members on his own side. The estimates have a perfect right to go through when they are proper and after we have passed fair criticism upon them, but it would not be out of place for the Minister of Public Works to take an evening off sometimes and let some other one of his colleagues have the floor. I am interested in the Marine and Fisheries estimates, but I say it is unfair to rush them through in the last days of the session when some of the members have got tired or have other engagements to fill. I do say that unless the suggestion of the hon. member for Grenville is adopted, the Minister of Public Works will not get along very well.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would be delighted to have my estimates discussed early in the session, but there seems to be an unwritten rule that the Minister of Railways should make a general statement as to the year's work of his department before he is allowed to go into Supply. That cannot conveniently be done until the returns are obtained up to September 31, both from the state owned railways and the Transcontinental Commission. I expect to have these returns completed in a few days and then I shall be happy to get into Supply and get some money to keep the transportation facilities of the country going.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—SPECIAL TRAINS.

Mr. PERLEY (Argenteuil). Last fall there was a demonstration in Montreal for the Prime Minister and in connection therewith a special excursion rate from Levis or Quebec to Montreal and return was granted by the Intercolonial. On December 15 last the Minister of Railways, replying to my question, stated that the excursion rate granted by the government on that occasion was $1.50 between Levis and Montreal and return, which is a distance altogether of 326 miles. The minister also stated that no excursion rate equally as low, had ever before been granted, but he justified the rate, by saying it was a paying one. Now, the average cost per passenger per mile on the Intercolonial railway for the year ending March 31, 1910 was slightly under but practically two cents a mile. We have an Intercolonial Railway Commission which was brought into being with a great flourish of trumpets as giving a business administration to the Intercolonial railway, and I was curious to know how this rate of $1.50 compared with the rates given by other railways for similar distances. I may say that the $1.50 rate, Levis to Montreal and return, is less than half a cent per person per mile. I have here a copy of the excursion rates registered with the Railway Commission by the Eastern Canadian Passenger Association, and they are based partly on the single fare rate which from Levis to Montreal is $4.90. The excursion rate that would be granted for that run by the other railways would be $3.35. The association or club which gets up an excursion would get that rate of $3.35, but out of that the so-

ciety or club would keep 65 cents which would leave the rate $2.70 net to other railways for a journey for which the Intercolonial railway received a rate of $1.50 on this special occasion of the great celebration for Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I understand perfectly well that the Intercolonial railway is not bound by the rates of other railways, but I submit that the Intercolonial railway is not run any better than the Canadian Pacific railway or the Grand Trunk, and that taking into consideration the cost of the service the Intercolonial railway is not in a position to grant better, or even as good rates as the Canadian Pacific railway would. It seems very strange to me that this rate could have been granted by the Intercolonial Railway Commission. I cannot imagine that it could have been granted on any business basis. It seems very evident that either the government or the Minister of Railways himself must have instructed the Intercolonial Railway Commission, either directly or indirectly, to make this extraordinary rate for this wonderful special occasion, and I would ask the hon. Minister of Railways to tell the House, if he thinks it is reasonable that the railway which he has control of, should make a rate of this kind even for the celebration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want, first, to correct my hon. friend's use of a word. I was careful, in making some readjustment of the management of the Intercolonial railway, not to appoint a commission, for reasons given by me at that time, but a board of management. In the second place, my hon. friend has not stated the whole situation when he states that the excursion rate given by all private roads from Levis to Montreal and return is $2.70. The excursion rate on the private roads is $2.70, with a guarantee of 100 passengers, which makes some difference. That amounts to $270. On the occasion referred to the Intercolonial, on a guarantee of 200 passengers, gave an excursion rate of $1.50, and for running a special train, instead of the ordinary guarantee of $270, it got a guarantee of $300 on a guarantee of 100 passengers.

Mr. PERLEY. From whom did the hon. gentleman receive that guarantee?

Mr. GRAHAM. The board of management had that guarantee from some person, I do not know from whom, but I shall be glad to get the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Would the hon. minister carry that principle to its logical conclusion, and carry 1,000 passengers for nothing?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will discuss that when we come to the 5,000 period. I am discussing what really did happen, not what might happen. Now, the Intercolonial has an arrangement with the other railways, and it could not without violating that arrangement offer this rate unless the other roads consented. I am given to understand that under the circumstances the other roads did consent to this rate, and they were at liberty to carry passengers on their lines at the same rate. But let us see what was the practical result of this excursion. My hon. friend has referred to the average rate per passenger per mile, but that does not mean the lowest rate. Railroads in different parts of Canada give very low excursion rates at times, and they give to commercial travellers and other special classes the rate of 2 cents a mile. These rates reduce the average receipts per passenger per mile down to 1·93 cents. My hon. friend thinks we ought to run the Intercolonial to make money. We want to give a good service and come out even, and when I tell him that this was the best paying train we have had on the Intercolonial for the past 5 years, I think he will agree with me that we did a very good thing in getting it. It costs, I think, $1.30 per train mile. The train ran 326 miles at a cost of $423.80. The receipts from that train were $903.75, or a profit of $479.95 on an expenditure of $423.80, or over 100 per cent profit. Now, I think that was good business, and the only point my hon. friend made was that the companies in the association could not do that. Well, we had a long speech yesterday condemning combines, and I think the people of Canada as a whole will agree with me that, no matter on what occasion I can run a train and make over 100 per cent, I am doing a good thing for the Intercolonial railway. And I will say, further, that if there should be occasion to give a demonstration to the hon. leader of the opposition in any part of Canada where the Intercolonial runs, if the hon. gentleman will give me the same guarantee, he can have the same train.

Mr. PERLEY. The hon. minister stated that he had consulted with the other railways interested, and they were satisfied, and that they were at liberty to quote the same rate. I may tell the hon. minister that it is utterly impossible for any society or any one else to obtain from the other railways any better rate than the rate quoted in this list.

Mr. GRAHAM. Except by consent.

Mr. PERLEY. I have had occasion myself to ask for a special rate on a larger guarantee, and I have been told officially that it could not be given—that these rates were the lowest excursion rates that could be obtained for any number of people. They called for a guarantee, but whether the

number was 500 or 1,000, the rate would be the same. The hon. minister makes a point as to the total amount received for this train. He knows perfectly well that we cannot obtain a flat rate for a special train, the only thing we can obtain is so much per passenger.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a state-owned railway, and it may be does some things which other railways could not do and it does them for the benefit of the people of Canada. The reason my hon. friend cannot get any lower rate from any of the other railways is on account of their agreement with each other, but if each would agree to waive that agreement under certain conditions who would complain?

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). No, the Railway Act prohibits it.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, the reason they cannot do it is on account of the arrangement between them. But, leaving that aside, this is a state-owned railway, and the same arrangement would be made in the event of a demonstration to the leader of the opposition. We would not be compelled to, but under our arrangement we could do it quite easily. We did it in this case.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I suggest that the hon. gentleman should get up excursions the whole year round, and in that way make the Intercolonial railway pay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. People are not always wanting to demonstrate.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The investment turned out not to be quite a good one as anticipated because it defeated the government candidate in the Drummond and Arthabaska election.

Mr. STANFIELD. With reference to the political demonstration, the Minister of Railways has said that the leader of the opposition could have the same privilege extended to him. In that connection let me call attention to what occurred in connection with a gathering which we had last August in Truro. We asked the Intercolonial for rates and they gave us one fare from all points to Truro and return. On August the 9th some of our friends found they could not buy these tickets as orders have not been issued to the ticket sellers to furnish them at these rates. On August the 10th in the morning some of our friends again went to purchase tickets and were informed that they could not get them at these rates unless they paid 50 cents extra on each ticket for a circus, which was going on at that time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were two.

Mr. STANFIELD. Let me draw attention to the correspondence from Moncton. The first letter from the management there reads as follows:

> Your favour dated 23rd inst. For this event we shall be pleased to instruct our ticket agents at Amherst, Halifax, New Glasgow, and stations inclusive, to sell excursion return tickets to Truro for p.m. trains August 9th, all trains August 10th, good to return till August 11th at first class one way fare.

On the evening of August the 9th when we found that we could not get these tickets we sent a telegram to Mr. Lyons, general passenger agent in Moncton, and he replied as follows:

> Your wire 9th. All agents interested were advised to sell excursion tickets to Truro for political picnic at single fare, p.m. train, August 9th, all trains August 10th, good to return till August 11th. Agent Truro advises Shubenacadie and Stewiacke did not receive instructions and am wiring these agents.

We also wired Mr. Brady and he replied that the agents had been instructed over a week ago and that duplicate instructions had been telegraphed that morning. That telegram was dated August the 10th. This matter was taken up by one of our people with Mr. Lyons direct, and on August the 20th, Mr. Lyons sent the following letter:

> Dear Sir,—Re political meeting, Truro, August 10th, and agents not advised.
>
> Referring to the above and your visit to my office yesterday. As explained verbally, the advice to agents outlining the arrangements of reduced fare named for your convention was prepared on July 27th and handed to one of the staff here to send to agents. On receipt of your telegram it was dealt with as quickly as possible in re duplicate advice by wire to agents, and I think we are safe in assuming that the original advices to agents never left the office, for which an apology is certainly due to your association, and the same is respectfully tendered with our sincere regrets. The person in fault will be properly dealt with.

Has that person been properly dealt with? Or has he been promoted for this good work?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am glad my hon. friend has called attention to this, and if he will let me have the particulars I shall inquire into it. There is a regular standard, as the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) has said, for excursions, and there is no reason why that should not have been followed in this case.

Mr. STANFIELD. What I complain of is that the instructions of the passenger agents were not carried out, and what I want to know is what treatment was given to the man in fault.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I can get his name I shall be able to reply.

Mr. STANFIELD. His name is not given.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister will see that his suggestion that the

Intercolonial is at the service of both political parties, under similar conditions, is hardly borne out by the illustration just given.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was an error or bungling of some kind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We do not know. At all events that is the situation. Excursion rates were asked for in the ordinary course for a political demonstration to be held in Truro. Assurance was given that the ordinary course would be pursued; but when the people went to buy these tickets, they found that they could only purchase them on paying 50 cents extra for a circus ticket. The only explanation given so far is that some one, whose duty it was to send out instructions to the agents, did not do so, and the assurance was given that the one who was in fault would be officially dealt with. If the minister is perfectly sincere in his statement that the railway is to be at the service of both political parties on the same terms in connection with transportation to political gatherings, it is only due to himself and the House that he should investigate that matter, find out who made the mistake and have the guilty party reprimanded or punished.

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall do that immediately.

SUPPLY.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Battleford public building, $33,000.

Mr. RHODES. The minister will recollect that when we adjourned early this morning it was the understanding that the correspondence between the former member for the constituency and the Public Works Department would be produced.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood that if there was any correspondence, that objection would not be pressed to-day. I was asked for it by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) who is not now in his place. If he should desire it, I will see that he gets the correspondence, if there be any.

Mr. RHODES. The understanding was that the item should stand until we got that correspondence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not take the request of the hon. member for Peel as one which would be pressed to-day if the correspondence were not here. It would take some time to get it if there be any. I propose giving it to the hon. member for Peel.

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend did promise to bring down the correspondence as a condition of getting the item through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Am I not right in saying that the promise was made to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) ? Carried.

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley), has no right to interrupt me. I did not suggest that the promise was made to any member in particular of this House. The promise was made to you, Mr. Chairman, as a condition of getting that item through, that the correspondence was to be produced. The minister said he hoped that hon. members on this side, because of that promise, would help them to get the item through. And, if now he pretends to say that, with that correspondence or without it, he can get that item through, I say it is a direct breach of faith.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may be misinformed, but I understood that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), was not further to press the point as to the correspondence. If I have been misinformed on that point, I will ask the committee to wait a few minutes until the deputy minister is here.

Mr. RHODES. A moment before, the hon. gentleman cried 'Carried.' I understand that he says now that the item stands until the correspondence is produced.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman desires it. But I was informed to-day, whether rightly or wrongly, as I have no means of knowing, that the request for correspondence would not be urged by the hon. member for Peel.

Mr. REID (Grenville). By the hon. member for Peel, because he could not be present.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite so. Do other hon. gentlemen urge it ?

Mr. CROSBY. If there is one reason more than another why the correspondence should be brought down, it is that the minister (Mr. Pugsley), does not want to bring it down. For my part, I might have thought that this was all right, but now that I find that the minister does not wish to bring down these papers, I think we should insist upon having them for it seems evident there is a reason for holding them back. No member of this House can pledge others. We are glad to follow the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), because he takes the right path; still, when he is not here, there are others to see to it that necessary information is secured.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crosby), is right. If he desires the correspondence, and there is any correspondence—I do not know that there is any—when the deputy minister comes I shall be able to give the information to the committee.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the minister have the member from the constituency here also ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood that the hon. member had a very important engagement this afternoon and was not able to be present.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Cannot you let the item stand until he is here ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can do anything to oblige hon. gentlemen opposite,—I do not think there is any limit to my ability in that respect. I observe that my hon. friend for Macleod (Mr. Herron), is here. We might take up the item for Macleod and get that through to oblige my hon. friend.

Macleod public building, $10,000

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the purchase of a site and towards the erection of a public building at Macleod, Alberta, for post office and customs purposes. Macleod is a place of a good deal of importance. The postal revenue last year was estimated at $10,584—I have not the exact figures for the year. We have not yet purchased the site, but propose to make the purchase out of this vote. The estimate of the population in 1906 was 1,144, but the town has grown very considerably since that time. It is a place in which, I think, it is necessary in the public interest that a building should be erected for the post office and customs house.

Mr. CROSBY. What is the population now ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is in the vicinity of between 2,000 or 3,000.

Mr. DANIEL. What will the building cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure as to the amount; we propose to put up a nice building, but the plans have not been prepared

Mr. DANIEL. Does the minister expect to go on with the building this summer ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not unlikely.

Mr. DANIEL. But the minister should know whether he is going on with it or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The most I can say is that if the money is voted we will endeavour, in the ordinary course, to purchase the site. That done, we will have the plans prepared, and I trust the building will be undertaken within the coming year.

Mr. LAKE. How long does it generally take to get the building started after the money is voted ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It depends on whether we are held up by the people wanting too high a price for the site.

Mr. HERRON. I am glad to see how ardently the minister presses this item for Macleod. He made several attempts to get at it last evening, and is evidently going out of his way now to take up this item. I am pleased that he recognizes the importance of the place and the need for the building. I hope that he will show as great energy in proceeding with the erection of the building as he has shown in the passing of the estimate. I notice the sum to be voted is only $10,000. Would the minister be kind enough to say whether any site has been offered to him or whether the department has taken any steps toward securing a site ? Will he appeal to the board of trade or the town council ?—or what steps will be taken to secure a site that will be agreeable to all the people of Macleod ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No steps have yet been taken toward the purchase of a site, and no location has been determined upon. Of course, nothing can be done until after the appropriation Bill passes placing the amount at the disposal of the department.

Mr. HERRON. The fact that only $10,000 is to be voted means that the minister is only preparing to buy the site, not to go on with the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That depends on the cost of the site.

Mr. HERRON. That would not leave much of a balance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We might get a site at $2,000 or $3,000, in which case we could let a contract for the erection of a building, coming to parliament, of course, next fall, with a supplementary estimate for the current year.

Mr. HERRON. I have several letters from people owning property in the town, wishing me to bring to the attention of the minister their wish to sell certain lots. Of these lots, I know little or nothing. The owners put prices upon them the reasonableness of which I am not able to judge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Herron), might say at about what figure these are offered ?

Mr. HERRON. Say two business lots with buildings in the centre of the town, $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the ordinary course, after the appropriation Bill passes, we would send an expert of the department to examine the different sites, and then take the necessary steps to purchase the property.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). What are the qualifications of this expert?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Thorough knowledge of the value of real estate, and thorough reliability.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). How would he get that thorough knowledge in the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has had experience in examining properties all over the country.

Mr. HERRON. I wish to urge upon the minister the great importance of this building. The post office in the town of Macleod is certainly not a credit to the government of Canada, it is a disgrace to the government. The building is not a fit and proper place for a post office in a town of the importance of Macleod. Macleod has probably 3,000 inhabitants, it is a railway centre, a judicial centre, and the centre of business in all that locality. The present post office is not even fit to accommodate a town of 300 people. I hope after the item goes through that the minister will lose no time in hastening the erection of that building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad my hon. friend agrees with me that this building is necessary. In that respect it is not an exception to the general rule.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister has asked the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Herron) for some information with regard to the site of this building. I would suggest to the minister that he get his information from the hon. member who represents that constituency, and who possesses the confidence of the people who elected him. Certainly he must know something about the values of property in that town. The minister would secure a much greater confidence from the public, and from members on both sides of this House, if he would select the hon. member for Macleod and delegate him to report on the values of these various sites.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would ask the committee to reconsider the item for a public building for Battleford. I have here the whole file which contains the correspondence. There is a letter from Mr. McCraney, who was then the member for the district, which I will read. It is dated the 19th of January, 1907, and is addressed to the then acting Minister of Public Works :

Dear Sir,—With reference to your letter of the 20th ult. regarding my communication to Mr. Oliver as to the establishment of a government building at Old Battleford, I am herewith inclosing you a letter received by me from Mr. A. Champagne, M.P.P., from whom I asked the particulars which you required.

I sincerely trust that the government may see its way clear to granting my request, and would ask that the sum of at least $25,000 be placed in the estimates for that purpose.

Yours very truly,
G. E. McCRANEY.

Accompanying that letter was a letter from Mr. Champagne, the present member for the district, dated Battleford, January 2, 1907 :

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of yours inclosing letter from Hon. Sydney Fisher re Dominion public buildings for Battleford, and asking for further information. In reply, I beg to state that the Dominion government has the following offices here: Dominion Land office, telegraph office, immigration office and temporary hall, post office.

The rent being paid at present is as follows: Dominion Land office, $50 per month; telegraph office, $25 per month; immigration office and hall, $35; post office, allowed by the department, $18, actually paid by postmaster, $25. The revenue of the Dominion Lands office for the year was $54,610.14, and in 1906, $87,363.71. The volume of business transacted in the telegraph office in 1905 was $5,750, and in 1906, $6,107. The post office receipts for the year ending June 30, 1906, was $3,908.40, and the money order business for the same period was issued, $29,359.03, paid $54,325.03, standing tenth in the province of Saskatchewan for gross revenue, and third for money orders paid.

It need hardly be pointed out to you that each of the buildings in which the government offices are now located are inadequate to the service rendered, and that a considerable saving in fuel, light and caretaking could be effected by having all the offices in one building.

Battleford is the oldest established town in western Saskatchewan, and has a population of about 1,100, being the largest town in the province west of the Prince Albert branch railway, and is centrally located in the district, being about 80 miles from the west boundary of the province, and has a force of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, a land titles office, an Indian agency, and is destined with the development of the surrounding a country to be a town of cosiderable importance.

I trust that with the above information, you will have no difficulty in securing a grant for the desired public buildings.

I am, yours truly,
A. CHAMPAGNE.

Mr. Champagne informs me, as I think I told the committee last evening, that the population is at present about 2,000. There is also a letter from the hon. Mr. Oliver addressed to the acting Minister of Public Works, which I would read if any hon. gentleman desires it.

Mr. RHODES. It would facilitate the progress of the work of the committee if the minister would kindly send over that file of papers, and let us examine it while he takes up another item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection to sending the file over to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL. As one of the committee of this House who last night disputed

this item and was called names, I may say, by the Minister of Public Works—

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope my hon. friend did not think I called him any but good names.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. gentleman applied an adjective to me, and to other members of this committee 'sleepy,' to which I take objection. I want to point out that the information we asked for at 11.20 last night has just been handed to us. We did not object to this item by any means, all we wanted to get was the information which has just been handed to us. I withdraw my objection I offered. At the same time, I wish to say that North Battleford is being neglected perhaps more than it should be.

Mr. RHODES. I do not wish to obstruct the progress of the committee, but I propose to look carefully into this correspondence, and would suggest that the committee take up another item, and let this one stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I propose leaving a military item and upon that my hon. friend can speak to this as well.

Calgary immigration building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for a new immigration building at Calgary. The quarters at present occupied are reported by the Minister of the Interior to be altogether inadequate for the requirements of the city. Calgary is growing rapidly and the surrounding country is settling up very fast.

Humboldt public building, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is to make provision towards the erection of a public building at Humboldt. The site has been purchased for $3,000. It is 75 feet on the main street with a depth of 132 feet. This building will serve as a post office, customs house and land office.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the revenue of the post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The post office revenue is $3,700, the customs duties over $7,000, the money orders issued over $36,000, and the money orders paid over $24,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the population?

Mr. NEELY. The population of the incorporated town is from 1,200 to 1,300. As the minister has said, this will house the post office, customs and land office services. The post office now occupies the third location since its establishment, the postmaster having been obliged to move as the rented premises became more valuable for private purposes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the rent now paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the post office $280. In addition to that I understand that this has been made a port of customs entry, an outport of Regina.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has it actually been made a port of entry?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Minister of Customs authorizes me to say he is positive that Humboldt was made an outport of Regina about three years ago.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the Minister of Customs say whether it is intended to make it a port of entry? This is very important in these western towns because the people are put to great inconvenience where the town is not a port of customs entry.

Mr. PATERSON. My recollection is that Humboldt is already a port of entry, an outport of Regina. The outport affords all the facilities to the public for the transaction of business that are afforded by the port. The outports collect their own revenues, but they are transmitted through the ports to which they are attached simply to save expense and in order that their returns may be supervised by the officials at the main ports who have possibly had more experience. When the outport becomes sufficiently important it is made a port, and makes its returns direct to the department.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is there a paid official of the government in charge?

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly, with all the responsibilities and duties that pertain to a port.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the salary?

Mr. PATERSON. That depends on the revenue, we have no uniform standard. As a rule, in the new provinces, where the cost of living is greater, we start them at a somewhat higher figure than in the older provinces. Humboldt was made an outport two or three years ago when the Canadian Northern was opened up.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Who asked for this expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was urged by the late member Mr. Adamson, in 1907, when there was an item put in the estimates, and also very strongly urged by the present member.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is there any correspondence in the matter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There apparently were letters from Mr. Adamson, dated February 25, and March 1, 1907, stating there was pressing necessity for a public building at Humboldt.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the letters be presented to the committee ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, if any gentleman moves for them. Of course it would require three or four horses and a number of carts to bring over from the department all the letters concerning all these public works.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Judging by the number of horses and carts paid for by the government you might engage one of them in that work, but it would be satisfactory to this side if we could even get the information that a boy with a wheelbarrow could bring over. If the minister does not get through with his estimates faster than he did last night I do not think it will require many horses to bring over the information. A page boy could carry all the information we asked for then, but we could not get it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be impossible for the minister to tell in advance what information might be desired, and if the records concerning all the buildings for which votes were taken were brought, it would mean immense labour and possibly after all hon. gentlemen would not look at them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want all the correspondence before this item is put through. I want the letters from the boards of trade and other bodies and from the gentlemen who have asked for this building in Humboldt.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very glad on Monday, before this item finally passes to bring any correspondence there is.

Lethbridge public building, $75,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As my hon. friend (Mr. Magrath) who represents the district knows this vote is to erect a building which is very much needed. Lethbridge is growing rapidly, and the post office accommodation for the public is very limited indeed. There has been a very strong demand by the people for a building and that demand has been supported very frequently and very persistently by my hon. friend from Medicine Hat.

Mr. MAGRATH. Is this building to be used for other than post office purposes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For customs as well.

Lloydminster public building, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site has been purchased. The proposed building is for post office, government telegraph office, and land office. The present accommodation is not what ought to be provided in a town of the importance of Lloydminster.

Melfort public building, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told that Melfort has a population of about 1,500, and it is growing rapidly.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). What rent do you pay at present?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $219.

Moosejaw, new public building, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry we have to expend money for the erection of a new public building in Moosejaw, but our experts advised us that the existing public building is absolutely unsuitable for the requirements of the city and so we have to provide a new one. Moosejaw is growing very rapidly. It has a population to-day of about 15,000, and the business there is very large. What we propose to do is to start the new building on the additional land which we purchased adjoining the old building, and when we get that part finished sufficiently to accommodate the public in it, we shall tear down the old building, and fill up the space by extending the new building to the street line.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Will this $50,000 cover the cost of the whole thing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. Of course a building in the west costs somewhat more than a building in the east. The building at Regina, which is a little larger than Moosejaw has cost in the vicinity of $180,000. We want to give it a building as near like the one at Regina as we reasonably can, to afford needed accommodation and at the same time be a credit to the city. We have to build, of course, looking to the future, and there is every reason to look forward to Moosejaw having a population in the near future of 30,000 or 40,000. As evidence of its growth, I may give the revenues for 1908-9: post office, $25,601; customs, $47,220; inland revenue, $13,925; making a total revenue of $86,727. At present, even with the existing post office building, we are paying the following rentals: Crown lands office, $2,280; inland revenue, $360; customs, $240; making a total of $2,880. We hope to be able to accommodate all these departments in the new building, thus saving that rent, as well as affording very much better accommodation.

Saskatoon, purchase of land for public building, $35,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision, looking to the future, for the purchase of land either in the town or in its immediate vicinity, for the erection of public buildings, the idea being to provide accommodation for mounted police and other military forces and other departments. The matter has been pressed upon our attention not only by the hon. gentleman who represents the constituency, but

by Mr. White, the controller of the North-west Mounted Police. Saskatoon is growing pretty rapidly, and even if we do not utilize the whole of the land for a number of years, we shall make no mistake in buying a considerable area.

Strathcona public building, $40,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hon. gentlemen know that Strathcona is a growing city across the Saskatchewan river from the city of Edmonton. We have purchased the land, 66 feet by 132 feet. The building is to be for customs and post office purposes. The population of Strathcona four years ago was close to 3,000. My information is that to-day it is 5,000 or 6,000. The hon. member for Strathcona is here, and would perhaps favour the committee with a few observations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I might inform the committee that Strathcona is a very important city. It has over 6,000 population, is the university centre of Alberta, and is also the seat of learning for theological colleges. We are looking for great advancement in the near future, and we do not think we are getting too much for this building.

Vegreville public building, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps the hon. member for the district will tell us what he knows about Vegreville.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria, Alberta). As everybody who knows anything about the west knows, the town of Vegreville is the largest town between Battleford and Edmonton, and is the centre of the best agricultural country in northern Alberta. It has a population at the present time of about 1,200. Four years ago there were only two or three settlers there. The reason I ask for this public building is not to provide work for the people there, because there is no doubt that in order to start the building we shall have to import the labour. The post office is now in a small store, and the postmaster has not the accommodation he should have. There is a large amount of parcel post business done in that country. I have seen no less than three double teams going out with the mail.

Wetaskiwin public building, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The population is about 1,700; postal revenue last year, $7,474; money orders issued, $63,000; money orders paid, $36,000.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). When was that item first put in the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 1907-08.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Just before the last election?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we have bought the land and are making preparations to go on with the work.

Weyburn public building, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a very important centre.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the population?

Mr. TURRIFF. About 2,500. It is the largest and most important town south of the Canadian Pacific railway, on its main line, in Saskatchewan. It is a large railway centre. It is about the second or third largest wheat shipping point in the three prairie provinces. The postal revenue from the sale of stamps is over $8,000. I do not know what the customs revenue is, but in the first six months after the office opened it was over $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The money orders issued last year amounted to $140,000.

Mr. TURRIFF. There is a very large business done there. It has a half dozen of our principal banks and a local bank, which does the largest business. This building is required for a land office, post office and a customs house.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What rent are we paying now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $500. The site has been purchased.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). When did this first appear in the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the session of 1910.

Chilliwack public building, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The land has been purchased and the plans are being prepared. My hon. friend who represents New Westminster will agree that this building is a public necessity.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Have tenders been called for yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet, but the plans are being prepared.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I ask that because I have heard that an official communication was sent to Chilliwack last June saying that tenders would be called immediately. Was that warranted by the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What date?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Early in June last.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell. The order was passed for the purchase of the land on the 3rd of June. If my hon. friend will write me a letter I will give him the information.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). It is not sufficiently important to trouble the minister with, but I would like to say that possibly there is no place where there is more urgency for a post office than at Chilliwack. That district is growing very rapidly. Even the word painting which we are accustomed to have from the minister in presenting his items would fail to do justice to the position of Chilliwack. It has made very rapid growth because of the introduction of railways and is now an incorporated city of sufficient importance to furnish business to five banks. The post office at present presents for the use of the public a room only some 12 feet square. If the minister will realize the conditions there with the population of that size trying to despatch and receive their mails in a room 12 feet square he will see there is need for urgency, and if he could take any steps to hasten the calling for tenders he would be doing a great service to the people. I would like to ask, also, whether the amount now provided for will complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but it will carry us over the next fiscal year.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). What was the $6,000 spent for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the site.

Crankbrook public building, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in the constituency of Kootenay. The site has been purchased and the plans are now being prepared. The postal revenue is $11,517; customs duties, $33,550; money orders issued, $178,917; money orders paid, $47,164. The population in 1908 was 3,500, and it has grown considerably since. If the hon. member who represents Kootenay were here he would endorse my statement that a public building in Cranbrooke is very much needed.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). When was this first voted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1906-07.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Why the delay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We did not purchase the site until 1908, on the 18th January. Then we had the one lean year, when our revenue fell off, and we were trying to economize.

Mr. GOODEVE. I desire to ask for some information on this item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site has been purchased and plans for the building are in course of preparation. We hope to call for tenders before long.

Mr. GOODEVE. Is it the intention to go on with the work this summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Has the hon. minister received from Mission City a largely signed petition asking for a building there, and what prospect can he hold out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure the hon. gentleman would feel that it would be quite improper for me to say anything in advance of the estimates which might be brought down beyond saying that the representations of the people of Mission City will have my careful consideration.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to point out that Mission City needs a public building very badly for at least two departments—the post office and the immigration departments. It is a point on the Canadian Pacific railway which immigrants pass through going to Seattle, and where they are very commonly detained, and where, also, immigrants from Seattle are usually detained. At present they have no other accommodation than the station house of the Canadian Pacific railway. The presence of large bodies of these immigrants there is not only very unpleasant for the general passengers, but it is also rather cruel to the immigrants, and gives them a very poor impression of the country. I do not expect the minister to act on impressions only, or on merely sentimental grounds, but I think that if he would seek the advice of the Immigration Department that advice would be in line with the request of the people of Mission City for the erection of a public building at that point for post office and immigration purposes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the population of Mission?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I should say about 1,500. That is the population of the village itself, but that figure does not indicate the importance of the place. It is the trade centre for quite a large district.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have it looked into.

Duncan public building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to purchase a site and to go towards the construction of a building for post office purposes. We pay now a rental of $250. The postal revenue last year was $3,305; money orders issued $26,393, money orders paid $14,929. I have not a statement of the population, but I believe it is a good town.

Fernie public building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to finish the payments on this building. We had a building nearly finished when the disastrous fire occurred which destroyed so large a part of

Fernie. We had to practically begin over again. This is to complete the work.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). What is to be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure to December 20 last, was $27,964.89.

Grand Forks public building, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site purchased for this building covers a whole block, having frontages on four streets. We have called for tenders for the building. The contract has not yet been let because it seemed to the department that the only tender received was pretty high and required careful consideration before awarding the contract. We are having the matter looked into by the chief architect.

Mr. BURRELL. Is the idea to advertise again?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, in the hope that we shall have wider competition.

Mr. BURRELL. I suppose the minister has no wish to delay this work. He understands the importance of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. But the tender was $18,000 higher than the chief architect's estimate; we did not feel that we could properly award the contract, but that it was better to call for new tenders.

Mr. BURRELL. I presume that due allowance was made for the necessary greater expense of construction in the west?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the chief architect allowed for that.

Greenwood public building, $30,000.

Mr. BURRELL. In what position is this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have bought the site and the plans are in course of preparation.

Mr. BURRELL. What site was bought and what was the price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site was bought from Mr. Nelson and consisted of lots 20, 21 and 22, block 5, having a frontage of 75 feet on Greenwood street, and 115 feet on Government street. The price paid was $3,000.

Mr. BURRELL. Is it the intention of the government to go on with this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BURRELL. Are the plans prepared?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are in course of preparation, and we hope to be able to go on during the coming summer.

Nanaimo public building, extension, $22,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract. It is a very important work, because Nanaimo is a city of a good deal of importance and the accommodation there is utterly insufficient.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the population of Nanaimo?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Eight thousand within the city.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is estimated at $29,900. This will leave an additional amount of $2,900 to complete the work.

Nelson public building, addition, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hon. gentlemen are aware how important a city Nelson is. It is a large distributing centre for postal business, and the accommodation there is wholly inadequate. The work is a much needed extension of the present building.

Prince Rupert public building, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site for this building, which is quite conveniently situated, is to be donated to the government by the Grand Trunk Pacific interests.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is the position a good one? Is it central?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is the very best we could get. We considered two locations, and, with the very best consideration we could give it, we concluded that this was the best. It is not far from the public wharfs and not far from the railway station. It is close to the business centre—right on the public square.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does the Grand Trunk Pacific own the land adjacent to it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They did own it, but I think they sold all the lots, and reserved this for public purposes.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the population now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand it is five or six thousand.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). The other day I asked the minister whether the government had bought any land from the Grand Trunk Development Company. He answered that his department had not. He said he had inquired to see whether other departments had bought any, and had found that the other departments had not bought any land from the development company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I said my information was that no other department had bought.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). What other departments did he ask for that information?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I tried to think what departments would be likely to buy, and I inquired from the Minister of Interior, and from the Minister of Railways. I could not think of any other department that would be likely to make purchases.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I asked that the question should be allowed to stand, but I see that it has been taken off the orders of the day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman has any idea that any department has made a purchase, and would intimate what department, and where the land is, it would facilitate matters.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). The Agricultural Department, this side of Prince Albert. I would like to have that question answered.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will see the Minister of Agriculture about it to-morrow.

Revelstoke public building, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Revelstoke is a very important station on the Canadian Pacific railway, being the point at which that railway branches off going down into the district of southern British Columbia. A demand for a public building here has been pressed upon our attention for a considerable time. We have purchased a lot 75 feet by 100, for which we paid some $5,000. We only purchased it after very careful examination and comparison with other lots, and believe we have got it at a reasonable figure. The population of Revelstoke a few years ago was 3,000, it must be considerably more now. The revenue last year was $8,437 ; customs duty, $103,000 ; imports, $367,350. We are paying a rental of $834 for post office and customs purposes.

Mr. GOODEVE. How far is the building advanced?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not entered into a contract yet, we are having the plans prepared.

Mr. GOODEVE. Can the minister assure me that the work is likely to be carried on this summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that the plans are pretty well advanced. Very likely the building will go on this summer.

Mr. GOODEVE. I can agree with the minister as to the importance of this town of Revelstoke, which is not only on the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway, but one of the chief branches of that whole western system starts there going down through the Arrow lakes. It has a very large traffic, and a good deal of tourist trade, besides a growing population.

Vancouver old post office building, alterations and fittings, furniture, &c., $35,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the purpose of renovating the old post office building for the accommodation of the inland revenue and the Dominion assay office. The total probable cost, including fittings, furniture, &c., will run to about $54,000.

Mr. DANIEL. We have given them already a fine new post office in Vancouver.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Vancouver is a rapidly growing city, and has now a population of nearly 150,000.

Vancouver examining warehouse, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have bought the land, and this is to enable us to call for tenders for the building. We called for tenders once, and we are going to call for new tenders.

Vernon public building, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend who represents the district of Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) knows that Vernon is quite an important town in the midst of a very excellent fruit growing country. It is proposed to provide for a post office, for customs purposes, and also accommodation for the commanding officer, and an armoury for A and B squadrons. The building is under contract. The total estimated cost will be in the vicinity of $55,000.

Mr. BURRELL. Is it actually commenced?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me it is actually commenced.

Mr. BURRELL. Will these quarters be amply sufficient for the military purposes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand so from the militia authorities. The material is to be brick, with stone dressings, and with a stone faced concrete basement, a two-story building, forty feet in depth, and sixty feet frontage.

Manitoba—Dominion public buildings—Renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $15,000.

Mr. STAPLES. What public buildings in the city of Winnipeg are being repaired?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the whole province.

Mr. STAPLES. I understand the old post office in Winnipeg is being repaired to some extent. To what purpose will it be utilized after it is fixed over?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have had it repaired and renovated for the purpose of giving accommodation to the Customs Department, and also for a branch of the Finance Department. Work was done last year upon the

immigration building to the extent of $2,590.

Mr. STAPLES. Are the repairs to the old post office completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not quite.

Portage la Prairie public building, $18,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to construct a public building in Portage la Prairie. The site has been acquired. The proposed building is to provide offices for the Inland Revenue and Indian Affairs Departments, and also to provide armour accommodation for squadron 'C' of the 18th Mounted Rifles and D and E companies of the 9th regiment. The site consists of two lots on Garry street, with a total frontage of 153 feet, purchased from the Housser-Armstrong Company.

Mr. STAPLES. Is it a corner lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say, but I think it is because it runs apparently on two streets, Garry and Campbell.

Mr. STAPLES. Have the plans been drawn?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are now completed and have been submitted to the department concerned, for approval. The tenders will be called for right away.

Mr. STAPLES. There is no doubt that the building will be gone on with this summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. None whatever.

Souris public building, $22,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to erect a public building in Souris. The work is now in progress.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In what year was this put in the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the session of 1907-8.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Just before the election?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That seems like the burning of Rome or the great fire in St. John, or the flood.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It was a very famous burning, it saved the life of the late Minister of the Interior. However, they need a building there.

Mr. STAPLES. I regret to be here another session and to find the promise the minister gave me—hardly a direct promise, but almost—that there would appear in the estimates of this session an appropriation for a public building in Carman in the constituency that I have the honour of representing. Each session since I have been here I have appealed to the Minister of Public Works for an appropriation for the erection of a building there. I might inform the minister that it is a growing town, it has a population of over 2,000 people, it has three banks, it is a railway centre, three railways running into it, it is a municipal centre, the post office revenue is over $4,000 a year, much greater than in other towns for which provision is made, every denomination is represented there with good churches, the town is equipped with very good conveniences, with electric light a water system, and everything required to make its citizens, who are very progressive, comfortable. It possesses every qualification that the minister has laid down as guiding him in the appropriation of moneys for the construction of buildings in towns throughout the country. I do not believe that either the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Finance can advance a single good reason why it should not have a public building. Petitions have been presented to the government asking for a building. I again appeal to the minister to erect a building there. I can see no reason why there should not have been an appropriation for this town long ago. It is the oldest town south of the Assiniboine river in Manitoba, a pioneer town, and I now hope to get an answer from the minister that in his supplementary estimates he will make the desired appropriation towards erecting a building in the town of Carman.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman puts the case so very nicely, and gives such strong evidence that he approves of my course in making provision for public buildings in different sections of the country where they are needed that it would afford me great pleasure if, at this moment, I could make the announcement that a public building would be erected at Carman immediately. I say that in all sincerity. But my hon. friend knows that when I make up my estimates they have to run the gauntlet of my colleagues, particularly of the Minister of Finance, and that I cannot accomplish all I would like even to please my hon. friend.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not know on what argument the minister can refuse a building to Carman. He erects buildings in towns like Humboldt, and other towns of that kind, only a year or two old. Carman is 35 or 40 years of age, and I do not know why the minister cannot give me a more definite answer than that. I would ask whether the Minister of Public Works has asked the Minister of Finance to endorse an appropriation for the town of Carman. I believe that if he has done so, the Finance Minister has told him: Yes, that is a deserving town, a growing town, and it should be supplied with a building.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

LACHINE, JACQUES CARTIER AND MAISONNEUVE RAILWAY.

Further consideration in committee of Bill (No. 44), respecting the Lachine, Jacques Cartier & Maisonneuve Railway.—Mr. Geoffrion.

On section 4.

Mr. GEOFFRION. In accordance with the notice given, I move that the following words be added to the section:

'And may, subject to the provisions of The Railway Act, connect each line of railway with the railway of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company or either of them.'

Amendment agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SECURITY TRUST CORPORATION.

Further consideration in committee on whole of Bill (No. 32), to incorporate the Security Trusts Corporation.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I wish to say with reference to this Bill——

Mr. FIELDING. I believe, apart from the question which has already engaged the attention of the committee, attention has been drawn to the fact that there is a company of a similar name in Manitoba, and I have discussed the matter with the hon. member for Regina and he agreed the Bill should stand until inquiry be made as to a possible change of name.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). That will be all right.

Progress reported.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES.

House in committee on Bill (No. 73), respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Mr. SPROULE. Some of the branches mentioned in this Bill were provided for in the committee without any notice having been given of them in the 'Gazette.' It seems to me that it is establishing a very bad precedent to let these go into the Bill. I think there was another Bill in which the committee did the same thing. The advertisement in the 'Gazette' is for a good purpose—to give notice to the public where it is proposed to ask for the right to build a railroad. After such notice is given, to insert in a Bill provision for a number of branches for which no notice has been given, is an interference with rules which we have been in the habit of adhering to pretty closely.

Mr. TURRIFF. While recognizing the force of the remarks made by the hon. member, I may say that two at least of these branches were asked for by the settlers in the vicinity of where it is proposed to build them, so that if it can be arranged that these can go through, I do not think anybody will suffer, while it will be of great advantage to the people in those districts.

Mr. SPROULE. One of these branches appears to be 60 miles long. I am not objecting because I think there is any special danger, but just because it has been our disposition always to observe our rules carefully. After watching the granting of charters, especially of late years, I have come to the conclusion that we would be just as safe and would avoid a good deal of work if we granted charters just as they do in the United States—giving power to any company that wanted to build a railway, upon submitting its plans and having them examined and registered, to go on and build the railway. If we go on granting charters at the present rate, it will become a mere matter of form before very long. What has the Minister of Railways to say about it?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a good deal of force in what my hon. friend says. But these notices and rules are for the protection of the public, and I suppose for the railways as well. But when a section of the committee, representing the people in a certain district, after having been made fully aware of the rule as to advertising urged very strongly, so strongly that they convinced the committee, that we ought to waive that rule, and allow them to put in these branches, I think a fairly strong case is made out. In all these cases where a rule is waived, it is reported by the committee to the House, and I suppose that was done in this case. If we adhered strictly to the rule, these branches could not go in. Speaking practically, what benefit could be derived by anybody if we did that, and what injury can be done to anybody in this case? If I thought any one was going to be injured, I would say stand by the rule, but the committee, after consideration, thought it better in this c[illegible] and one or two others not to insist on the rule.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think, from our late experience in granting railway charters, that any harm will come from allowing these Bills to pass because one of the strong reasons for the rule, heretofore, was that we should not charter parallel lines or give charters which would interfere with

the rights of chartered lines through the same sections. Of late, however, we take very little concern of this objection but grant charters to almost all who ask them. I do not think any serious injury will arise in this case, but I am only speaking of a disposition to contract a loose habit, and these very cases may be used as precedents by some designing individuals with regard to other Bills. If by any possible means we could avoid these being used as precedents, there would be less danger from the innovation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would feel like going this far, that where there is any real objection to a rule being waived in committee, we ought to insist on its being observed. As to what some call free trade in charters, it is difficult to know what is the better method to adopt. Charters have been obtained, particularly in the newer portions of the country, by companies which have no apparent intention of building. They get these charters renewed from time to time but do not build ; and if we were to stick to the practice which existed formerly of protecting companies that had acquired charters, we might never get railways in some particular sections. I have almost come to the conclusion that where three or four people are after a charter in the same territory, we should give a charter to each and let the man who first builds, get the railway. The same thing comes up in approving route maps. One company will get a charter, and a route map, and will sit down on that, and not build the road. Another comes along and it is told to keep off the right of way because the other company has a route map approved. I think we should change the method of approving route maps by approving them only for a limited period.

Mr. HUGHES. What about a pass?

Mr. GRAHAM. When there is only one pass, my idea is to give the other railways a right to run over the one which has the charter, and the route map. That is provided in the Railway Act, and I would feel like putting that in the route map approved.

On section 4,

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to call attention to another feature, and that is with reference to the rule we laid down for compelling railway companies to make their capital stock bear some proportion to their length of road. Where you increase the length of a road by several hundred miles, it would seem to me that the capital stock would have to be increased also. I do not know whether the branches proposed in this instance would cost sufficient money to require us to reconsider the question of the capital stock or not.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a railway that put its capital stock very high in the beginning, up to $50,000,000 to start with. I think they put it very high in order to cover lines they might construct. The other was that line running from Vancouver north to Yukon, which we raised from $1,000,000 to $10,000,000.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The committee boost the amount of capital stock, helping on watering and over-capitalization. Then, when you come down to this House in the afternoon, you find the House criticising the very thing the committee has been doing in the morning.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE McCLARY MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 75) respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Mr. SPROULE. This is reported by the Private Bills Committee. I do not know what consideration was given to it. I confess it has a rather suspicious look to me when an industrial concern like this asks power to purchase the stock of other concerns of the same nature. It looks as if it were intended to put several concerns into one combine.

Mr. GRAHAM. In our Railway Committee, when a company asks power to amalgamate with, or purchase, the stock of any other company, it must name the company, or companies. In a case of this kind it may not be possible to do this, perhaps.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The hon. member (Mr. Beattie) in charge of the Bill is not here, but I may say that, under the Companies' Act, every company chartered has this clause.

Mr. NESBITT. Is it not a rather wide clause?

Mr. SPROULE. This company is not chartered under the Companies' Act, but has a special charter, which, evidently, had not this clause, or the company would not be seeking to insert it.

Mr. NESBITT. I think the Bill had better stand.

Progress reported.

ALBERTA RAILWAY AND IRRIGATION COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 51) respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—Mr. Crothers.

Mr. HERRON. I gave notice of amendment of subsection (c) of section 1 of this

Bill. The notice is wrongly worded, but I feel sure that the committee will accept it notwithstanding this error.

Mr. GRAHAM. What is the amendment?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The notice is given that clause 1 of section (c) be amended by striking out the words 'Spring Coulee' and inserting the words 'Cardston,' and after the word 'westerly' the words 'to the town of Pincher Creek.'

Mr. HERRON Instead of reading subsection (1) of clause (c), it should read subsection (c) of clause 1.

Mr. NESBITT. That was not accepted by the committee.

Mr. HERRON I will explain why it was not accepted in committee. When this Bill was before the committee on Tuesday last I moved the same amendments that I am offering here. At the request of the lawyer in charge of the company's interest, I did not press the matter to a decision, but allowed it to stand over until he should hear from his company. For some reason there was a meeting of the Railway Committee on Thursday last, I believe, the first held on a Thursday this session. I was, unfortunately, sick and confined to my room by the doctor's orders. The committee, I think, did not treat me fairly in passing this Bill in its original form without my consent. When I heard of it I gave notice of the amendment. This is an old charter, one of eleven or twelve years' standing. It gave very broad powers. The country was a cattle country when these people obtained the charter, but to-day it is a farming country. There were only a few settlers in there then, and to-day there is a thickly settled country from one end to the other. In the olden days the people did not expect railways, they knew they were not going to get them, therefore, there was little interest taken in the charters. But to-day some company is going to build over this identical ground, in fact this summer the same company will build over the proposed line and they are asking for their old powers under a renewed charter, the powers that they had eleven or twelve years ago. They are asking now for this charter from Cardston to Pincher Creek, a distance of 55 or 60 miles; they are asking for a spread at the starting point between Spring Coulee and Mountain View for a distance of about 30 miles, that is at the southwest end of the proposed road, going a distance of 55 or 60 miles north. When they land at the north end they ask for another spread of five townships again, where they strike the railway at the north, that is 30 miles more. We know the company could not come to this parliament to-day and ask for a new charter granting them these powers and they are trying to revive an old charter with all the powers which they got twelve or fifteen years ago. That is what I object to, and I dont think it is right to grant an extension to the company with such conditions. I have had protests from people along the line, and from Cardston in particular, against the granting of the extension altogether. The minister has frankly stated this evening his reasons for granting free trade in charters, and I agree with the minister that when they are not getting any exclusive rights, no harm would be done by renewing an old charter. But I think when the old company is getting the old charter revived, they should comply with the conditions such as they would have to do when they are asking for a new charter. That is all I am asking. I am asking that at the point of starting they be confined to a distance of 15 miles instead of 30 miles and from Cardston to Mountain View. I presume they will strike the Crowsnest branch near the Pincher Station, and if they do they will have to pass close by the town of Pincher Creek. The present Canadian Pacific railway station is the centre of the spread where they join the Crowsnest road at the north, I therefore ask that they be compelled to go through the town of Pincher Creek. Pincher Creek will not put them out of their way. The Crowsnest Pass branch has left our town nearly three miles to the north, and now the same company are proposing to run another line two or three miles to the east of us for they have already made the preliminary surveys. I can assure the House that there is no engineering obstacle in the way. There has been a survey made over the same ground by another company within the last three months, and there is not a one per cent grade on the line from Cardston to Pincher Station. For these reasons I ask the committee to accept the two amendments I have offered.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Herron), has taken a reasonable stand, and I do not see why we should be expected to revive a charter which was granted ten or twelve years ago, giving them the very extensive powers which they had then, and which we would not give them if they were applying for a new charter.

Mr. NESBITT. I did not suggest that the Bill stand over for the purpose of blocking it, but for the purpose of allowing the hon. member for Macleod and the railway company to get together.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I do not want to do anything against the wishes of my hon. friend from Macleod. By this Bill, the

company have power given them, before they even do any work on the railway, to sell out their charter. It looks to me like a scheme of certain promoters to get a charter and sell it out to somebody else. If my hon. friend from Macleod wishes to push his amendment, I am prepared to stay here and fight it out.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers), has charge of the Bill. The circumstances are a good deal as outlined by my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Herron). The regular days for our committee to meet are Tuesdays and Thursdays.

Mr. HERRON. Did they meet this year on Thursday ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure, but I think we have met on Thursday. But that is immaterial. I want to assure him that we were not trying to take any advantage of him in the committee. He made a strong protest the day before, and the Bill was left over to allow the representatives of the company to communicate with the head office. He told the committee the last time that the company could not see its way clear to comply with his request to build into Pincher Creek, and the hon. member not being present, the committee took it for granted he had reconsidered his objection. The hon. member for West Elgin will say whether he thinks we ought to go on with it.

Mr. CROTHERS. I am not particularly anxious to proceed with the Bill to-night. In fact, I believe, as stated by the Minister of Railways, that when the Bill came before the committee my hon. friend from Macleod proposed the amendment he has proposed this evening. It was then allowed to stand to enable communication to be had with the president of the Canadian Pacific railway company, which recently acquired the rights of this company in the old charter, and only recently. The reply came from the head of the company that they would be very glad if they could comply with my hon. friend's request, but that owing to engineering difficulties in the construction of the road as he suggests, they regretted they would not be able to accept his suggestion. This Bill deals with four branches, only one of which is affected by the proposed amendment. I understand it is the intention of the Canadian Pacific railway company to proceed with the construction of these branches in the near future if the charter be renewed as requested now. But they say they would let the whole project drop rather than undertake to carry it out as suggested by my hon. friend from Macleod. If my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), thinks there is a possibility of the company and the hon. member for Macleod agreeing on any compromise, I have no objection to its standing over.

Mr. TURRIFF. I think my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Herron) is quite right. I do not think that this House should allow an old charter like this to be revived when the company now owning it, or the same company object to carry out such a reasonable proposition as to run their line through a town when they propose to run right close beside it.

A good deal of that sort of thing has been done in the past to the great detriment and loss of men who may have from $5,000 to $20,000 invested in one of these towns. A railway comes along and runs two or three or one mile outside of the town limits with the result that a new town has to be built up which deteriorates property in the old town very materially. A little while ago I had occasion to have a matter of this kind attended to in fixing the route map by the Grand Trunk Pacific, and they readily agreed to go through a town instead of a mile to one side as first intended. The other day in the committee we compelled the Grand Trunk Pacific to go through Hanley as shown here to-night instead of going a mile or two north or south, and I think on this occasion we ought to compel this company if they build, and I would not tolerate any such threat as they have made that if they do not get all their own way they will not build at all. I would say let them build through Pincher Creek or not build at all.

Mr. CONMEE. I happen to know the ground over which this railway is projected. I agree with the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Herron). There are no engineering difficulties. The line is coming from the southern boundary of Alberta on a gradual rise until it connects with the Crowsnest branch of the Canadian Pacific railway at Pincher. There are two towns of Pincher. Pincher on the Crowsnest is about three miles from the town of Pincher Creek, and while I think if proper representations had been made to the Minister of Railways and Canals when they built that branch line, it could have been built through that town, I do not see any reason, having regard to the alignment that the road must take to reach the point at which they are aiming, which is within three miles of the town, why they should not pass through it, and no hardship would be imposed upon them by compelling them to do so. Only justice would be done to the town of Pincher Creek.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.
THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 54) respecting the E. B. Eddy Company.—Mr. Devlin.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—Mr. Currie (Simcoe).

Bill (No. 59) respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 42) respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

SUPPLY.

The hour for private Bills having expired the House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Winnipeg public buildings, improvements, repairs, &c., $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the same vote as last year to make repairs to the public buildings in Winnipeg.

Mr. RHODES. If the minister has no objection I would like now to say a few words in connection with the Battleford public building in order that I may return to the minister the file which he sent to me. I find upon looking at the file that on February 21, 1908, the acting Deputy Minister of Public Works wrote to the chief architect as follows :

Kindly send Clerk of Works Mollard to Battleford to report on suitable site for proposed new public building there. Instruct him to confer with Mr. Champagne, M.P.P., in regard to it.

On March 30, a little more than one month later, the following letter was sent to the chief architect by the Deputy Minister of Public Works :

Have you the report of the Clerk of Works Mollard regarding site for Battleford public building referred to in my memo of 21st ult. If not, please ask him to hasten his report?'

Then, written at the bottom of the letter was this reply, dated April 1, 1908:

Mr. Mollard's report has not yet reached me. Have wired him to-day to hurry his report.

D. EWART,
Chief Architect.

On March 30, we have the following letter addressed to the chief architect:

Re Battleford site for public building.
Sir,—As directed by your letter of February 22, 1908, I went to Battleford re site for public building, and beg to report as follows: I saw Mr. Champagne, M.P.P., who pointed out the site which I have reported upon, and which he said was the popular site. I believe the site is a good one. I have attached an offer of sale from the owners.

Yours respectfully,
W. T. MOLLARD,
Clerk of Works.

Concerning these three communications I have this to say: That although Mr. Mollard was appointed inspector on February 21, we have a letter from the deputy minister on March 30, or nearly five weeks later calling upon the chief architect to hasten this man in making his report on the site for the Battleford post office. That is rather interesting in view of the impression the Minister of Public Works left on my mind when, a few evenings ago, I was referring to the delay in the preparation of the plans for the post office at Parrsboro', Nova Scotia. The minister then rather intimated to me that these various works were allowed to take their own course, and that no special instruction was given to the chief architect, but in this case we find that specific instructions were given to him, and that he has a peremptory letter from the deputy minister to have the agent of the department hasten sending his report from Battleford. We find the agent of the department at Battleford conferring with the member for the county and selecting the site, which the member for the county indicated should be the site to be chosen. I shall not say anything further on that point; I think these facts are clear enough. But, I would like to address this question to the minister: In view of the fact that Mr. Champagne was the man to whom the agent of the department went to select a site, who is the Esther Champagne referred to in the letter from the Deputy Minister of Justice addressed to the secretary of the Department of Public Works, dated Ottawa, January 20, 1909, and reading:

BATTLEFORD PUBLIC BUILDING.

Sir,—I have the honour herewith to inclose assignment from Esther Champagne and Robert Henry Speers of the former's interest in the lands in question, also our agent's account certified for $35.39. Kindly send me a cheque in his favour for this amount.

I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,

E. L. NEWCOMBE,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

Has the minister any knowledge who the Esther Champagne referred to in this letter is?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have no idea at all. Will the hon. gentleman send me over the file?

Mr. RHODES. Has the Minister of Public Works any intimation as to the relationship of Esther Champagne to the sitting member for the county?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no knowledge whatever. I have not the slightest information of who Esther Champagne is. The question of the title would be in the Justice Department, and my department would have nothing to do with it. Now, it does not seem to me that in the citation from these letters my hon. friend has shown

that I have been inconsistent in my statement. The hon. gentleman has called attention to the fact that Mr. Mollard having been asked in February, 1908, to make a report, and not having made it on the 30th of March, the deputy minister instructed the chief architect to see why the report had not come in. That is an entirely different thing from the preparation of plans which rests with the chief architect. I think it was a very proper course for the deputy minister to take in the discharge of his duties. As to Mr. Mollard conferring with Mr. Champagne I think that is entirely proper. Mr. Champagne was a prominent resident of Battleford, and was at that time a member of the legislative assembly, not of this parliament. He had urged most strongly the erection of this public building, and I think it entirely right that Mr. Mollard should go there and confer with Mr. Champagne. But, it was Mr. Mollard's duty in pursuance of the general instructions given to him and to others, to examine other properties as well, to make inquiry as to the values and to report so that the department could judge whether the price put upon the property recommended was a fair price. I do not know what report Mr. Mollard sent in, but I take it he reported on the value of the property. Yes, I see his report here: He gives the size of the lot, where it is situated, the name of the owners, the price $3,000, a sketch of the property, a short description of surrounding property; he certifies that in his opinion the price is a reasonable one, he gives the assessment which was $2,100 in 1906, two years before, and I presume property values advanced in the meantime.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Why did he not give the assessment in the year the sale was made instead of two years before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know. He gives the price paid at a previous sale of this property, the price paid for neighbouring properties, and he says he doesn't think a better site could be found for a public building, and that the present post office stood on this very lot. So that the lot he recommended was the very lot on which the rented building then occupied as a post office stood. I think there was nothing else of importance that my hon. friend spoke of except the fact of the deputy minister urging that a report should be got from Mr. Mollard as to the site of the building, and there is nothing to interfere with the chief architect preparing the plans of the different buildings according to his own judgment from day to day.

Mr. RHODES. I quite agree with the hon. minister. It is entirely commendable in the deputy minister to hurry the chief architect to get a report from the agent of the department. I have no fault to find with that. I simply made reference to this matter for the purpose of contrasting the actions of the agents of the department in a case in which they were starting a post office a few months prior to a general election in a constituency which was represented by an hon. gentleman sitting to the right of the Speaker with the case of my own constituency which for the moment happens to be represented by a member sitting on this side of the House. I do not propose to deal with that any further. But the other thing that struck me was that the name of Champagne is an unusual name, and it is rather singular that the man to whom the agent of the department was referred to select the site was a Mr. Champagne, and that the title should come from Esther Champagne and one other. Has the minister any idea of whether Esther Champagne is related to Mr. Champagne?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make inquiry, and give my hon. friend the information later on.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I understand that the hon. minister, when he was in the west last summer, promised to put in a fish ladder in connection with the St. Andrew's locks. I would like to know whether he has fully decided to go on with that work next summer, and if so, why there is not an item in the estimates for it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have given a good deal of attention to the matter of a fishway in the dam at St. Andrew's rapids, and personally I am in favour of it being put in. We were requested to put that fishway in, not only by residents of Manitoba, but also on behalf of residents of the neighbouring state of Minnesota by the American consul at Winnipeg. In conference with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries I learned that upon the American side of the boundary, in the Pembina river, which is a branch of the Red river, there is a dam which was erected by American citizens, and which prevents the fish going up the river and coming around again into the province of Manitoba. We are trying to induce the state of North Dakota to put a fish-way in the Pembina river, and we hope it will be done concurrently with our putting one in the Red river at St. Andrew's rapids, so that fish might ascend both the Pembina and Red rivers.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I am very much pleased to hear what the minister says. I may say that this dam in the Pembina river is at Walhalla, and for 30 years we have not been able to get fish in that river because the Americans who own the dam have absolutely refused to put in a fish ladder. I hope the minister will give his

word that he will not put in a fish ladder at St. Andrew's rapids until the other is put in.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would all our friends in Manitoba be satisfied with that?

Mr. BRADBURY. They would not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If our friends in Manitoba would be satisfied with that, and we could use the dam at St. Andrew's rapids as a leverage to induce our American friends to put in a fish-way on the Pembina river, I would be pleased so to use it. However, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has the matter under his consideration, and has been for some time in communication, through his officials with the authorities of the state of North Dakota.

Mr. BRADBURY. I had this matter before the department on three or four occasions, and I understood that last session the fish-way in the St. Andrew's dam was provided for. I referred to it again in the early part of this session, and had the assurance of the Minister of Public Works and afterwards the assurance of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the work would be done. I concur in the idea that it would be good policy to use the St. Andrew's dam as a leverage to induce the Americans to put a fish-way in the Pembina river as well. At the same time, I hope it will not be long before we have a fish-way at St. Andrew's dam. There is no doubt that both of these dams should have fish-ways.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This matter shows the benefit that is likely to result from the treaty that has recently been agreed to. I am inclined to think, as at present advised, that this is a matter that could be referred to the International Joint Commission, because both of these rivers cross the boundary between the United States and Canada, and that they could take action by way of advice or otherwise which would be of great benefit.

Mr. BRADBURY. As far as I am personally concerned, I feel like leaving the matter in the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has given me his word that it will be attended to.

Mr. DANIEL. Has that commission authority over the state of Minnesota?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, if they have any authority at all, it is within the scope of the treaty, and a treaty is the paramount law. It over-rides all state law, provincial law or Canadian law. Under the American constitution treaties become the supreme law of the United States.

Mr. DANIEL. What power have they to enforce their decisions?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government of the United States is a very strong one.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I might say a word with regard to the fishways on the Pembina river and the Red river. The question of the Pembina river has been before the department for some time, and we have, in different circumstances, taken some steps to induce the state authorities to remove that dam on the Pembina river. Unfortunately, we have not so far been very successful. However, the commission which was appointed some time ago to investigate the fisheries in Manitoba were instructed by the department to visit that dam and see what steps could be taken to remove it. We are expecting their report very shortly, and shall be prepared to act on their recommendations. In the meantime, it would be, perhaps, advisable that nothing should be done with regard to the dam on the Red river. I do not think that much time will be lost, or that any one will suffer by the delay, and I hope, with the good relations which seem to exist now between the two countries, that better arrangements will be brought about with regard to the fisheries. This Pembina river is not one of those included in the boundaries waters treaty, but it is one which I intend bringing to the attention of the commissioners when the fisheries treaty is accepted by the American authorities. Both governments have the right to extend the provisions of that treaty to some waters which are not included in it. I am now referring to the fish treaty. I hope that the commissioners will agree with me that this river is one of those which should be included in that treaty, and, perhaps, that will be one of the ways in which the matter would be more easily settled; if, in the meantime, we do not succeed in getting it settled in some other way.

Mr. BRADBURY. While discussing these two fishways, I might remind the minister of another fishway of which I spoke last year, that on the Whitemouth river, entering the Winnipeg river, and which I think he promised to refer to the commission. The Winnipeg river enters just below the Lac du Bonnet, which abounds in fish, and the Whitemouth river extends a distance of some 75 to 80 miles north and south, and there are numbers of settlers all along its shores, and the fish cannot get up. It will cost very little to put a fishway there.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am under the impression that this is one of the questions referred to the commission. The report of that commission has not yet been handed to me, but I expect to have it soon, and shall not fail to bear in mind the remarks of my hon. friend.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I am very much pleased with the stand taken by the government in connection with this matter. The people along the Red river have had fish there a great many years, and we allowed the fish to go right down to the United States. The Americans have had all kinds of fish from Canada, and I think it was a very mean piece of business on the part of the United States people to build this dam on the Pembina river and absolutely refuse to put in a fish ladder. I think this government is perfectly justified in standing pat in connection with the fishway on St. Andrew's locks, because in the early days, when the first settlers went into southern Manitoba, they could get all the fish they wanted, but as soon as the dam was put there the fish ceased coming up. I think we would be justified in using that to bring these people to time. They are in the same box as we on account of there being no fish ladder in St. Andrew's lock, so that fish cannot get through to North Dakota. I think that the government are taking a justifiable course.

Mr. BRADBURY. While speaking on the subject of the locks east of the dam at St. Andrew's locks, as I may not be here when the harbours and rivers are up, I wish to refer to a matter in that connection. The hon. minister will recollect that last year, in the early part of the session, I drew his attention to the necessity of building approaches to the bridge at that dam. In the early part of this session I asked him whether he had provided a sum in the estimates this year for that purpose. Here is the question I asked:

THE ST. ANDREW'S DAM.

Mr. Bradbury. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works whether it is his intention to place a sum in the estimates this year for the completion of the bridge at St. Andrew's dam. I understood the hon. gentleman to state distinctly last year that the work was to be proceeded with immediately; but since then nothing has been done, the approaches have not been built, and the bridge is standing there useless, so far as the public on either side of the river are concerned. It is a very important matter to that part of the province of Manitoba.

To this the minister replied:

I would say to my hon. friend that the work at St. Andrew's rapids was not undertaken for the purpose of affording a bridge across the river, but for the purpose of improving the navigation by the building of a lock and a dam so as to increase the depth of the water between that point and the city of Winnipeg; but it was found, as incidental to the construction of the dam and lock, that provision might be made for the erection of a highway bridge, which would add somewhat to the cost, although the cost would not be nearly so great as it would be if the bridge were undertaken by itself. The work has cost a good deal of money, and up to the present moment the government has not seen its way clear to ask parliament for a vote for the purpose of providing the approaches to what would be the highway bridge. I may say to my hon. friend that there has been no decision arrived at against doing this work. All I can say is that up to the present it has not been decided to ask parliament for an appropriation during the present session.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how he reconciles that statement with the statement which he made most distinctly on the floor of this House last year, that a sum was going to be placed in the estimates for the building of these approaches.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not recall exactly what was said, but I am inclined to think that any statement which I made was simply an expression of my own opinion; but, of course, in addition to any opinion I might have as to the desirability of going ahead with the work, would be the question of providing the money, a matter which would rest with my colleagues, and more especially the Minister of Finance.

Now I wish to point out what occurred last session. The minister gave me, as I understood, a distinct promise across the floor of this House, that this work should be undertaken. This is a very important work. About $1,500,000 if I understand correctly, has been spent there already. The bridge stands there to-day about twenty-five or thirty feet up in the air and fully 200 feet away from the highway;—there it stands, a monument to the foolish policy of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend tell me how it could have been used as a service bridge for the purposes indicated, except it had been just at the height it is?

Mr. BRADBURY. When the plans were prepared, no provision was made for a highway bridge. There was provision made for the construction that has taken place of a service bridge for the purpose of moving the curtains. But to provide the highway bridge I am informed by the minister's own engineers would entail an extra cost of about $200,000 to strengthen the steel work in connection with that bridge. But whether it did so or not, the question is not whether the work could have been constructed without this bridge or not, but the bridge is there, and the minister promised me that the approaches would be completed, so that the settlers on each side could use it for the purpose for which it was constructed. Now, I wish to refer to what I stated. When the minister was going into Supply last year, I rose to draw attention to this matter, but as soon as he saw me he understood what I was going to say. I began:

With reference to the bridge over the St. Andrews dam——

I got no further, because the minister at once said:

We are going to build that bridge.

I understood what he meant, and he what I meant, and I did not pursue the matter further.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is just what I want to know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BRADBURY. Then I will not discuss it. I am very glad that the minister has seen the necessity of doing that work.

But my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples), did not catch the drift of the conversation between us, and did not understand the position as well as the minister and I did. He interjected a question:

Mr. STAPLES. Does the minister mean that he is going to build the approaches?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The approaches to the bridge.

Mr. STAPLES. The intention is to build the approaches?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The intention is to complete this work by building the approaches. The bridge is designed as a service bridge in connection with the dam and also for a highway bridge.

Later, when an item was under discussion in my absence from the House—as will be seen on reference to page 6103 of 'Hansard' of last year, an item of $55,000 for improvements at St. Andrew's rapids, this matter came up again. The following discussion took place:

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government has been engaged for some time in building a lock and dam at St. Andrew's rapids for the purpose of affording navigation from Lake Winnipeg to the city of Winnipeg. The work is now practically completed, and we expect that in a few days it will be open for navigation.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. minister purpose completing the roadway across this superstructure, which I understand is intended to be used as a municipal road? Does he propose making connections with the banks on either side?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What my hon. friend, I suppose, means is, shall we build the approaches so as to enable the people to avail themselves of the bridge, which was built primarily as a service bridge for the lock and dam, as a highway bridge. I may say that we intend to do so.

My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), in requesting the minister to hold that item over, as the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) and I were not present, said:

Perhaps we are not warranted in asking the minister to withhold the item, but the members for the two constituencies directly interested are not here. My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) has not yet returned from his Easter holidays, but I understand he will be here on Saturday. My hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) from Selkirk is in the city, but I have been unable to get in touch with him to have him here while this vote is under consideration. I would like if the minister would permit either of these gentlemen at a later stage to speak on the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be very glad to. Both of these hon. gentlemen have already spoken on the question, and I am sure that they would regret that there should be any delay in the passing of the item. The hon. member for Selkirk, a short time ago, spoke in very strong terms of the importance of finishing up these approaches and of the very great importance of the work.

Now, if language means anything, surely I am justified in saying that I had a distinct promise from the Minister of Public Works for the completion of this work. He not only tells me across the floor that he intends to complete the work, but when an item was under discusion two weeks after, for that particular work, he left on the minds of hon. members an impression that if that item went through, it was to provide for the very work that he had promised.

Now, it will be almost an outrage if this matter is allowed to go over this summer without this work being completed. A magnificent bridge has been constructed there, and all that is needed in order to complete it, is the two approaches, one on either side of the river. The absence of these approaches means that about 2,000 people are denied the means of using that bridge, which has been built by the people of this country and which stands there, as I have said, a monument to the foolishness of the policy enunciated by the minister. If he maintains the position that he took in the early part of the session and practically says that the government have not decided what they are going to do in this matter, after giving me a distinct promise across the floor of the House, what reliance are we to place upon the promises of ministers? I have never doubted, and I hope the minister will not give me reason to doubt, that a distinct pledge coming from a minister of the Crown would be openly violated. I do not believe he intends to do so. I do not believe that he recollected that he had made this promise across the floor. I ask him now to redeem that promise, in the interest of the people along that river, and in the interest of the people of this country, who have to furnish this large amount of money already spent. I ask him to go on and construct this work. There must have been some change of policy, because when I was at the locks myself after the session, the engineers led me to believe that tenders had been called for a cantilever bridge to span the lock. So there must have been a change of policy. Whatever it is, I hope the minister will see his way clear to provide the money in the estimates this session, and proceed with that work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When I had the pleasure of visiting St. Andrews locks a year ago last summer, I was impressed with the desirability of building the approaches, although I must say that the question as to whether the government should build them or leave the work to the provincial authorities was not entirely free from doubt. It is not so easy as my hon. friend might think to get my colleagues to agree, after building a lock and a dam, and providing that portion of the bridge across a navigable water, to go to the further expenditure of building the approaches to the bridge, which I may say many provincial and municipal authorities would be extremely glad to construct at their own expense in order to give the needed accommodation to the public. However, after a good deal of hesitation, I decided to recommend to my colleagues to strain a point and to build the approaches for the accommodation of these people living in the municipalities on each side of the river, without calling upon them to bear any portion of the burden. Perhaps I was a little over sanguine as to the time when my colleagues would authorize me to undertake the work. They have not so far given me the requisite money to enable me to do this work. I may say that my hon. friend himself and some of his associates are not altogether blameless for certain difficulties which have been thrown in my way. I call to mind that at the session before last the hon. member for North Toronto, a leading member of this House, speaking in the presence of the hon. member for Selkirk, charged that that whole work was simply a shameless waste of public money. He used this language:

> The Prime Minister is head trustee for the people of Canada. Will he now justify his conduct as head trustee for the people of Canada in sinking——

'Sinking' is the word the hon. member for North Toronto used.

> —sinking a million and a quarter of money in the St. Andrew's locks? Of that amount, $200,000 is for a highway bridge, for which no vote was ever taken, and that bridge lies there in its naked steel splendour, thirty-five or forty feet up in the air from the road on either side. I want to ask the Prime Minister, as head trustee for the people of Canada, to tell me to-night if he can get any three businessmen in the city of Winnipeg to put within his hand any justification, in the traffic that exists at present or in the business which may be expected in the near future, for the expenditure of a million and a quarter of money on that work. It is one of the finest pieces of concrete masonry and steel that I ever saw; but where is the business to come from? It is an absolute waste of public money at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when a prominent member of this House, occupying the leading position in the opposition of the hon. member for North Toronto, makes the statement that this whole work is simply a waste of public money, and when those hon. gentlemen representing the community especially interested, sit silent and allow that statement to go through this country, it makes the position of the Minister of Public Works much more difficult than it would be if the gentlemen interested had risen in their places and protested against a statement of that kind. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not withdraw one moment from the expression of opinion that I gave that it is desirable for the accommodation of these people, who are poor and unable apparently to build these approaches, that this government should build them. But I have not stated when it should be done. I intend to urge upon my colleagues to grant authority to build these approaches; whether I can get that authority this session, I am not prepared to say. But I shall continue to ask for that authority and I think that is as far as my hon. friend can ask me to go.

Mr. BRADBURY. The hon. minister has endeavoured, by using the words of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), to let himself down from a very nasty position. There is no question that the member for North Toronto did make the speech the minister refers to, and that speech was referred to by myself in the House later. I had talked the matter over with the member for North Toronto. What he meant, I think, is this, that there was no justification for the large expenditure that had been made at St. Andrews dam. He did not mean that a dam was not required, he did not mean that a lock was not required. The position taken by the member for North Toronto and by myself was that this work could have been done for about one-half the money the present government is spending upon it. But aside from all this, is the fact that the minister, knowing the conditions, having visited the work himself, knowing that it stands there twenty to thirty feet in the air from either side of the roadway, knowing that there has already been spent in constructing that bridge nearly $200,000, still allows the work to stand out in the middle of the stream quite useless to the people on either side of the river. Now the minister states that he is only one member of the cabinet, and that he cannot obtain this money that he is desirous of obtaining. How does he reconcile this with the fact that when asking a vote of $55,000 in connection with this work he left the inference plainly to be drawn from his language that that $55,000 included a sum to start that work. He stated distinctly when the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) asked him to allow the vote to stand over until I or the member for Winnipeg returned to the House:

I would be very glad to. Both of these hon. gentlemen have already spoken on the question, and I am sure that they would regret that there should be any delay in the passing of the item. The member for Selkirk a short time ago spoke in very strong terms of the importance of finishing up these approaches and of the very great importance of the work.

What other inference could be drawn from that language than that the minister was providing for that work in the estimate before the House? That was my understanding of the question when I was informed of what had taken place. I presumed the work would cost more than $55,000. When a minister asks for public moneys to carry on public works and makes promises, and then his colleagues practically turn him down and refuse to carry out the pledge given by him, that minister is placed in a very awkward position and one which I am sure the Minister of Public Works would not tolerate. The minister, on this occasion, pledged his word. I do not think his colleagues would compel him to violate his word given across the floor of the House, and I hope he will see his way clear to go on with the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret very much, indeed, that my hon. friend should have sought to misrepresent the representations which I made to this House in 1910, when the item of $55,000 was being obtained. He says I gave the committee to understand that the vote I was then asking would enable me to go on with the building of the approaches of the bridge. I would ask him to look at page 6103 of the 'Hansard' of 1910, where he will find:

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a difference, a very great difference. In this case the character of the river at that point is being changed. The ordinary mode of crossing by boat is necessarily being considerably affected, and I felt that the government, having been obliged to spend a considerable amount of money in building a service bridge for the operation of the lock and lifting curtains, it would not be unreasonable to go a little further and, instead of compelling the municipality to build the approaches, do that work ourselves.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not wish the minister to think for a moment that I am objecting. I think it is a very good idea to provide this service bridge for the people, because the municipalities contiguous to this portion of the river would certainly be put to a very large expense to erect a bridge. But I am rather amused at the reason the hon. minister has given, that the erection of this dam is going to interfere with the crossing of the river by a ferry. However, I do not wish to make any objection. I think the idea is a very good one.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the increased cost to make the provision for the municipality?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $63,000 is the estimate.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understand the minister to say that the present vote of $55,000 will complete the opening of the river for all the purposes of navigation, but will not complete the bridge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete the payments under the existing contracts, but will not complete the approaches to the bridge or the sodding.

So the amount I was then asking the committee for was the amount required to complete the payments on the bridge. I said as plainly as any words could say it that if we were to go on with the approaches and to complete the sodding we would have to get a further vote.

Mr. BRADBURY. Will the minister read the other portion, which is marked, and say what inference he would draw from it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall read all the passages that are marked:

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government has been engaged for some time in building a lock and dam at St. Andrew's rapids for the purpose of affording navigation from Lake Winnipeg to the city of Winnipeg. The work is now practically completed, and we expect that in a few days it will be open for navigation.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. minister purpose completing the roadway across this superstructure, which I understand is intended to be used as a municipal road? Does he propose making connections with the banks on either side?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What my hon. friend, I suppose, means is, shall we build the approaches so as to enable the people to avail themselves of the bridge which was built primarily as a service bridge for the lock and dam, as a highway bridge. I may say that we intend to do so.

I was not asking for a vote then for that purpose. I did not say that we were going to do it now. It was intimated as clearly as words could intimate that the vote for which we were then asking would not enable us to do it, and clearly the hon. gentleman who heard me must have understood that we would have to come back again to parliament for a vote which would enable us to build the approaches and to do the sodding if we so decided. Afterwards, if I remember rightly, we did come for authority to do the sodding.

Mr. BRADBURY. I want to emphasize what I said. The minister read a portion of the 'Hansard,' which I admit I did not notice, but it would not have made any difference in the construction I placed on the portion of his remarks which I read. I was not in the House and my attention was drawn to it, and I submit that no other inference could be drawn by any fair-minded man than the inference I drew. After the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) had asked to have the matter stand, the minister said:

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be very glad to. Both of these hon. gentlemen have already

spoken on the question, and I am sure that they would regret that there should be any delay in the passing of the item. The member for Selkirk a short time ago spoke in very strong terms of the importance of finishing up these approaches and of the very great importance of the work.

I would like to know if it is not fair for me to infer that the minister meant us to understand, and I am sure the hon. member for Portage la Prairie and the other members must have felt that the minister was providing some part of the money necessary to complete the approaches to that great work. The Dominion of Canada has expended large amounts there. I understand it has already cost $1,500,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was for purposes of navigation.

Mr. BRADBURY. The bridge is there, concreted, all ready for use; all it wants is the two approaches, which I understand will cost $60,000 or $70,000. Is it possible that the minister is going to allow that magnificent structure to stand there without those approaches, which will enable this work to be used, and allow it to rust year after year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Allow me to correct any error into which my hon. friend has inadvertently fallen. He said the highway bridge cost $200,000 ; but my information from the engineering branch of the department is that such is not the case. We have constructed a service bridge for the purpose of operating the curtains and that service bridge cost $200,000, but the extra cost of preparing it as a highway bridge only represents $50,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. I will not argue that point, but as I have already stated I myself investigated the matter when the work was under construction, and one of the resident engineers informed me that the providing of the highway bridge involved an extra cost of something like $200,000, and he figured it that while the service bridge was an absolute necessity for raising the curtains, the steel work in connection with it had to be made so much stronger for a highway bridge that it occasioned the extra cost. However, that is aside from the question ; the bridge is there. Is the minister going to allow it to stand there idle? I appeal to him now to complete that work. It is of absolute necessity to the welfare of that district. The country has spent one and a half million dollars constructing the work and surely the people should not be denied the advantages which would accrue by the completion of this bridge at an extra expenditure of $50,000 or $60,000. As it stands at present it is a disgrace to this government. Does the minister intend to provide a sum in the estimates to implement the pledge in regard to this matter which he gave across the floor of the House last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimates must speak for themselves when they are brought down. I regret I am not able to give the information ; I have no authority to say what council will do.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It seems to me that the term 'service bridge' is a bit of a joke when applied to a bridge that is of no service to anybody. I notice that in these estimates there is $174,000 all told allocated to poor little Manitoba, and I feel that it is necessary for some one from that province to draw the attention of the government to the fact that Manitoba is not getting its just due in the matter of public expenditure. For instance, in Nova Scotia these estimates provide for an expenditure of $938,230, and in New Brunswick for an expenditure of $1,323,950, while at the present moment Manitoba has a greater population than either of the other two. But, New Brunswick represented by the Minister of Public Works gets $1,323,950 expended within its boundaries while poor little Manitoba is only to get $174,000. It is the most scandalous thing which has ever been shown up in this House. What is the reason of it. Is it bribery, is it corruption, or is it reward? It is a most scandalous piece of what I call parliamentary corruption, and jobbery. I want to know from the Minister of Public Works why Manitoba is treated in that way. Is it because Manitoba sent eight Conservative members here, and only two to support the government? Let me tell the minister if he does'nt know it—and he never knows anything that is pertinent to the question before the House unless it suits him—let me tell him that in 1901 the population of Manitoba was about 500,000, the population of Nova Scotia 459,000, and the population of New Brunswick 331,120. I hope it is not my remarks that make the minister yawn. I want some accounting from the minister for this. Is Manitoba being punished, is New Brunswick being rewarded? I want a fair, square answer if it is possible to get it from the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is so unconscious of the meaning of some observations that he makes, that I will not take offence.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think you could.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If these remarks were made by some hon. gentlemen I would take offence, but we have to give to the hon. and picturesque member from one of the Manitoba constituencies a good deal of latitude.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not want any privilege in this House except the privi-

lege of any honourable, decent member. I have made a proposition to the minister, and I ask him to answer it, as one man to another man on honourable grounds.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The committee tolerates a good deal from the hon. gentleman, and I will not depart from what has been the custom of the committee and this House in regard to him. Therefore, I will endeavour to make a courteous answer. He asks in regard to the expenses in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick compared with those in Manitoba. As far as New Brunswick is concerned, there are no expenses being made which are not in my judgment absolutely necessary in the public interest. We are making provision at the port of St. John for accommodating the national traffic which is coming to that port. The city of St. John began some 14 years ago to make improvements. The people taxed themselves to the extent of a million and a quarter dollars, to provide terminal facilities. The business has increased enormously, and last year the exports at that port reached $25,000,000. Then, it has been necessary to build wharfs at various places throughout the province for the accommodation of shipping. Public buildings we are only putting up where they are necessary. So far as the province of Manitoba is concerned, while the appropriations for this year are not large, we completed only recently, at a cost of a million and a quarter dollars, a work at St. Andrew's rapids which I believe, is going to be of paramount importance to the city of Winnipeg and to the province of Manitoba generally. We have erected in the city of Winnipeg a magnificent post office building, a magnificent customs warehouse and an immigration building. We have erected a public building at Brandon, and we are proceeding to erect one at Portage la Prairie. We are also putting up public buildings at Souris. We have erected public buildings at Emerson, Dauphin and other places. There are no great harbours to dredge in Manitoba, but we are doing dredging on Lake Winnipeg, on Lake Manitoba and in the Red river. Then we have in prospect the building in the near future of the Hudson Bay railway, which, if the boundaries of the province of Manitoba are extended, as we expect they will be to Hudson Bay, will be built wholly in the province of Manitoba. There will be an expenditure on that railway reaching upwards of $20,000,000, made wholly in the province of Manitoba, and when the railway reaches either Fort Churchill or Fort Nelson, I expect that we shall be called upon to expend, not hundreds of thousands, but probably millions of dollars in the improvement of the harbour, giving facilities for, I hope, an enormous traffic that will flow from Manitoba and the other western provinces, by way of this short line, to the markets of the old world. We have made surveys of the Saskatchewan river, and if we carry out the works which those surveys seem to warrant, we shall have to build dams at various points along the route in order to bring Winnipeg into water communication with Prince Albert and Edmonton and right on to the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. I trust that the hon. gentleman will not be sectional in this matter, for we hope to make improvements in that province even beyond his most sanguine anticipations.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know that I can take much exception to the opening words of the minister, in which he referred to me as a picturesque member. I think I would rather be called a picturesque member than an unctuous member. Beyond those few personal words, I do not see the bearing of what he has said. He refers to what he expects to do on the Saskatchewan river. What has that to do with Manitoba? He refers to the expenditure he proposes to make in Portage la Prairie that does not help us, because the expenditure has not been made. He refers to the possibilities of Fort Churchill. What has that to do with Manitoba as at present constituted? Perhaps the minister will tell us that the efforts of the provincial ministers who have come down here have resulted favourably, and that Fort Churchill is going to be in Manitoba. If that is the case, I will welcome any expenditures that he makes in that direction. I only opened this subject because as a Manitoban I object to my province being so neglected by the minister as the blue-books show.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What works does the hon. gentleman ask for?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask for a fair per capita expenditure of public money. We find that the government of Canada is spending 34 cents per head in Manitoba, while it is spending $2 per head in Nova Scotia and $4 per head in the province of the Minister of Public Works. Where is the justice of that? All I ask is justice and fair play all around.

Mr. ROCHE. Before this item passes, and in view of the remarks which the Minister of Public Works dropped a moment ago, I am sure he will pardon me if I say a few words on behalf of the constituency I represent, more particularly as he certainly cannot accuse me of imposing my views on him too frequently or of urging him to undertake unnecessary public expenditure within the borders of my constituency. Since he has seen fit to refer to some works he has had built within the borders of the province of Manitoba, let me refer him to

a few more which he has omitted. When we rise to protest against an expenditure or to urge a request for a fair appropriation, we are open to one of two charges. When we ask for so much needed expenditure within the confines of our own constituency, we are accused of desiring to increase the expenditure of the country. But should we fail to do so, and later on bring to the attention of the minister some much needed improvement, we are twitted with the fact that this is the first time he heard of it, and are made to appear as if we had been lacking in our duty in not having brought this matter to his attention before. I desire to say a word or two with reference to the treatment given the constituency I have the honour to represent. Last night I heard the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) say that there was not a constituency in the Dominion which had met with the same treatment as had been accorded to his during fourteen years when the Conservatives were in office. During all that time not a single dollar, he said, had been expended in the way of constructing a public building in that constituency. Well, this is the fifteenth session I have been in this parliament, and I have not yet had in all those years a dollar expended within the confines of my constituency on any public building. That caps the experience of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). And that is not due to any remissness on my part. On several occasions I have drawn the attention of the hon. minister and of his predecessor to the town of Minnedosa. His predecessor went to the extent of promising to put an item in the estimates for the purchasing of a lot for the erection of a public building in that town, but for some reason or another he failed to keep his promise. I have not pressed this matter session after session on the minister, because I knew there were many important towns requiring large expenditures; but when I see towns with a few hundred population and a postal revenue of some six or eight hundred dollars, given public buildings while more important towns are passed by, I cannot help drawing attention to this unequal distribution of the public money and this unfair discrimination. The Minister of Public Works has referred to the fact that he has just completed a splendid building in Brandon. That is very true. But who represents that city? It is represented by the Hon. Clifford Sifton, and the building put up exceeded the estimate and cost something between $50,000 and $75,000. I am not raising any objection because Brandon is a thriving city, and deserves a public building. But when in that same constituency we see another town less important than Minnedosa—the town of Souris, with less population and less postal revenue and which is besides the second town in the same constituency presented with a public building, whereas there is no town at all in the constituency of Marquette similarly treated, it is high time to enter a protest. And when you come to another town in that same constituency with a third public building, in the town of Virden, I think I have still greater ground for complaint. In the constituency of Brandon represented by a government supporter, there is a large expenditure in three towns, whereas during fifteen years not a single dollar has been expended in Marquette.

True there is a public building in the constituency represented by my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell), but that building was given it when it was represented, not by a Conservative, but by a friend of this government. The minister has also pointed out that there is a public building in Emerson, but that was also erected, not when that constituency was represented by a Conservative, but when it was represented by a Liberal. St. Boniface also was given a public building when it was represented by a Liberal, and Selkirk was equally favoured when a Liberal, Mr. Jackson, represented it. In Neepawa also when it elected a Liberal, there was a considerable expenditure on a public building, and in that connection there was a good deal of protest on the part of the people, because the building was placed in a most inconvenient place in order to benefit a supporter of the party in power and who was fortunate enough to own the site. I might go on and cite other places in which public buildings have been erected by this government, but not a dollar has been expended in any of these since they have been represented by Conservatives.

There are only three items in the estimates this year for public buildings in the whole province of Manitoba, whereas in Saskatchewan and Alberta there are 22, of which only three are for renewals and repairs. Minnedosa has a population of about 1,700. The money orders issued last year amounted $57,228. When asked to give a reason for the construction of a public building in any particular locality, the minister is always ready with a stereotyped set of replies. Either the town has a certain population, or if the population be not sufficient to offer as a reason, it is a shire town, and when that will not suit, he tells us it has a certain postal revenue. But the real reason, which is his desire to help political friends, he never under any circumstances will admit. If he would frankly say, we have so much money to spend which we must distribute among our own friends, and if anything be left over some of the hon. gentlemen opposite will get a

share of it, we would at least honour him for his frankness.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that Manitoba is pretty fairly served in public buildings, judging by the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche).

Mr. ROCHE. What does the minister think about Marquette? Has that been fairly served?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is only one, and, of course, the hon. gentleman's own friends would oppose any expenditure there, because they condemn expenditures in towns of 1,700 of population.

Mr. ROCHE. But there are towns under 1,700 to which the hon. minister has given public buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But hon. gentlemen opposite have protested most indignantly against this.

Mr. ROCHE. Some of the items went through with very little criticism, indeed, and for towns with less population. Therefore, I think that Minnedosa, which is a railway centre, and is developing a large water-power, and which is becoming a summer resort, and is likewise a judicial centre, or shire town, in which the provincial government have erected a $40,000 court house and jail, certainly deserves the attention of the minister far more than some of those other insignificant places which he has favoured. I would urge the Minister of Public Works to carefully consider my representations and see that justice is done the town of Minnedosa in the future, and not pass it over in favour of towns much less important, more especially in view of the record his government has had in connection with the constituency of Marquette since I have had the honour of representing it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the request of my hon. friend very reasonable, and if I had the money available it would give me great pleasure to accede to it, more particularly as the hon. gentleman is very reasonable at all times in the representations he makes to the House. I think he has made out a strong case. He has pointed out that Minnedosa is a shire town, that it is a thriving place, and that there is no public building in the constituency. So that certainly I shall take his remarks carefully into consideration with a view of seeing whether or not it is possible to meet his request.

Mr MEIGHEN. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) must feel his hopes raised to the very zenith by these remarks of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The member for Marquette seems to be quite able to take care of himself.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I am sorry that the minister fails to understand what I am saying. When the hon. minister tells my hon. friend that he will take this into his consideration, it may, in the course of a year, get into his estimates. Then when the hon. member is returned again, if the minister follows his record in other constituencies, in about four years more he may possibly start the building. So it is the duty of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) to communicate the good news to his constituents that within five years there is a possibility of a start being made on a post office at Minnedosa. What I complain of is, not only what has been pointed out by the hon. member for Dauphin, that there are in the estimates only 34 cents per man in Manitoba, while there are $2 for Nova Scotia, and $4 for New Brunswick ; but also that the items in the New Brunswick and Nova Scotia estimates, so far as they cover constituencies represented by friends of the government, are live estimates, and are being actually spent; while the Manitoba estimates are dead estimates, waiting for the elections. For every dollar that is spent per man in the province of Manitoba there are $6 spent in Nova Scotia and $12 spent in New Brunswick. If we leave out the class of expenditures the minister refers to, namely, those that in some sense serve the whole of Canada and are chargeable to capital, the fact still remains that for $1 spent in Manitoba there are $8 spent in Nova Scotia and $8 in New Brunswick. Leaving out that class, it would not be unfair for us to ask the minister to observe some due proportion between these three provinces. The minister knows enough about the duty of a member to his constituency to know that he cannot expect members on this side of the House to sit quietly in their seats while he performs a gross injustice to the province he represents. In the constituency of Portage la Prairie the hon. gentleman did, during the time it was represented by a friend of the government, build a post office at Neepawa. The post office was erected in a location to suit the party rather than to suit the town. Now the other estimate that was put in for Portage la Prairie was also a pre-election estimate. The minister placed the item in the estimates in 1907-8, he dropped it immediately the elections were over. Subsequently he was prevailed upon to reinstate it, on the general principle which he then laid down that all the estimates of 1907-8 had a prior claim on the attention of his department. The site was purchased, and it still stands I believe in the name of the government; but there the whole matter rests. I have communicated with the minister, petitions have been urging the matter, but somehow they land in the vermiform appendix of the government and never seem

to get through. I do not need to call the attention of the minister to the necessities there. The minister has acknowledged them years ago, they have grown in importance since the number of regiments has been increased by one, making two now. The building that they are trying to use at present would be discreditable to a Chinaman. One is in grave danger of breaking his leg if he tries to enter it. It is an eyesore on the street, it would not be looked upon with credit in the most dilapidated and forsaken spot in the universe. Now there is a considerable interest being taken in military matters in that city, it has grown by leaps and bounds. Indeed, one of the chief promoters, and one of those most thoroughly imbued with the military spirit, is the representative in the local House on the opposition side for that constituency. I am sure that gentleman will use his influence with the minister, and I will assist him all I can to urge the minister to forward that work. I have brought to bear upon the minister every influence of a legitimate character that I could think of to urge forward this building. It is at present in an embryo state, the working plans I believe are under way. But I want to ask the minister if he can suggest anything further I can do as a representative of that constituency to hurry on the completion of this work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the hon. gentleman a typesetter?

Mr. MEIGHEN. No, I am not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then the hon. gentleman cannot help the matter at all, because the specifications are now being printed. They will be ready in about a fortnight, when tenders will be called for by public advertisement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want to put in another word for Manitoba. Manitoba wants a great deal. Now, when so much money is being voted, only $170,000 for Manitoba and over $1,300,000 for the province the Minister of Public Works comes from, with only two-thirds of the population of Manitoba, surely Manitoba is not being treated justly. We are asking for all kinds of things of Manitoba not in a partisan way, but for the benefit of the province; we are asking for $2,500,000 for an exposition in Winnipeg. This is not a political matter, it is a plan for the benefit of the province, for the benefit of all Canada, as we believe. Can we not get some assurance from the minister that he will further our desires in that regard?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The matter of aid to the exhibition is under consideration. My hon. friend would not expect me to inform him in advance as to whether the decision of the government will be favourable or otherwise. I regret I am not able to give him any information on the subject.

Winnipeg military buildings, hospital, $13,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg) want that to stand?

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). No. I think this would be a proper time to bring up the question as to the Winnipeg armoury. No doubt it has been brought to the attention of the minister many times and strongly urged upon him. We have, I think, during the past year, two new regiments, and they have not facilities for even storing their regimental equipment. I had fully expected to see an item in the estimates in connection with this. While answering that question, the minister might also make a statement that, I am sure, will be received with interest by the people of Winnipeg. He is aware of the situation of the parliament buildings there. They are old, out-of-date, unsanitary. They occupy a part of one block, the other part of which is occupied by the barracks and drill shed. I believe it has been the desire of the local government to acquire the portion occupied by the Dominion government with the barracks and drill shed in order to have an area upon which to put up proper parliamentary buildings for the province. We would then have what could be made a modest but very nice little park, bounded by Broadway, Osborne and Kennedy streets, and, upon the south, by the Assinboine river. I would like to know from the minister if there is an intention on the part of the government to act in that way?

Mr. PUGSLEY. With regard to the drill shed, I think I am right in saying that the proposed exchange of properties would not affect the site of the drill shed—I take it that it could be built on the same property. The question of building a new drill shed has not been recently brought to my attention. I am not aware whether complaints have been made as to the accommodation afforded by the drill shed. I will have it looked into, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg) will mention it when the Minister of Militia is here—for there are items for military buildings that have been left over—I can assure my hon. friend that he will not be held down to technical rules, but, if Mr. Chairman and the members of the committee are willing, he will be afforded facilities for getting the information he desires. As to the proposed exchange, I understood that the communications between the provincial government and this government took place, so far as our side is concerned, with the Militia Department. They have not been brought to

my notice, and I have no further information than what I have seen in the newspapers. It is not unlikely that the Minister of Militia will bring this matter to my attention shortly. I will ask my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg) to be good enough, when some of these buildings are under consideration, to mention this matter as well. I have no doubt the Minister of Militia will give as full information as he is able to do with regard to the negotiations.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). With regard to the item under discussion, I suppose we are to understand that this hospital, wherever it is to be built, will not be built on the present military property in the city of Winnipeg?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will not be built in such a way as to interfere at all with the negotiations. That will be very important, of course.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). A very important matter has been brought to the attention of the minister with regard to the way Manitoba is treated by this government. Looking through the estimates, we find item 141, which shows that Manitoba is getting the paltry sum of $73,000 for public buildings for the whole province. A few years ago, when we had quite a number of gentlemen from that province occupying seats on the other side of the House, we saw that Manitoba was a good deal better treated than it is to-day. If we look at the next item, No. 142, we find that Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Northwest Territories receive $584,000. These items should, to a certain extent, take into consideration the amount of revenue collected in the several provinces. If you look at the figures you find that Manitoba pays into the Dominion treasury between $6,000,000 and $7,000,000 a year, which is a good deal more than double what is paid in by both these provinces put together. And when you analyse the amount that is being spent in these two provinces you see that almost every man occupying a seat on the other side of the House is being taken care of in splendid shape. I do not think it is right that we should be treated in that way. In my own constituency we have several towns a good deal better than the town of Humboldt, for instance, yet we see that Humboldt gets a new building worth about $25,000 or $30,000. They are renting a building there at the present time for $280 a year that fulfils the conditions necessary for that town, or, at least, has fulfilled them in the past. Under this expenditure in Humboldt we shall be paying—taking the money at six per cent—instead of $280 a year, about $1,500 a year. We have not a single public building in my whole constituency, and we have several towns there a good deal more entitled to it, I think—and I believe the minister would acknowledge that if he would look into the case—than even this town of Humboldt. I think these public buildings should be more fairly distributed among the different provinces and among the various constituencies.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we have made exceedingly good progress to-day. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fisher, the House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 6, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

WESTERN FARMERS' DELEGATION.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to move that the proceedings of the meeting between the farmers' delegation and the Prime Minister, and other members of the government in the House of Commons chamber on the 16th December last, be printed for the use of members and that rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How soon may we expect that report?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Right away.

TRAFFIC AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Before the orders of the day are called I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister or the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) to an article which appears in the February issue of the 'Review of Reviews,' with reference to an agreement said to have been reached between the Railway Commission of Canada and the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States. The article is as follows:

It is expected that with the reciprocity treaty there will also be submitted to Congress the text of some sort of traffic agreement with Canada to regulate railroad business over the border. . . . The report of Chairman Knapp, concurred in by Chairman Mabee, and presented to the Secretary of State on the last day of December, contains recommendations of such importance to those of our citizens who are interested in trade and travel across

the border that we herewith summarize its most important points.

Then the article goes on:

The proposed treaty provides for a tribunal to enforce and administer its provisions to be known as the International Commerce Commission and which shall consist of four members, namely, the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the chief commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada for the time being, a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission to be appointed by the President of the United States, and a member of the Railway Commissioners of Canada to be appointed by the Governor General of Canada in Council. The powers conferred upon and the authority given to this commission in respect of international carriers would correspond to those exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission in respect of interstate carriers within the United States.

The provisions of such a treaty should apply to telegraph, telephone and express companies and such companies should be subject as respect to international business to the authority of the International Commerce Commission.

I would like to point to a paragraph taken from the message of President Taft with reference to reciprocity, which he sent to Congress on the 26th January last. After reciting a few of the matters which had been settled, and which, he says, enabled them to make a reciprocity agreement, he proceeds thus:

An equitable arrangement has recently been reached between our Interstate Commerce Commission and the similar body in Canada in regard to through rates on the transportation lines between the two countries. The path having been thus opened for the improvement of commercial relations, a reciprocal trade agreement is the logical sequence of all that has been accomplished in disposing of matters of a diplomatic and controversial character.

I would like to know if that be true, and if such an agreement has been reached between our Board of Railway Commissioners, and the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States. If so, by whom was the initiative taken; and if such an agreement has been made, will it be submitted to this House before the conclusion of the discussion on reciprocity, as is proposed to be done apparently on the other side of the line. Have our Railway Commissioners the authority to make any such agreement without subjecting it to ratification by this House? The whole trend of such an agreement, I presume, is to facilitate traffic north and south instead of east and west.

Mr. GRAHAM. As I have already stated on several occasions in this House, the question of control of rates on lines running from Canada into the United States, and from the United States into Canada has been under consideration, I think, more than a year. I am not prepared to say just who originated the idea of solving the problem by the appointment of an international tribunal. It was first brought to my attention by Judge Mabee, the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. The difficulties experienced by shippers on traffic between the two countries are quite apparent at times. For instance, the rate is a point, say from New York to Toronto. It is possible, I presume to get a through rate by the boards acting separately. But what results often is this, that the railway companies on each side charge a local tariff, particularly if there be no competition, and as a result the purchaser of the goods in Toronto is obliged to pay two local rates instead of one through rate. The object of the agreement, if one could be arrived at, was to form some tribunal that could quickly make a through rate that would apply from any point in Canada to any point in the United States and vice versa, so that, so far as control of rates was concerned, there would be a tribunal that as completely controlled the traffic originating in either country going to the other as if the traffic were all in one country. Judge Mabee and Mr. Knapp, head of the Interstate Commerce Commission, had several conferences and they did arrive at a basis that to them seemed satisfactory for the solution of the difficulty, and in a manner to protect both shippers and producers on either side of the line having business on the other side. The report of each of these gentlemen is now in the hands of his government. If approved it will take the form of a treaty. As to the details, so far as I am concerned, they have not been given to the public. But the information which my hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) finds in the magazine referred to approximates the truth as to outlining the details. All I can say is, that so far as the Canadian government is concerned, this matter is still under consideration, and no action has yet been taken. But the report of Judge Mabee was made to this government as the report of Mr. Knapp was made to the United States government.

Mr. FOSTER. Did Mr. Mabee take the initiative in this matter without any consultation with or authorization from the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, that is not what I said. I said I was not in a position to say who originally took the initiative; the first I heard of it, Judge Mabee discussed it with me, and he had full authority to discuss it with Mr. Knapp and make a report embodying their views.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. This report, apparently, states that an agreement will be sub-

mitted to the United States Congress when the treaty is discussed. Will it be discussed here when we discuss reciprocity?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will be premature, I imagine, to say much about it, as it is entirely under negotiation at the present time. And, as it will be in the form of a treaty, the usual custom and practice as to treaties will be followed in both countries.

RECIPROCITY—INQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

Mr. BRADBURY. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the returns brought down of the petitions and representations for and against the proposed arrangement with the American government. I notice that the petition from Manitoba in favour of admitting vegetables free into Canada is among the papers brought down, but the petitions against admitting them free are not included. Last year I had the honour to present to this House a petition from the Kildonan Association protesting against the admission of vegetables into this country free of duty. I think there was a petition sent to the hon. minister in addition to that. And I understand that a similar petition was sent in the early part of the present session. Does the minister intend to bring these down? I may also mention a petition from the stonecutters along the same line.

Mr. FIELDING. If any petitions have been received at my department which are not included in the return, they should certainly be brought down. It is quite accidental if they have not been.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the minister if, since our conversation across the floor the other day, he has yet brought himself into a state of mind to obey the order of the House and bring down the correspondence of parties either with himself or the Minister of Customs, or any other member of the government, not any of which has yet been brought down?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not had the opportunity of looking over the returns, but I may say that I gave directions in a general way that anything covered by the order of the House should be brought down. I was informed that there were letters, which, it was thought by my officials, were not intended to be made public, and I stated that, in that case, they should not be brought down. I will give my personal attention to the matter. But I am not able to change the judgment I gave as to the rule governing cases of this kind. If there is anything not brought down which falls within the rule—and not necessarily the written rule, but the ordinary rule and custom of the House—I will bring it down.

Mr. PATERSON. In that connection I have a telegram, received late Saturday night from Vernon, stating: 'Associated Boards of Trade here are forwarding resolution that duty be not taken off fruit.' I have received similar intimations from others, but my impression is that copies of what I have received have gone to the Minister of Finance as well. If there is anything of that kind, copies of which have not been sent to the Minister of Finance, I will try and look them up.

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to have them complete. The order included all minutes.

Mr. PATERSON. It has not been brought to my notice.

Mr. BLAIN. I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether or not serious consideration will be given to any special interest in Canada that may be affected by the proposed reciprocity arrangement should it become law? In the county I have the honour to represent there is a very strong feeling in respect to these matters. Throughout the western part of Ontario, at the present moment, large sums of money are being subscribed to send delegations to the government to explain the position of specific interests that will be affected if these tariff changes become law. Will the government give serious consideration to the representations of these interests if they are made? I may anticipate by saying that a general answer that the government will listen to all complaints of everybody will not be quite sufficient. I want to know if the government will give serious consideration to these matters, or whether it will be better for these gentlemen to stay at home on the ground that this proposal will not be changed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will give most serious consideration to all the interests represented, reserving our judgment.

Mr. BLAIN. I anticipated that.

DAMMING THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether or not any further communication has been sent with respect to the proposed dam across the St. Lawrence river. I ask this question because, as I understand it, action taken by the government at the present juncture might have considerable effect.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know about that. The last move we made was to ask for all information on the subject. I received, a few moments ago, a report of the committee which had charge of the Bill. It will be brought down to-morrow.

Mr. HUGHES. In the same connection, has the Prime Minister, or any member of the government, information as to any proposal on the American side for the diversion of the waters of the St. Lawrence by

means of a dam between Long Sault island and the mainland, and the cutting of a canal to connect the St. Lawrence river with Lake Champlain waters?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have received no intimation of that kind.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the government when I may expect a return to an order of the House of January 16, relative to the large number of appointments made from South Grey during the last few years?

Mr. MURPHY. The material for that order has been sought in all the department. Several of them have responded, and I hope to bring down complete returns soon.

Mr. BLAIN. And with respect to Wentworth?

Mr. MURPHY. Wentworth as well.

Mr. BLAIN. May we expect it within the near future?

Mr. MURPHY. Within a couple of days.

MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION, OTTAWA.

Mr. MILLER. Before the orders of the day are called, perhaps the House will not object to listening to a resolution passed in this city at a meeting of the Ministerial Association. I do this in defence of a man who is not able to be here to defend himself.

Mr. SPEAKER. How is the hon. member bringing that matter up at this stage?

Mr. MILLER. With the consent of the House.

Mr. HUGHES. I respectfully request that the hon. member be allowed to proceed, and read his resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot allow that now, under the rules.

RECIPROCITY—STATISTICAL TABLES.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Finance as to whether the statistical tables, to which reference was made a day or two ago, are about ready?

Mr. FIELDING. I have just had word that they are. I think they are within the precincts of the House, and I expect to lay them on the table within a few moments.

Mr. HUGHES.

PRIVATE BILLS.

LAKE CHAMPLAIN AND ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CANAL COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 60) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the charter was first given in 1898.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Long before that. Is there a provision that the government may at any time complete this work if they choose to do so?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there is no such provision in the Act.

Mr. HUGHES. Where is the terminus?

Mr. GRAHAM. The starting point is opposite the city of Montreal, and the terminus is at St. Johns, Que.

Mr. HUGHES. I suppose the minister has heard that there is a proposition to run a power canal, not a navigation canal, from the St. Lawrence river, between the Long Sault island and the American shore, to Lake Champlain. Has the minister heard anything about that?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. There is a canal on the south side of the Sault now, that supplies power to Massena, N. Y.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the probable cost of a work of this kind?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a company affair, I do not know what it will cost. It starts from Montreal and goes to St. Johns, a distance of about thirty miles.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). This canal covers the line of a canal projected by the late Hon. John Young from Montreal or Caughnawaga to Lake Champlain. It was one of the great schemes that was advocated by Hon. John Young, and has been before the country for the last sixty years. I do not know how it has got into private hands.

Mr. GRAHAM. Going into the matter lately in my department, I found an Act was passed in 1898. From St. Johns it follows the river down to Lake Champlain. I think the idea was to facilitate transportation by making a canal and river stretch, via Lake Champlain, from Montreal to the city of New York.

Mr. BLAIN. Should not this be constructed by the government instead of by a private company?

Mr. GRAHAM. The government has not seen its way clear to take up the proposition yet. Like some other propositions, the company wishes to have its powers renewed ; and the committee thought, after hearing the discussion, that there was no

objection to renewing their powers. The government has not thought proper to take up the project.

Mr. PERLEY. Has the minister, in giving his consent to this renewal, considered the government control of rates over the canal? Has he looked at the statute to see whether there is anything in it that ought to be altered, so as to give the government control of rates over this canal when it is completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is merely a renewal of the powers the company had before. I do not think myself there is any immediate danger of anybody constructing the canal. But as no new powers are given them, no restrictions are placed on them that were not in the original Act of 1898. When looking over the old statute a couple of years ago, I found nothing in it about the control of rates.

Mr. HUGHES. Is this going to be something like the Quebec bridge, that a corporation may get control of it, and after a while, ask the government to take it over from them?

Mr. GRAHAM. As the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) says a project of that kind has been in existence for sixty years, I do not think, judging from past experience, that it will be hurriedly built.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister keeping it on on the basis of vested rights which have accrued and which he does not like to disturb? He does not vouch for the necessity or practicability of the work or the possibility of its being completed. We may have some British bank taking up this blamed old thing, taking stock and bonds and people may be victimized to a large extent as was the case in Gaspè and other Quebec counties. There is a lesson in that mad riot of ill conditioned speculation, consequent upon the subsidies given to those roads down there, that is that this parliament should be a little careful of how it places public franchises in the hands of private individuals who show no prospect of action and who are probably holding for speculative purposes what belongs or should belong to the country in the shape of franchises. I do not want to be hard on an old thing that has been living for 60 years, but surely it will die of old age if of nothing else.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not my child and I am not particular. I am simply pointing out in the absence of the member in whose name it stands, just about the situation. The House is at liberty to do as it likes with the Bill. The committee, after hearing the whole matter threshed out, thought there would be no serious harm in renewing a charter that has stood for years, but if the Committee of the Whole should think better to let it stand I am not concerned.

Mr. PERLEY. I do not think we should grant a renewal of one of these old charters in exactly the same terms as the original charter, merely as a matter of form; such charters should be altered to suit present day conditions. Parliament was much freer in granting powers and authorities for works of this kind at the time this was granted than it is to-day, and I suggest to the minister that in renewing this charter after so many years, when nothing has been done, conditions as to control of rates, &c., should be inserted as if it were a new charter.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend says, conditions have changed greatly and we think more, for instance, of water-powers now than they did then. We might let it stand until the hon. member in whose name it stands is in the House.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. In this very Act the company is given power to acquire and utilize water-power for the purpose of compressing air or generating electricity for lighting, heating and motor purposes in connection with the canal, and power to sell surplus power generated, and not required for operating its canal, &c. They have an absolute power and a monopoly apparently to generate electricity from the water-powers there and there is no restriction as to the rates.

Mr. NESBITT. I understood the Bill was amended in the committee to comply with the suggestions that have been made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A number of new sections have been added, but we have not reached them.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be a good thing to let it stand in the meantime.

Progress reported.

CANADIAN WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 70) respecting the Canadian Western Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

On section 1,

Mr. HERRON. This company has a local charter covering almost identically the same ground and the condition has been imposed that they must build thirty miles of the road within one year. Would the Minister of Railways and Canals think it proper to restrict the Dominion charter in the same manner as it might have a tendency to expedite the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. How long has the provincial charter been in existence?

Mr. HERRON. About three years.

Mr. GRAHAM. Have they built any of the thirty miles?

Mr. HERRON. They have had the charter renewed once.

Mr. GRAHAM. The difficulty about a clause of that kind is that it does not have any effect in making them build. You say that they must build a certain number of miles within a limited time, but the only result has been that they come back and ask for a renewal just the same as if there had not been any condition of the kind. It is a difficult question to determine how to induce the railway companies to build a little more rapidly than they are doing. My own private opinion is that no clause of this kind will make them build a mile of railway any quicker. When the railway company want to build they will do it. The only alternative is not to renew their charter if such a renewal is interfering with the construction of a railway. The fact that this company came back for a renewal of the local charter instead of building thirty miles of road within a year, proves that the imposition of that condition did not result in expediting the railway. I suggested once or twice to railway companies that we would have to impose some such condition and they said: All right, do not renew the charter for we will only have to come back for another renewal; we cannot build the road in the time stipulated. If my hon. friend wants to do something practical in order to get the railway constructed I am afraid such a clause as he suggests will not accomplish the object.

Mr. LENNOX. As long as the minister recognizes that a clause such as this will have no effect and that we will grant renewals just the same he cannot expect such a clause to have any different effect from that which he speaks of. When people come to ask for a renewal of their charter, if we would require them to show reason for their default and grant the renewal only if they were able to show a satisfactory reason and we give them a reasonable time within which to build the railway there would be some sense in putting in this condition. But, if we are going to concur in this practice in every instance and they are going to continue ignoring and defying parliament we had better drop it altogether. My idea is that when a company come for a renewal of their charter they should be asked within what time they can commence to build the road, and having stated that, it would be for the committee to consider whether it was a reasonable time or not. If it appeared to be reasonable and in the interest of the public then grant a renewal and insist in every case when they get their renewal they build the road or come back with some legitimate excuse for asking for another renewal. It is getting to be a perfect humbug to put in conditions which are never observed and which the companies do not intend to observe at the time they accept a renewal, and largely the members of the committee, I believe as a rule, and the Minister of Railways, judging from the result, do not intend to hold the company to the condition at the time. It is getting to be more or less of a scandal. Year after year we are granting these renewals and it is thoroughly well known that railway companies snap their fingers at us and that we have no way of enforcing the conditions imposed by us. If we cancelled a few of the charters, or if we refused to renew them, we would have a different condition of things altogether.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the British Columbia and Dawson Railway Company. —Mr. Burrell.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 105), to incorporate the All Red Steamship Company.—Mr. McKenzie.

Bill No. 106), to incorporate the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Harris.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—EASTERN DIVISION.

* Mr. BORDEN:

What was the total cost up to the 31st day of December, 1910, of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. $89,553,740.32.

OFFENSIVE WEAPONS.

Mr. LEWIS:

1. During the past six years how many requests have been made to the government or to the Minister of Justice for more legislation re offensive weapons or offences against the person, respectively, by grand juries, corporations, public or private, municipalities, or other persons?

2. What was the nature of such applications?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH:

1. From Grand Juries, 9; from various associations, 9; from other persons, 20.

2. As regards offensive weapons, the correspondence includes recommendations

that foreign immigrants and labourers should be searched for weapons, that sentences for carrying weapons should be increased, that no weapons should be sold except under license, that sale of noiseless guns should be prohibited, that an officer should be appointed to instruct immigrants in the Canadian law on the subject, that sale of air guns to minors should be prohibited, and that posters advertising the sale of firearms should not be allowed. Some representations were also received opposing the proposal to restrict the sale of weapons.

As regards offences against the person—the correspondence includes recommendations that the lash should be inflicted for all offences against women, on highway robbers, wifebeaters, and habitual criminals, and for all crimes of brutal violence; that cruelty to children and kidnapping should be more severely punished; that young girls should be better protected; that the definition of incest should be enlarged; that the procedure in cases of manslaughter should be altered, &c., &c.

ST. JOHN RIVER SURVEY.

Mr. CROCKET:

1. From whom does the Public Works Department rent the premises at Fredericton which are used as an office in connection with the survey of the St. John river channel between Fredericton and Woodstock?
2. On what street are said premises situated?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. When in use for departmental purposes, these premises were rented from A. E. Hanson.
3. On Queen street.

WAGES AND COST OF LIVING.

Mr. ECREMENT:

1. What is the increase in the wages of workingmen since 1891?
2. What is the mean increase in the cost of living during the same period?

Mr. KING. The increase varies so considerably as respects different trades and localities that the information cannot be given in the form of an answer to a question. Much of the information desired will be found in a special Report on Wholesale Prices 1890-1909 inclusive, issued by the Department of Labour, 1910.

THE MONARCH BANK.

* Mr. FOSTER:

1. When was the Monarch Bank incorporated, and who were its provisional directors?
2. Were the preliminary conditions required by the Bank Act complied with, and a certificate applied for or granted by the Treasury Board?
3. If not, did the government take any steps to ascertain, or does it know if the requirements of section 17 of the Bank Act were carried out, and the amounts paid in by subscribers duly returned to them?
4. Has the government in its possession the list of subscribers and subscriptions to the stock of the Monarch Bank?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. July 20, 1905. The provisional directors were: William Samuel Cochrane, of the city of Montreal, Thomas Henry Graham, David William Livingston, Edward James Lennox, Thomas Marshall Ostrom, and Alfred Harshaw Perfect, all of the city of Toronto. (Cap. 125, Acts of 1905; extension one year, Cap. 127 Acts of 1906).
2. No. No money was paid to the Minister of Finance, and no certificate was granted.
3. In view of the answer to the preceding question there were no requirements of section 17 of the Bank Act to be carried out. The provisions of section 17 had no application to the return to the subscribers to the stock of the Monarch Bank of the amounts paid by them to the provisional directors.
4. No.

THE VANCOUVER BANK.

* Mr. FOSTER:

1. When was the Vancouver Bank incorporated, and who were its provisional directors?
2. What evidence was given that the preliminary conditions required by the Bank Act were complied with, and when was the certificate issued by the Treasury Board?
3. Has the government in its possession the list of subscribers and subscriptions to the stock of the Vancouver Bank?
4. Will the government lay on the table of the House a list of the subscribers and subscriptions to both these banks?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. April 3, 1908, Thomas Wilson Paterson, James Alexander Mitchell, and Frederic William Jones, of Victoria; James A. Harvey, of Cranbrook; William Harold Malkin, Robert Purves McLennan and Henry Tracy Caperley, Vancouver, were the provisional directors. (Cap. 166, Acts of 1908; extension one year, Cap. 144, Acts of 1909.)
2. The Treasury Board had under consideration in connection with the application for the certificate a statutory declaration as to the requisite notices in the 'Canada Gazette' and newspapers, with exhibits of such notices; original stock subscription contracts; a list of the subscriptions and allotments made up by Messrs. Clarkson, Cross, and Helliwell, chartered accountants, certifying to $569,500 stock subscribed and $274,815 paid in thereon, exclusive of $40,590 paid in on account of premium on stock; copy of minutes of organization

meeting of subscribers verified by statutory declaration of the secretary of the meeting; certificate of audit of balance sheet of bank at time of organization confirmatory of the figures given above by the same chartered accountants; original minutes of directors subsequent to organization; statutory declaration by the general manager as to amount of stock bona fide subscribed; the amount paid on account thereof in cash to the provisional directors by the subscribers; and the payment to the Minister of Finance of $250,000 under section 13 of the Bank Act. The certificate was issued March 16, 1910.

3. Yes.

4. A copy of the list of the subscribers and subscriptions to the Bank of Vancouver will be laid on the table of the House.

RIGAUD POST OFFICE.

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Has the contract for building a post office at Rigaud been made? If so, what is its date?

2. At what price was it made and with whom?

3. Were tenders asked for this building If so, what is the amount of each tender and the name of each of the parties tendering?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. No.

2 and 3. Inadvisable to make public such information until after the contract has been signed.

PRATT'S SIDING POST OFFICE.

Mr. STAPLES:

1. Has the government been requested to establish a post office at Pratt's Siding on the Canadian Northern railway, Manitoba? If so, what requests have been made?

2. Is it the intention of the government to open a post office at Pratt's Siding immediately? If not, why not?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

A recommendation was made by Mr. H. E. Hamilton, of Sydney, Manitoba, through Mr. John Crawford, ex-M.P., on the 28th April, 1909, that a post office be established at Pratt's Siding. The matter was referred to the inspector at Winnipeg, who in his report stated that he had communicated with Mr. Frank Evans, who was represented to him as a leading resident in the district. Mr. Evans stated that:

We expected a store to be built at once, but it will not be built until fall when we will make another application as we cannot get any one to carry the mail at present.

No petition, or renewed application, has since been received by the department in the matter.

Mr. FIELDING.

SUBURBAN HOPE TOWNSITE.

* Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster):

1. Under what circumstances did the Dominion land agent at New Westminster accept payment from James Wardle for lot 3a, and lot 8, block 3, Suburban Hope townsite?

2. What was the date of the payment, and has the money since been returned? If so, at what date?

3. Has any compensation been paid or offered for improvements made by Mr. Wardle between these dates?

4. What disposition has since been made or is intended to be made of these lots?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. The Dominion land agent at New Westminster accepted payment from James Wardle for lot 3a and lot 8, block 3, Suburban Hope townsite as money tendered or offered in connection with an application to purchase lands not yet priced or placed on the market and not available for sale.

2. $66 paid on lot 3a, 27th May, 1909, $25 on lot 8, 3rd August, 1906 and $20, 27th May, 1909. $111 refunded to James Wardle 14th June, 1910, returned by Wardle and again refunded to him 23rd August, 1910.

3. No compensation has been paid or offered for improvements if any made by Mr. Wardle.

4. The department has under consideration the placing of suburban block 3 on the market for sale at public auction later on when deemed advisable. It is intended to investigate Mr. Wardle's improvements, and claim before the land is placed on the market.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FIELDING presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting supplementary estimates for the year ending March 31, 1911, which, on motion, was referred to the Committee of Supply.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FIELDING. I beg to lay on the table correspondence with reference to tariff relations between Canada and the United States. In addition to having our own blue-book on the subject, I have sent to the distribution office a number of copies of the American printed agreement with their own statistics, which any hon. gentleman may obtain on application to the distribution office.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. LENNOX moved:

For a copy of the last advertisement for tenders, and the specification and contract or proposed contract for the erection of the Quebec bridge.

He said: This has been standing a long time, and I would like to call attention to the fact that it does not appear to me to involve the divulging of anything which would be prejudicial to the public interest in any way. The matters referred to will all have to be made public. Owing to statements which have appeared in the public press, it would be very desirable that the House should have further information as to the exact situation at present. I understand that the minister has some difficulty in ascertaining just what kind of bridge should be built. I do not want to press this motion if the minister thinks that it would be contrary to public interest to do so, but I think we ought to have some explanation from him.

Mr. GRAHAM. I see no reason why I should not take up a few minutes in making the explanation my hon. friend suggests. I can see no reason just now why this order should not pass. The situation is this. When the government took over the work of reconstructing the Quebec bridge, it appointed a board composed of three eminent bridge engineers who were to prepare the plans, and be responsible for the construction on those plans. Three eminent engineers were named by order in council: Mr. Vautelet, of Montreal, Mr. Fitzmaurice, of London, England, and Mr. Modjeska, of Chicago. In the order in council there was a provision that if these engineers did not agree on any point, two other eminent engineers should be called in to advise with them, and the board, composed of the three original members and the two additional ones, should decide the points of difference. On several occasions differences arose and two other eminent engineers were appointed to the board for the time being, and the points of difference settled. But when it came to the time for advertising for tenders, two members of the board were not in perfect unison with the chief engineer and chairman as to the design. It might be said that there had been a difference of opinion as between the principle of double intersections, and single intersections.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What does that mean?

Mr. GRAHAM. That will come out later. The two members of the board who did not agree entirely with the chairman, and chief engineer, as to the design which had been prepared, agreed that tenders should be called on this condition, and a resolution was passed by the board. The resolution provided that tenders should be called on the official design prepared by the chairman, and chief engineer, and that each tenderer would be asked to submit a plan of his own for the erection of a bridge, and if a better design than the official design were submitted it should be adopted.

Mr. LENNOX. That would be the plan of the proposed contractor?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, each tenderer would submit a plan of his own. On that condition tenders were called for. Some 35 different propositions were submitted—not 35 plans. These were all submitted by four different tenderers—and by the board. The board's design, called the official design, contained a design with several modifications—numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, I think, with little variations. From the St. Lawrence Bridge Company there were five or six modifications of the one design. A German Company submitted a design of their own as well as a tender on the official design. The Pennsylvania Steel Company submitted a design for a suspension bridge in addition to tendering on the board's design.

Previous to this, during the summer Mr. Fitzmaurice, who had been ill some time, resigned. And his resignation was accepted. Mr. Charles E. Macdonald, once president of the Engineers' Association of New York, a native of Leeds county, now living in the town of Gananoque again, was appointed in the place of Mr. Fitzmaurice. These three gentlemen met and looked over the tenders, and the various propositions. They reduced the number which ought to be considered to the tenders on number 5 of the official design and propositions (a) (b) and (c), if I remember correctly of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company. That company is composed of two companies, the Canadian, in the western part of Ontario, and the Dominion of Montreal, and these two formed a third company for the purposes of this work. There then remained tenders to be considered from the British Empire Company of England, from the German Company, from the Pennsylvania Steel Company, and the St. Lawrence Bridge Company on the official design. And the other propositions, (a) (b) and (c), on their own designs from the St. Lawrence Bridge Company. They tendered on both. No company sent in a tender on its own design without tendering also on the official design.

The question to be decided was as between the tenders on the official design, the lowest of which I have no hesitation in saying was the British Empire Company, and the counter propositions of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company on its own designs. The board recommended to me that a substantial bridge could be erected on either of these propositions. I replied asking them to perform their whole duty, and tell me which one was the better, if there were a better. Two members of the board

reported in favour of the St. Lawrence plans.

Mr. LENNOX. That is the board as originally constituted of three members?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Modjeska favoured one of the designs of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, while the chief engineer and chairman, Mr. Vautelet, could not coincide with this, as he thought the official design was fully as good, or better, and was considerably cheaper. After waiting for some time and consulting with the board as then constituted to see if they would not make an unanimous recommendation, I came to the conclusion that they would not, and so proceeded—a week or perhaps ten days ago, I have forgotten the date—to act under the order in council, adding two other eminent engineers to the board for the purpose named in the order in council. The chief engineer and the chairman was ill at his home in Montreal, and at his suggestion I sent for Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Modjeska, and they came to Ottawa. Mr. Hodge, a prominent engineer and Mr. M. J. Butler, my former deputy, are named as the two additional members. They are sitting in Montreal to-day working at the question, and I hope shortly to have a decision on which the government can act one way or the other in reference to awarding the contract. I see no reason why the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) should not pass; and, as he says, if there should be anything in the documents that should not be brought down, I will consult with him. But I think there is nothing.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister mentioned that he had no hesitation in saying which company was the lowest tenderer and that the British Empire Company was lower than the St. Lawrence. Are the tenders now known to the proposed contractors? I presume they are.

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. LENNOX. Then, I would ask the minister whether there is any increased width of the bridge? Was the bridge proposed by the St. Lawrence Company not wider than the bridge according to the official design. And also, I would ask the minister—although I will not ask him to go into the matter in detail—if the government has had before it the question of a tunnel in place of a bridge? I know that subject has been brought to the attention of the minister. But whether it has been regarded as a matter worthy of serious consideration I do not know. Nor do I profess to have any definite opinion on the subject myself.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am sure my hon. friend will not expect me to go into details. The contract has not been let, and I think I have gone fully as far as I should go in discussing the matter. I might say that the bridge is to be 88 feet wide, and, as I understand it, both designs conform to that measurement. As to the question of a tunnel that has not been seriously considered. I discussed it some time ago with one or two gentlemen who ought to be pretty well informed on the subject. The conclusion I formed, after conversation with these gentlemen was that, the banks of the river being very high, a tunnel would have to be started a very long distance from the river on either side. My own conclusion was that, even if we were beginning de novo as the lawyers say, a tunnel was not as practicable as a bridge.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I desire to ask the minister a question. A few years ago I placed before the House the facts with reference to the height of the bridge. About that time the Board of Trade of Montreal sent in a petition showing the need of raising the bridge, owing to the traffic likely to come up to the harbour of Montreal. If the minister will look into the matter he will find that, unless he decides to raise the bridge a considerable height, the smokestacks of the larger steamers built to-day, some that have actually been completed, will not pass under the bridge. The proposition was placed before the House and while the idea of raising the bridge was ridiculed by some, the vessels that are built seem to be larger year by year. The adjustment of masts after the manner followed in the harbours of some of the larger cities of the old country and on the navigable rivers, could not be carried out very satisfactorily. It was thought by a number of prominent men throughout the Dominion, including many able engineers, that it would be absolutely necessary to considerably increase the height of the bridge. Was this taken into consideration in asking for tenders, or is it the intention of the government to look into the matter? ,

Mr. GRAHAM. I am afraid this will have to be my last appearance in discussing this matter; we might get into something that would be embarrassing if we discussed too many details of a tender that is still under consideration. After full discussion and consideration, it was decided that the distance between high water and the bridge should be 150 feet.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. With permission, I desire to say that is the old contract, and I understand that the government were taking into consideration the raising of the level of the bridge. I would ask the minister whether he has taken that into consideration at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. I can only repeat that it was fully considered before tenders were called for.

Mr. MONK I desire to affer a word with respect to this matter. I am afraid—

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to inform the House that under rule 38 this motion is not one open to discussion. I thought it was the sense of the House that a question might be asked and the minister answer it. Of course, if the House desires to have the matter debated, I have no objection.

Mr. MONK. If it is not debatable, I do not wish to violate the rule.

Mr. SPEAKER. I allow the question, and, if it is the wish of the House I have no objection to further discussion.

Mr. MONK. I am afraid that this is an ill-fated enterprise. The House will remember under what circumstances the bridge broke down. There was a plan prepared by the building company, and that—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point being raised, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) cannot debate the motion, but can put a question. Under rule 38, this is one of the notices that cannot be debated. If it is to be debated, it must be turned over to another order.

Mr. MONK. If I may only ask a question, I will put this: Has the state of anarchy that has existed for months among members of the commission as originally constituted been finally put an end to? There has been an importation of new engineers, consultation, additions to the board for the purpose of deciding points, but I understand that there are still radical and important differences between the members of the board as originally constituted. Have they now come to an agreement?

Mr. GRAHAM. As I explained a few moments ago, differences existed until this morning, and perhaps until now, but under the order in council two other members have been appointed to act with the members of the board to settle these differences, and I am in hopes that they will settle them.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL NAVAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. MONK moved:

For a copy of the final protocol of agreement entered into at the International Naval Conference held in London, December, 1908, February, 1909, and of the general report presented to the said naval conference on behalf of its drafting committee, and of all correspondence exchanged between the Imperial government and the government of Canada in regard to the same.

He said: I may give a word of explanation on this motion. At the time of the second Peace Conference at the Hague, a convention was entered into providing for the establishment of an international court of appeal in matters of prizes (annex 12 to the final act of the second Peace Conference). By article 7 of this convention, it is agreed that this new court, in the absence of treaty stipulations, would decide appeals in accordance with rules of international law; or, if there were no such recognized rules, then according to justice and equity. On the invitation of Great Britain, a conference of the great maritime powers took place afterwards in London in order to define certain principles respecting maritime war. The conference agreed upon a certain number of rules. The result of this meeting is said to have been communicated to the colonial government. That is the reason why I move that that protocol be laid before the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware that there is any such correspondence; but if there is, there is no objection to bringing it down, provided it is not confidential.

Motion agreed to.

STEAM TRAWLING FISHING.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough), moved:

That in the opinion of this House, as the mode of fishing known as steam trawling, prosecuted by ships of different nationalities on the coast of Canada outside Canadian waters, is destructive to fish life, it is expedient, in order to conserve the deep sea fisheries, that negotiations be opened with the view of securing an international agreement prohibiting this mode of fishing in such spawning grounds for deep sea fish, as the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the banks of the North Atlantic adjacent to the coasts of Canada and Newfoundland.

He said: My purpose in moving this resolution is to press upon parliament, and especially upon the government, the importance of dealing with this question. I bring it forward with a good deal of confidence, knowing that in the past the government have not given any encouragement or assistance to this mode of fishing. When this matter was first discussed on the coast of Nova Scotia some few years ago, the fishery committee of the Halifax Board of Trade pressed upon the government the importance, in their view, of doing something in the way of introducing this mode of fishing in Canadian waters. The request they made on that occasion was met with prompt refusal from the Minister of Marine

and Fisheries at that time, the late Hon. Mr. Préfontaine, as will be seen by reference to the papers that were brought down the other day and laid on the table of the House. Time passed along, and about two years ago, a private company was organized in the city of Halifax for the purpose of introducing the method of fishing known as steam trawling in Canadian waters. I had the honour on that occasion of bringing the matter to the notice of the government, and I was much pleased with the fact that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave the matter such prompt attention; and within two or three weeks of the date when steam trawling first commenced on the coast of Nova Scotia, an order in council was passed prohibiting fishing by steam trawling in the bays and harbours, and within three marine miles, of the coast, that is to say, in all the waters controlled by the government. The following is the regulation then adopted:

The use or operation of vessels known as steam trawlers, operating beam otter or other trawls for the purpose of catching fish, is prohibited within the three mile limit and in the bays and harbours of Canada.

Now there is a good deal of doubt as to whether this parliament has power to do any more than has already been done in regard to this matter. It is well known that we have not power to deal with trawling in the open sea. The open sea, as everybody knows, is common to all nations. My proposal is not that we should attempt to make regulations that we have not jurisdiction to make, but that we should endeavour to obtain some international regulations by which this mode of fishing shall be prohibited on the spawning grounds, and I regard the banks and bays adjacent to Nova Scotia, including the Gulf of St. Lawrence as spawning ground, or as the chief spawning ground. The steam trawler that is referred to in my resolution, is an immense net, from 70 feet to 100 feet in length, drawn along the bottom of the sea by a hawser attached to a steamboat, with a mouth wide enough to take in everything that comes in its way, both small and great. The only difficulty of dealing with this question, has been the lack of information. We have not had the steam trawler very long operating on our coasts, and consequently we are not able at this stage to give to the House much exact information from the experience of Canadian fishermen in this method of fishing. We have to inquire in quarters where steam trawling has been operated for a number of years, in order to get exact information. I am informed that this mode of fishing had its origin in Great Britain, in the North Sea, which is the home of steam trawling, where it has been going on for a great many years. It has been largely developed in recent years. I am informed that at present there are about 3,000 trawlers operating from ports in Great Britain; about one-half of these are driven by steam and the other half by sailing ships. A fleet of steam trawlers assemble in the waters of the North Sea, they start out and operate in other waters along the coast of Europe, as far south as the coast of Africa. Most of the fish caught by these steamers are landed on the coast of Great Britain, and chiefly at the large towns on the eastern coast, such as Grimsby, Hull, Yarmouth and Aberdeen. The Imperial government has imposed certain restrictions on this mode of fishing; for example, the Moray Firth is closed sea. On the whole this mode of fishing is regarded as legitimate on the coast of Great Britain. About two years ago the first trawler arrived in our waters and two of them were operating last year from Canso in the province of Nova Scotia. But, there are a number of French ships of this description operating on the banks south of Newfoundland and east of Canada. The French British consul at Bologne has given the following figures regarding the number of French trawlers that are working in our waters:

1907	2
1908	7
1909	20
1910	17

Now, Sir, I may be asked why I object to this mode of fishing in Canadian waters, and I am going to try to answer that question. I object to it for the same reason that I object to purse, seigning and other destructive modes of fishing. The indictment against the steam trawler is as follows: First, it is injurious to the net and line fisherman; second, it disturbs the fishing grounds and makes it impossible for the net and line fisherman to carry on business in the same water; third, the trawler destroys the fisherman's gear; fourth, it destroys large quantities of young, undersized fish and depletes the waters. If that indictment can be proven, I presume the House will agree to my resolution.

In the first place, it is injurious to the net and line fisherman. Of course, at the present time, with only a few of the trawlers working on our waters, the injury is not very apparent. I am referring to the time when they will increase to large numbers. This business being carried on extensively, it is quite apparent that it will ultimately put an end to net and line fishing in the same waters. It has done that to some degree already on the British coast, because, as the trawlers increase, the net and line fishermen will decrease. And if you will examine the reports

of the fishing industry in the case of Great Britain, you will see that what I say is borne out by the evidence. Permit me to quote the following table, showing the gradual lessening in the quantity of fish taken by the net and line fishermen from the Scotch waters during the period from 1896 to 1907. These figures are taken from the report of the North Sea Fisheries Investigation Committee, page 350:—

	Quantity caught. Cwt.	Value. £
1896..	1,589,204	581,746
1897..	1,416,237	570,031
1898..	1,058,993	470,113
1899..	939,362	439,851
1900..	754,416	371,173
1901..	696,019	341,892
1902..	608,750	318,308
1903..	602,603	315,955
1904..	753,740	361,185
1905..	619,194	274,954
1906..	601,033	282,144
1907..	529,962	262,817

Now, Sir, you will see that this table shows a steady decrease in the quantity of fish taken by the net and line fishermen on the coast of Scotland during these years, while another table shows that fish taken by all methods has very largely increased in quantity. Permit me, also, to quote an extract from a recent report of the German Scientific Commission for International Sea Investigation, page 139. This report says:—

In consequence of the very great increase in the trawl fisheries in the North Sea, none of the fishery methods that flourished in earlier times has been subjected to greater vicissitudes than line fishing for haddock and cod. The German line fisheries of Heligoland, Norderney, and other islands, as well as that of the East Friesland coast have almost completely disappeared, and of the fishing fleets that were so numerous in earlier times a mere scanty remnant is to be seen.

It may be said that this change is inevitable, and that we have not the power to stop it. That may be true, but my position is that we should endeavour to obtain such international regulations as will prevent the destruction of undersized fish in the spawning waters of Canada. The next point I make is that the trawler is destructive to the fisherman's gear. You can readily understand that with a large number of these trawling vessels driven at a high rate of speed or working in the same waters with the net and line fisherman injury is inevitable, and it is difficult to carry on the business in the same waters. That has already been shown to be the case in Scotland. Some instances of it in our own waters with regard to French trawlers have appeared in the newspapers. Recently a Nova Scotia captain who was in charge of a Gloucester ship had to use a shot gun to defend his property on the banks from injury by one of these French trawlers. On this side of the Atlantic, inshore, or in the gulf, where these two trawlers have been operating, I have not heard any particular complaint of damage to gear with regard to them, but there are a great number of cases on the coast of of Scotland where fines have been imposed upon these trawlers for destroying the nets and lines of the fishermen. They have a fishery board to deal with these cases. Last year sixty-three cases were brought before this board, sixty-one convictions were obtained, and fines were levied to the amount of £4,478. In looking over the reports I find that in Scotland, between 1886 and 1909, six hundred prosecutions for illegal trawling have taken place, that in 537 cases convictions were obtained, and that the fines imposed amounted to the sum of £27,990. Our Canadian bank fishermen are not so fortunate as their Scotch contemporaries in this respect, as there is no general court to which they can go and lay their complaints, each man has to depend on his own efforts to protect his rights, and these trawlers destroy his gear sometimes at night, when he is not there himself.

Now, the next point is that they destroy small, undersized fish. There has been a conflict of evidence in so far as the destruction of undersized fish is concerned, but the local fisherman's union of Canso put in information here which you will find on file, stating that very large quantities of small, undersized fish are caught in these nets, that they are thrown overboard, and that that will result in depleting the waters. In order to ascertain the facts with regard to that question the department last year sent an officer by the name of Mr. Andrew Halkett to Canso to go on board one of these trawlers, make an examination, and report to the government. Mr. Halkett, it appears, went on one trip on board the trawler 'Wren,' and his report, which is on file among the papers which have been brought down, bears date the 29th of October last. As I intend to criticise the report of Mr. Halkett, I think it is only right that I should read the instructions he received from the department. They were as follow:—

In order that the department may be in possession of irrefutable information as to the operation of these trawlers it has been arranged with the Maritime Fish Corporation to have an officer sent on board who would carefully follow the operations and ascertain the most exact information possible as to the kinds and quantities of fish being taken, the quantities of each kind and the proportion of each kind thrown back into the water.

Mr. Halkett was authorized to go to Canso, go on board the trawlers, find out the facts, and make a report to the government. The following is Mr. Halkett's report:

Having carefully followed the fishing operations carried on by steam trawlers on board the trawler 'Wren,' I have to report that the complaints made against such operations are entirely without just reason. On the contrary, instead of being exceedingly destructive and wasteful, practically everything drawn up in the great net, excepting the dogfish which are entangled in considerable numbers, is utilized and turned to account, and the very destruction of the dogfish is a benefit, whilst the men are entitled to save their livers on their own behalf. I understand that until recently the flat fishes, such as the rough-dab, were thrown away; but since the establishment of the glue factory at Canso such are now sold to that institution. There is really nothing drawn up in the net which any economical fishing corporation would ever think of wasting, and certainly the captain of the 'Wren' is awake to the interests of the Maritime Fish Corporation in this respect. The bulk of the fish caught is haddock, and it is for them that the trawling is carried on. The weight of the catch of haddock was 27,580 pounds, exclusive of 3,300 pounds of assorted small ones. This numerically, judging by the respective sizes, approximately represents some 6,895 and 1,650 fish. The weight of flat fishes was 325 pounds, of the cod, 150 pounds, and of the hake, 1,550 pounds, or numerically, 100 flat fishes, 25 cod and 100 hake. True, I was dependent on the corporation for these figures after landing at Canso; but based on my own observations on board the 'Wren,' I can vouch for the figures being approximately correct. The total weight of these was 32,905 pounds, and the number approximately 8,770. Besides them, leaving out the dogfish, there were a few silver hake, pollock, skate and gaspereau, and a shad, an angler, and an eel. It is difficult to form an estimate of the number of dogfish caught, but the number was very considerable. Sometimes there would be only two or three, and at other times the net seemed to have swept through a regular school of them; and they are immediately destroyed, their livers cut out and thrown overboard. Besides the true fishes there were a very limited number of squid, saved like other odds and ends, like the angler, skates, &c., for making glue, and there were hardly any other invertebrates except a few worthless star fishes, &c. I will work the matter out in a more detailed way later, but meanwhile give some broad outlines in a summary way. Occasionally, but very rarely, I saw an insignificant gaspereau or other very small fish thrown overboard; but there is virtually no waste whatsoever. The operations were carried on not closer to the land than four miles, and besides the 'Coquette' no other fishing craft was to be seen.

(Sgd.) ANDREW HALKETT,
Naturalist, Dept. Marine and Fisheries.

St. John, N.B., October 29, 1910.

Now, I do not credit this report; it does not appear to me to be an impartial statement.

Mr. FRASER. Can the hon. gentleman state what period of time is covered by the observations of that officer?

Mr. SINCLAIR.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I cannot give that information; the report itself does not give it. The officer appears to have been out on only one trip. Now, this officer was not asked to give any decision on this question. He was asked to go on board these ships, ascertain the facts, and report to the government. But one of the very first things he says in his report is that the complaints made against such operations are entirely without just reason. It was not his duty to express that opinion. It was his duty simply to ascertain how many small and undersized fish were thrown overboard or destroyed, and he ought to have been content with that. He says he was dependent on the corporation for his figures. He should not have been dependent on the corporation for anything. He ought to have found out the facts for himself, without reference to the corporation. He tells us there were no small fish taken. He reported that there were 1,650 assorted small fish weighing 3,300 pounds, which is an average weight of two pounds, and every one knows that a fish of two pounds weight is not an undersized fish, of no use commercially. I want to suggest to the minister that further investigations be made on this matter—that a thorough and searching investigation be made regarding the number of small, undersized fish which are destroyed by these trawlers, and it might be necessary to have an officer or representative of the Fishermen's Union present in order that credit might be given to the report of such an investigation.

This is not a new question. It has been discussed and dealt with many times during many years past on the coasts of Great Britain. Complaints were made by the Scotch and English fishermen of this destructive mode of fishing, and the imperial government spent large sums of money in ascertaining the facts. They themselves employed commercial trawlers, which went out into the North Sea, caught the fish, turned them out on deck, and counted the large ones and the small ones, and made tabulated reports to the government. These experiments proved beyond question that this mode of fishing as carried on in Scotland destroyed very large numbers of small, undersized fish, unfit for the market. I find that these investigations were carried on during recent years chiefly by Dr. T. W. Fulton, F.R.S.E., Superintendent of Scientific Investigation. In order to get a fair idea of the destructiveness of an engine of this kind, it would be necessary perhaps to make a great maney experiments.

Let me quote a table showing the results of trawling investigations made by Dr. Fulton as will appear by reference to table 1, attached to his report :

Place.	Date.	Number Marketable.	Number Haddock thrown overboard undersize.	Number thrown overboard, all kinds.	Total number Fish taken.
	1904.				
1. Aberdeen bay off Newburgh	Jan. 14	360	8	27	387
2. " "	" 14	148	11	70	218
3. " "	" 14	275	.....	18	293
4. Off Lybster	" 17	206	100	146	352
5. "	" 17	330	158	192	522
6. "	" 17	311	104	149	460
7. "	" 17	313	100	175	488
8. "	" 18	292	92	156	448
9. "	" 18	108	.....	.....	108
10. "	" 18	168	190	324	492
11. "	" 18 and 19	261	96	191	452
12. "	" 19	118	89	146	264
13. Sandside bay	" 20	169	68	155	324
14. "	" 20	175	44	75	250
15. Off Ord Caithness	" 21	170	48	235	405
16. "	" 21	169	78	277	446
17. "	" 21	106	30	55	161
18. "	" 21	138	41	104	242
19. "	" 23	138	78	145	283
20. "	" 23	79	102	200	279
21. "	" 23	95	92	175	270
1. Burghead Bay	Mar. 28	780	20	422	1,202
2. " "	" 28 and 29	574	52	401	975
3. " "	" 29	413	4	285	698
4. " "	" 29	1,181	43	1,150	2,331
5. Off Lossiemouth Dearing W	" 29	191	.....	79	270
6. Off Burghead	" 30	1,280	29	358	1,638
7. Off Burghead, Covesea, S. W. by W.	" 30	2,483	29	1,547	4,030
8. " "	" 30	1,083	21	344	1,427
9. Dornoch Firth	" 30	354	.....	46	400
10. " "	" 30	199	.....	11	210
11. " "	" 31	333	.....	.....	333
12. " "	" 31	352	.....	14	366
13. " "	" 31	438	.....	12	450
14. " "	" 31	161	.....	12	137
1. From off Findhorn to off Burghead	April 1	229	.....	127	356
2. Smith Bank	" 2	65	.....	4	69

So that the whole time during which these operations were carried on, there is a summary attached to Dr. Fulton's report. I find the following:

In the course of the year 1905 the results of 91 hauls of the large otter trawl in the closed waters were recorded, of which 75 were taken in the Moray Firth, fourteen in Aberdeen Bay and two in Sandside bay. The aggregate number of fishes of all kinds caught in the recorded hauls was 63,525, and of these 44,538 or 70 per cent were marketable. The other 18,987 or 30 per cent being thrown overboard as unmarketable.

You will see that, in these experiments made with great care, the superintendent of scientific investigation in Scotland, Mr. Fulton, discovered that 30 per cent of the fish taken had been thrown away as too small.

Permit me now to quote a resolution sent from the Fishermens' Union in Canso, which deals with the question:

At a regular meeting of Station No. 27 F. U., of Canso, N.S., the following resolution was unanimously passed:—

In view of the fact that the beam or otter trawler is still a menace to our fisheries, two of these ships at present continuously operating within a short distance of our port in one of the great spawning grounds for the North Atlantic, namely, the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and that when though they observe the three-mile limit, this affords very little protection to the cod, haddock, lobsters and numerous other fish in the shallow waters of the gulf and adjacent bays, and we are of the firm opinion that if this method of fishing develops here, and it seems to be doing so, that in a comparatively short time the gulf and inshore fisheries will be depleted. In support of this we have only to look to the coast of Britain where trawling has been extensively carried on, and it has, we are told, not only destroyed the inshore fisheries, but has also been the cause of depopulating the towns and villages along the coast.

We are aware that it is beyond the power

of any government to control fishing on the high seas, and in answer to a former appeal your government has gone the limit, but we are of opinion that the government of Canada can deal with this for Canada, by making it illegal to engage in this method of fishing, a method which, to our minds, is more destructive than explosives.

Therefore resolved, that as our Dominion representative, you use your utmost influence to have such legislation passed as will prevent beam or otter trawling in Canada.

(Signed) JAMES LUKEMAN,
President.
ALEXANDER KEATING,
Secretary.

Canso, N.S., Sept. 10, 1910.

The fourth point I make is that trawling depletes the fishing grounds. It follows that if large quantities of undersized fish are taken that will naturally deplete the grounds. I am quite aware that this is also disputed. For example the Fish Traders' 'Gazette,' of London, which is looked upon as one of the most influential papers in the trade in the world, published a few days ago a statement referring to the fishing industry in the past year, from which I shall quote one paragraph :

It is not expected that the weight of the fish caught will show any appreciable change either way or the other when the official figures are available, but it is noted with satisfaction that many of the North Sea grounds have produced improved supplies; while several new though restricted areas for trawling have been discovered by local fishermen.

Mr. John J. Cowie, in the report of the Fisheries Department for the year 1910, says that steam trawling has not had the effect of depleting the North Sea. I wish to say a few words on that statement, but let me read what he did say so as to avoid any misunderstanding. Here is Mr. Cowie's statement :

I have always maintained in the press and otherwise, that trawling within limited sea areas is most destructive, and, apart from the fact that the many line fishermen, who depend for a living entirely on what the baited line captures, have some rights, held that the compelling of the steam trawler to keep to the open sea and the offshore grounds is a wise and necessary measure for the protection and insurance of the fish supply, from inshore grounds.

At the same time, I cannot agree with those who assert that trawling, if long continued offshore, as well as inshore, is destined to deplete the sea of food fishes.

Notwithstanding the alarming prognostications of a sea denuded of fish life, and ruined and idle line-fishing fleets, put forth at the recent international conference at Washington, United States of America, as the results expected to attend the use of the otter trawl on the Atlantic 'banks', the facts and figures concerning trawling in the comparatively narrow North Sea, where the method is so old, and the fleets so large, do not at all lend themselves to such alarmist views.

Mr. SINCLAIR.

The absolutely reliable figures of the Scottish Fishery Board in relation to trawling in Scotland, tell quite a different story and prove that the total quantity of fish landed by trawlers each year keeps pace with the increase in the fleet. I take the Scottish Board's figures as they are more readily got at, but the figures of the English Board of Agriculture and Fisheries and those of the Irish Fishery Board, show the same results.

Then Mr. Cowie quotes figures to show that in 1898, 778,731 hundredweight of fish were caught off the coast of Scotland, and in 1906, the quantity had increased to 1,807,517 hundredweight. Then he goes on to say :

There need be no fear of trawl fishing ever depleting the sea here. The conditions on this side of the Atlantic are altogether different from those on the other.

In European waters—in the comparatively narrow North Sea—excessive fishing goes on from January to December by an immense fleet of trawling and other vessels, and in spite of this, the total landings, as has been seen, are actually increasing rather than diminishing.

I do not agree with Mr. Cowie in his conclusion. The flaw I find in his argument is that he takes no note of the fact that the grounds upon which these fish are caught have been enormously extended during the late years, so that there is a very large increase of area over which the trawlers work. He argues that because the total catch has increased, the North Sea has not been depleted by trawlers. But he forgets that the operations of the trawlers have extended from the coast of Africa as far south as Morocco, and to the farthest point north where they can work through the ice. No statistics are given by him to show how many hundredweight have been caught in the North Sea alone. Most of the trawlers land their catch on the coast of Great Britain, and it is impossible to say whether the quantity of fish caught in the North Sea is increasing or decreasing.

In order that there may be no question about this point I desire to quote further from the official fishery reports of Great Britain, showing the area in square miles of all the various waters where the British trawlers operate, and which shows that the North Sea is only a very small part of the total area. The table is as follows :

Name of Region.	Approximate area in square miles (nautical.)
White Sea..	701,569
Coast of Norway..	29,648
Baltic Sea..	134,891
North Sea..	152,473
North of Scotland (Orkney and Shetland)..	18,096
Westward of Scotland..	32,099
Iceland..	36,608
Faroe..	4,949
Rockall..	3,430

Name of Region.	Approximate area in square miles (nautical.)
West of Ireland..	9,066
Irish Sea..	15,743
Southward of Ireland..	50,416
Bristol Channel..	8,613
English Channel..	25,238
West of France..	25,422
North of Spain..	5,464
Coast of Portugal..	9,997
Coast of Morocco..	10,499
Total..	701,569

This table shows that British trawlers are trawling over that vast area while the North Sea embraces an area of only 152,473 square miles. I have already told you that no separate statistics are kept and Mr. Cowie takes the catch of all these various waters comprising that 701,000 square miles, bunches them together and credits them all to the North Sea in order to prove that the extensive trawling that has been carried on in the North Sea has not depleted the waters.

I could call some witnesses who ought to know something in regard to this question. For example, I wish to call Sir George Doughty, who was elected a few days ago as Unionist representative of the town of Grimsby in England. Sir George Doughty visited Canada last summer and made some investigations into the Pacific coast fisheries. On his return to Grimsby he received a very cordial welcome from his townsfolk and an address was presented to him. In his speech, speaking of his trip to Canada and of the prolific fisheries of the Pacific Coast, he referred to the state of the fisheries in the North Sea and incidentally spoke of the fact that the waters of the North Sea had been depleted. He ought to know a good deal about this question because he lives in Grimsby and is himself a trawl owner and has always taken, in parliament and elsewhere, a very lively interest in this question.

Take the evidence of Dr. T. W. Fulton, Superintendent of Scientific Investigation for Scotland. Dr. Fulton lectured before the students of Aberdeen University on July 2, 1908. Let me quote an extract from his lecture.

As you are probably aware, the old fishing grounds in the North Sea, especially in the southern part, are now generally regarded as being much less productive than they were formerly. We now get little more than one-half of our supply of bottom fishes from the North Sea, and about 30 per cent of the bottom fishes landed come from foreign coasts outside the North Sea altogether.

Later on there is another passage in which he shows where the trawlers have had to extend their operations of late years to keep up the catch of fish. He says:

'All those coasts and grounds extending for some thousands of miles from Africa to the polar region, from about 30 to 71 degrees of north latitude, are now frequented by our trawlers. The only exception is the coast of Norway, and the exception is probably temporary, though the bottom there is mostly rocky. Iceland, as I told you, was opened up in 1891; operations began in the Bay of Biscay and on the Spanish coast in 1892; in the same or next year Portugal and Morocco were included, and only a year or two ago, in 1904 or 1905, English trawlers began fishing in Barents sea, practically at the edge of the ice, among the polar bears.'

Take the statement of W. J. Saunders, representing the district of Devonshire, before the British Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, at a meeting held in the House of Lords on June 22, 1909. He said:

'Although there is an abundant supply of fish to-day, I think every one will acknowledge that that supply is not coming from anything like the old grounds. That supply is coming from new grounds.'

Then again at the same meeting Mr. P. C. Moss, representing the North Eastern Division bordering on the North Sea, says:

'What I should like to see, gentlemen, and I am sure it would be most interesting to every person who is interested in fishing, is a reform of our methods of keeping statistics so that there can be an analysis made of the fish that comes from outside waters and the fish that is caught in the North Sea. I submit that when the figures are published they will stagger people with regard to the diminution of fish in the North Sea. I will not venture on a percentage, but I will say that the great percentage of the fish in this country now is coming from Iceland, Faroe and the White Sea.'

Here is the statement of a man whose duty it is to represent the very area of which Mr. Cowie is talking. He made his statement in the presence of the assistant secretary of the Board of Fisheries and Agriculture, Mr. Archer. It is not too much to say that when Mr. Cowie stated that the catch of fish in the North Sea was increased rather than diminished by the use of the trawlers, he was not sure of his facts; he was, in my opinion, misinformed.

I have pointed out that in 1908 trawling was prohibited in the inshore waters of Canada, in bays and harbours and in the waters over which we have direct control. This to some extent protects the inshore fishermen, but it affords no protection whatever to the banking fleet. The Bankers, as some hon. gentlemen know, are the deep sea fishermen who carry on their operations on those shallow grounds far out to sea, known as the Banks. These banks are situated in the North Atlantic, adjacent to the coasts of Canada and Newfoundland. If you could imagine them all grouped together they would form an area of 360 miles east and west, by 300 miles north and south. These banks have been for centuries the home and the nursing grounds of cod and haddock. They have been for generations the special preserves of the line fishermen of Nova Scotia, New

England, Newfoundland and France, and it is not to be expected that these fishermen would be willing to give them up without a struggle. The fishermen do not come here as suppliants, they do not ask for any special favour, all they ask is that they will get a square deal for themselves and for the business by which they make a living. The fishermen of Canada have been accustomed to look after themselves. The method that has been adopted in this country in regard to this industry for generations by which the fisherman is captain of his own vessel and master and owner of his own business has tended to produce a virile and robust type of men. If you, Mr. Speaker, and other hon. members of this House, could see, as I have seen, the fishermen engaged in winter fishing on the coasts of my own constituency, on a winter morning, when the thermometer is around zero and the whitecaps are on the water, steering in open boats for the open sea to spend the day in the prosecution of their calling, regardless of the cold, regardless of the sudden gales prevailing in those stormy waters, you would understand the force of my statement that this line of business tends to produce a virile and robust type of men. During the last few years a good deal of oratory has been indulged in in regard to the importance of maintaining the naval supremacy of the British Empire. Let me say that the best contribution we can make here in Canada to the naval supremacy of the empire is to stand by our fishermen. I venture to say that no other part of the British Empire, or, I think I could say no other part of the world, can produce a finer or more robust body of seamen than the men who tramp the decks of our fishing vessels. These men are hardy and adventurous ; nor are they lacking in courage. Every year adds to the list of brave deeds done by these men who frequent our coast waters engaged in the fishing industry. Permit me to give an example recently published in the Boston 'Post' :

Every now and then a splendid deed is done that makes the sun seem very bright and life well worth living in this throat-throttling era of competition.

Every athletic profession has its opportunities for heroic daring, but possibly none greater than those who go down to the sea in little vessels. Here the Gloucester fishermen have an enviable record.

The other day, a sailor on the fishing schooner 'Athlete' was swept into the sea while trying to secure a sail in a howling gale. To breast the waves in a dory seemed the madness of suicide, but in a minute the crew was engaged in a desperate struggle to see who should man the rescuing dory. Two sturdy fishermen won out and managed to launch the shell. The man they tried to save was found dead, killed by floating wreckage. With the greatest difficulty the heroes regained their schooner.

Such a defiance to danger and death makes the blood of all men run redder and beat quicker. There is no need of pessimism when we breed such men.

Similar incidents of bravery of this kind can be told in connection with a blizzard that took place on the coast of Nova Scotia on the 6th of January last year when the little haddock fleet at Dover and Whitehead was driven to sea in a wintry gale, and when tossed by the storm, the sails frozen and the vessels accumulating ice until they were almost ready to sink, brave men risked their lives to save their comrades. Here is another item that I clipped from a local paper published a few days ago:

CANSO MAN TO GET MEDAL FOR BRAVERY.

Wm. Sullivan, of Canso, N.S., is to receive from the French government by way of the United States government and its consular service, a reward for his heroism in the saving of the crew of the French vessel 'L. A. B.' in July, 1909. Mr. Sullivan will receive the bronze medal, which is emblematic of the highest honour for bravery which the French government bestows upon a civilian. This medal was forwarded from Washington to John E. Kehl, United States consul at Sydney.

I do not know why this medal came through the United States government, but probably this man was working on board an American ship at the time. Stories like the foregoing are told around the firesides in Nova Scotia every year on the return of the Banking fleet. The record of many of these vessels carrying on this hazardous business has been handed down from father to son for generations. Year after year the hungry sea claims its toll. Every spring the sailors leave with high hopes, and the best of good cheer, but when the storms and the fog have done their work some of the ships are sure to return with flags at half-mast. Our people have paid dearly for their proprietary rights in these Bank fisheries, and the families are very few on the coast of Nova Scotia who have not lost relatives in these waters. Not even the miners follow a more hazardous calling. It has been said that it costs a life for every 100,000 tons of coal mined, and the fish we eat must be won at an equally dreadful price.

Now, we are deeply interested in this matter in the maritime provinces, because we not only man our own fleet but, to a large extent, that of New England as well, and it would be a calamity to the maritime provinces if anything should happen to drive the bank fishermen off the sea. No nation ever yet became a great maritime power without first building up its fisheries. The fishing fleet of Great Britain is to-day the greatest fishing fleet in the world, and it is the basis of Britain's naval power and her commercial sea-power as

well. Canada owns to-day the greatest fisheries to be found in the world, and the question is whether we can preserve and hand them down to those who come after us. I am stating it mildly when I say that our fishermen are alarmed at the influence this mode of fishing is likely to have on their business—not only the deep sea fishermen but the inshore fishermen as well. I had the honour, last year, to present petitions signed by 1,800 fishermen on the coast of my county who are in sympathy with the deep sea fishermen on this question. Resolutions have come from fishermen's unions and associations all along the coast asking that some action be taken in regard to this matter. I do not regard this as unnecessary or needless alarm. The depletion of the fisheries is, of course, the most important thing. I know that it will be contended that it is necessary to prosecute this mode of fishing in order to keep up the constant supply in the market. It is also contended that the sea is large, and that no method of fishing that we can adopt will destroy the fish. It is true, the Atlantic ocean embraces a very large area, but it must not be forgotten that those portions of it frequented by fish, and where the fish shed their spawn embrace a comparatively small area, and so it is quite possible, by improvident methods of fishing to destroy the fishery. International conventions have taken place for the purpose of conserving the forests and our other natural resources of this continent. International arrangements are now in force to protect the sealing industry of the coast of Alaska. I submit that the best breeding ground of cod-fish and haddock in the world is important enough to call for international negotiations to settle this question of steam trawling. I submit, that we should, without delay, endeavour to obtain some arrangement by which we can secure an international agreement prohibiting trawling in the spawning grounds, which, I take to be the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Banks. I have no way of saying how these regulations could be secured, but I think that it could be done. The United States, I understand, is in the same position as ourselves, and the sympathy of the government at Washington ought to be with the Canadian government in respect to this matter, they having a large fishing fleet on the sea which is disturbed as ours is, by this method of fishing. It is not for me to dictate to the governments of Canada and the United States, but, as they are equally concerned, if they will act together, they should be able to secure such international arrangements as will preserve this great industry, and do justice to the men who are engaged in it.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Mr. Speaker, coming from the maritime provinces as I do, and representing a county with 90 miles of coast line or so off which is one of the best fishing grounds in Canada, I need not apologize to the House for taking up a little of the time devoted to this discussion. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has gone so ably and exhaustively into the discussion of this matter that it might be supposed that it should be content with simply expressing my acquiescence in what he has said. But when I tell you that this trawler, the 'Wren,' has been operating off the coast of Antigonish for a portion of each season for three years past, which operations have been much to the dissatisfaction and injury of local fishermen, I make bold to hope you will excuse me if I presume to discuss this matter at a little greater length, and even though, in discussing it I should find it necessary to go over again some of the ground covered by my hon. friend.

The importance of the fisheries is generally recognized. We are spending hundreds and thousands of dollars every year in endeavours to conserve our natural resources. We spend large sums in the protection of our fisheries, in the establishment of hatcheries, and a dozen of ways to promote our fisheries. In the city of Quebec a meeting was held a few days ago of eminent Canadians and others to advocate the conservation of our natural resources. They are doing a great work. I claim that in the fisheries of Canada we have the greatest heritage that any country ever possessed ; and it is the duty of this government and of the Canadian people to see that that heritage is handed down to posterity without any serious diminution. There is an idea prevalent among the fishermen, and indeed among us all, that we are justified in taking present advantage of every opportunity to utilize the natural resources in which our country abounds, and without having any consideration for the future. That sentiment I submit is an unfair and a dishonest one. The idea prevails that we have a right to get all we can out of our fisheries, irrespective of future results. We hear it sometimes said : What has posterity done for us? We will make all we can out of our present resources. As I have said, I think that is an unworthy and unpatriotic sentiment. I claim it is the duty of the government to take steps to conserve these valuable fisheries, and that we should transmit them unimpaired as we received them.

My hon. and learned friend (Mr. Sinclair), has gone over the history of trawling pretty well. He has informed the House that there are over 3,000 of these trawlers operating in the North Sea. We hear the argument made sometimes that since these trawlers have been operating on the coast of Great Britain for a period of 125 years, there cannot be any very

serious or harmful results from trawling. I propose to trace the history of trawling in the old country, and to call your attention to some investigations that have been held by the authorities, and to show the evolution of opinion that has been going on in the old country with respect to trawling. I should also quote the findings of royal commissions, appointed to investigate this matter, and show how opinion has changed with regard to the matter. I do not quote these resolutions, because I endorse the views therein contained so far as they may be an apology for, or defence of trawling. At the same time they were expressed, there was a strong approval of the custom ; but as time rolled on, and as the number of trawlers increased, that opinion seems to have changed in the old country. At that time trawling was pronounced to be 'the source of the greatest and most progressive supply of fish other than herring to the principal markets of the country.' To-day it is generally recognized that the practice of trawling has been injurious to the fishing industry, injurious both to the fisheries themselves and to the line fishermen. I may say that the shore fishermen have been practically driven out of business altogether. In the city of London, the proportion of fish caught by trawlers to that caught by hand lines, is something like 10 or 12 to one. The result of trawling has been that the line fishermen practically abandoned the field to their enemy, the trawler. Latterly, they have been making efforts to recover their ground in certain waters along the east coast of Scotland, and other parts of the United Kingdom, and the result is, that the line fishermen are now beginning to regain a part of what they have lost and are hopeful that in a short time they will be able to prosecute with advantage the industry that seemed once to have about disappeared. The history of trawling in the old country is the history of a prolonged fight between the line fishermen and the men engaged in this destructive method of fishing. The hostility of the line fishermen has been so great that it was scarcely safe for any prominent man to express any sympathy with the trawlers. There have been demonstrations against these trawlers in Aberdeen and other towns on the east coast of Scotland, and the way they took to show their hostility was to conclude their demonstrations with that irrefutable argument of burning in effigy any person to be in sympathy with the trawlers. Now I wish first to refer to a report of a royal commission that was published in 1863. It was appointed to investigate certain complaints of the fishermen who asserted that their industry was being destroyed, that the spawning grounds were injured, and that a large number of immature fish were caught, with the result that the fisheries were becoming exhausted and threatened with extinction. This commission was composed of such eminent men as the Rt. Hon. G. Shaw-Lefevbre, Sir James Caird and Prof. Huxley. Here is what they say regarding the waste by destruction:

> Waste by the destruction of young fish takes place in the course of the practice of all modes of fishing, and is to a certain extent inseparable from them. The waste which occurs in the course of beam trawling in the open sea and in all kinds of sweep net fishing has certainly not affected the supply of fish in many localities, and is not proved to have affected it in any. With respect to inshore fishing, although the evidence so far as it is conclusive, appears to prove that the taking of small and immature fish, has not as yet produced any serious effect upon the fisheries, it is undoubtedly possible that by improved engines the destruction of fry might reach such a pitch as to show a large, instead of as at present, an insignificant ratio to the destruction effected by the natural enemies and by conditions unfavourable to their existence.

That report was made in 1863, when trawling was not carried on to the same extent that it has been in later years. But even then you will observe that report states that, whilst it was denied that destruction was taking place, to any very appreciable extent, yet there is an admission that there is a great deal of waste; and a further admission that whilst the taking of small and immature fish has not as yet produced any serious effect upon the fishery, it is possible that such will be the result ultimately. Subsequent to 1863 other commissions reported, but I will only call attention to that which was appointed in 1883, the president of which was Lord Dalhousie. In this report the Royal Commission go on to say :

> We are unable to come to the conclusion that trawling is the sole cause of the decrease of fish in inshore waters. In so far as it may contribute to any decrease, we think it can only be as part of a system of overfishing and not because of the wasteful destruction of spawn, fish food or immature fish.

There is an admission of injury; they admit that trawling produces a decrease in the quantity of fish, but they are unable to come to the conclusion that trawling is the sole cause of the decrease in the inshore fisheries. You will observe that the commission admit that there is a decrease in the inshore waters, that the decrease is noticeable, and that they attribute it to the system of over-fishing. I do not care what it is attributed to; what we are after is the result, and the result is that there has been a diminution in the quantity of fish. Blackwood's Magazine for May, 1885, has an article on this subject, and the very fact that it is in Blackwood's Magazine justifies

me in quoting it. It refers to the report of the Trawling Commission of 1883 on the fish supply. There is a reference to the destruction of immature fish, but before I come to that I might refer to the destruction of spawn. One of the arguments used against the trawlers is the injury to the spawning ground and the destruction of spawn. According to the finding of the Royal Commission, that is not the case. The opinion that such is the case is based upon misapprehension, for it is a fact, that the spawn of fish generally is found, not upon the bottom, but floating on or very near the surface. The ripe uninjured ova of cod, halibut and most of fish is not found on the bottom. The principal exception to this is in the case of herring, the spawn of which goes to the bottom, so that the operations of the trawlers would not seriously affect the spawn. One would think they might, perhaps, affect the spawning ground, but the finding of the commission is that they do not seriously do so. There is a slight disturbance of the ground, but this is very temporary, and normal conditions are soon restored. Now, to come to the question of the destruction of immature fish, I find in this article in Blackwood's to which I have already referred, the following:

If evidence of reputation were to be trusted, the trawlers would come off badly on the charge of destroying immature fish. The bad name that they have incurred in this respect is perhaps due to the work of the small trawlers alluded to in the beginning of this paper, who on many parts of the coast work close inshore, and probably do destroy a large amount of fry. Although, throughout the evidence taken by the commission, it is clearly the belief of the fishermen that this evil prevails to a very large extent, they do not seem to have produced any really conclusive proofs of its existence. In the experiments of Professor McIntosh——

Prof. McIntosh is a professor of St. Andrews university, one of the greatest scientists of Scotland. He conducted a series of investigations from 1885 to 1895, in a trawler placed at his disposal for the purpose, called the 'Garland,' and wrote some works on the subject, one of them 'Resources of the Sea.' He is quite an authority on fish and the operations of trawlers.

—in the experiments of Professor McIntosh, the immature fish registered as caught in the trawl were mostly of the less valuable kinds. The quantity of young haddock and whiting taken was inconsiderable, the immature specimens of these fishes being generally found in the mouths of the larger kinds—a state of things that makes the trawlers their avengers rather than their murderers. It seems likely that below a certain size the fry escape altogether through the meshes of the trawl-net, as Professor McIntosh states that it was rare to capture dabs under 5½ inches in length, and that in using the small trawl close inshore in St. Andrew's bay, none of the smaller flat fishes with which that region abounds were taken. This absence of immature fish in large quantities from the trawl-net was fully borne out by the trawlers themselves; and it seems clear that, at any rate in the districts visited by the commission, there is no wasteful or unnecessary destruction of food-fishes committed in this way.

This refers to the commission of 1883, and it would appear from reading it that the charge against the trawlers was very much exaggerated. As I said before, I do not agree that the charge that is made to-day against the trawlers is very much exaggerated, but if these assertions were made at that time I would think that they would be much exaggerated, because conditions have changed since then. The number of trawlers then was comparatively limited. There was not the same intensity of fishing if I may so describe it, then as there is now. I am quoting this for the purpose of showing the change which has been going on with respect to trawling. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) referred to the report of Mr. Halkett to the effect that there has been no great destruction at all of fish in the operation of the 'Wren.' In that report it is claimed there is no real waste or destruction of fish except dog fish. I quite agree with the remarks of my hon friend from Guysborough, and I cannot understand how Mr. Halkett could arrive at such a conclusion. It does seem almost incredible that no small fish were found in the trawler on the occasion of Prof. Halkett's visit. It strikes me that Prof. Halkett must have started out, well fortified by his instructions from the department, feeling as strong as Samson, but when he got on board the trawler he must have met some Delilah, before whom he gave way. I do not think that the report of Prof. Halkett should be given very much credit now. He may, when he works the thing out, as he promises in his interim report to do, be able to explain some of the seeming inconsistencies of the report. But he is not alone in his praise of trawlers. He has company in the person of Mr. Alexander Milliken, General Inspector of Fisheries for Scotland, who does not agree that trawling is a bad thing. With the case that has been made against the trawler, it is surprising that anybody can be got to defend it, but here is a man who not only defends it, but commends it. He says, in his report to the board in 1907:

Having in view the fact that these fish (referring to catfish, marks and other fishes) were rarely caught by lines, and their destructive powers amongst other fish such as herrings and haddocks, it can be seen what an immense benefit it is to the general prosperity of the fisheries to have such large quantities of these destructive fish captured annually which were formally allowed to roam at sea until they die of old age.

Thus Mr. Milliken seems to think that trawling is a good thing because it destroys some of those fish that roam the sea and kill fish that are of merchantable value. I am sure none of our fishermen in Nova Scotia will adopt this view. This recalls to my mind the story of the Scotchman and the bagpipes that was told in this House at the earlier part of the session by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). A Scotchman was sick unto death, in the hospital and the doctor was called in. The doctor examined the pharmacopoea, but he could not find anything to suit the case. He decided upon a novel remedy and suggested that a Highlander be brought to play the bagpipes, walking up and down the hall in the ward beside the patient's room. Next morning the doctor returned to the house and met the nurse who looked very serious, and he said: 'How is Sandy?' The answer was: 'Oh, Sandy is all right, but all the rest of the patients are dead.' This is very similar. Prof. Milliken would allow the trawlers to operate in order that they may destroy those voracious fish that roam the sea, but he forgets that the other fish are being interfered with and destroyed at the same time. In a word the trawler kills the hen that lays the golden egg. Now, I have read to you the report of the Royal Commission of 1863, and that of the Royal Commission of 1883. To summarize these reports: In the report of 1883 it was alleged that there had been a destruction of spawn. The finding was that such was not the case, that that allegation was based upon a false assumption, that false assumption not taking into account the fact that spawn, as a rule, float near the surface. Then there was the allegation of the destruction of immature fish. The finding was that there was no evidence of the wasteful destruction of immature food fishes. There was the allegation that there was a disturbance and exhaustion of fishing grounds. By disturbance I mean that the fish are frightened away from the fishing grounds or the fish go away for a shorter or longer period, but that they may return later on. Exhaustion means that the grounds are fished out. As to disturbance and exhaustion, this report of the commission of 1883 finds that the number of fish in inshore and narrow seas may be seriously diminished by the use of trawlers. If in the narrower seas there is exhaustion because of the operations of trawlers, it naturally follows that in the broader seas, in the high seas, where you have a large number of trawlers operating, the same result is inevitable. It is only a question of degree. Then there is the allegation that the injury done by the trawlers to the food of fish is insignificant.

A select committee on Sea Fisheries was appointed in 1893. It was appointed 'to consider the expediency of adopting measures for the preservation and improvement of the sea fisheries in the seas off the British Isles including the prohibition of the capture, landing or sale of undersized sea fish * * * and other like regulations, international or otherwise.'

Evidently an impression was beginning to prevail among the fishermen and others that something was required for the preservation of the fisheries, that the fish were in danger. This committee proceeded with its investigation, and there seems to be great contradiction in the testimony of the witnesses who came before them. The evidence of those in the trade, those engaged in fishing with trawlers, conflicted with that of the professional and scientific witnesses in regard to the decrease in the quantity and size of fish caught in the North Sea. The naturalists of the Marine Biological Association, Messrs Holt and Calderwood, and other witnesses whose testimony was of a technical character maintained that there was a decided depletion in the North Sea fisheries. The evidence of those in the trade was to the effect that there was virtually no destruction, and no serious diminution in the quantity of fish. The finding of this committee was:

There is no indication of a falling off in the number of herrings to be found off our coasts.

There is no evidence of important diminution in cod and haddock.

A considerable diminution in flat fishes, as soles and plaice, which must be attributed to over fishing by trawlers in certain localities.

I cannot understand why there should be a finding with respect to herring, because they are not ground fish at all, and are not affected by trawling unless it might be that a decrease in the quantity of herring might follow an undue disturbance of the grounds where the bait was found.

In 1900 a select committee was appointed on the Fisheries Bill. They found:

That it is proved beyond doubt that there is a very serious diminution in the supply of certain kinds of flat fish, particularly in the North Sea.

That in default of a remedy, the consequence to the flat-fish industry will be disastrous.

That one of the causes of this diminution of supply is undoubtedly the destruction of inshore fish.

The committee in the conclusion of their report urged:

That the subject of the diminution of the fish supply is a very pressing one. That no efforts should be spared to arrange for international treatment of the subject generally.

Whilst in these reports it is denied that trawling particularly destroys spawn or wastes immature fish, or injures the spawning ground to any great extent so far as

the outer waters are concerned, yet it is admitted on all sides that in the inshore fisheries there has been a decrease both in quantity and quality.

I wish to call your attention to a finding in one of these reports with reference to the falling off in the bays and harbours where trawling has been largely carried on.

Continuous fishing with such an effective implement as the steam trawler within a limited area may sensibly diminish the number of fish.

Now, what occurs in the limited area is bound to happen in the broader area if you increase the number of those effective implements.

At the beginning of investigation made in 1883, a series of questions put to Coast Guard officers of the United Kingdom elicited answers that in 52 districts out of 85 there was a falling off in the quantity of fish taken and in 45 of these where there was falling off trawling in some shape carried on.

At Scarborough, Aberdeen and St. Andrews' catches fell off greatly pointing to danger of exhaustion if continued.

James Farquharson, fishery officer for Banff, in a report dated January 5, 1907, after stating that line fishing returns for that year compared favourably with those of previous year, adds that cod and haddock show a considerable increase in quantity and concludes:

Fishermen are of opinion that the increase is partly due to the absence of trawlers in the Firth.

James Ritchie, Findhorn, district, in a report dated January 3, 1907, says:

There was little cod fishing done in the Moray Firth by line fishermen as that species of fish was very scarce. Fishermen, however, are hopeful that the fishing may improve if trawling is prohibited in the Firth.

Inquiries in Denmark, Holland and Germany elicited the reply that they had like conditions.

I have before me extracts from the evidence taken before a special committee to inquire into the conditions of the fishing industry of the United Kingdom, under date of April 1, 1908. I find that Mr. G. Alward, connected with the fishing trade all his life, gave evidence. He lived at Grimsby since 1856. He was the owner of several fishing vessels, and was connected with National Sea Fisheries Protection Association for twenty years and member of the executive thereof the greater part of that time—an expert.

Q. Is it your opinion that the fact that you do find these small fish on the grounds where you previously got large fish is due to what we might call the intensity of fishing, the big fish having been killed?—A. That has something to do with it. Of course, in the North Sea, as you have probably had placed before you, the theory put forward—and I think there is a great deal of truth in it, is that the reason why we get so many small fish on the east side is that the larvae float into it, driven by the currents, and find a suitable location, and live on, whilst in the middle of the North Sea, the probability is that a large portion never get into that side of the tide and die.

Q. (To Sir Reginald McLeod). Is it your impression there is a decrease in the quantity of fish obtainable on the banks in the North Sea?—A. I think that is well established, and that it extends over many years—going back say thirty years.

Q. Would the fact that you have been able to maintain the fish supply be due to the circumstance that you are now fishing over a wider area, and with more elaborate and effective engines?—A. That is so.

Q. So you think some steps should be taken shortly—the sooner the better—to avoid intensity of fishing?—A. Well, some step—I do not know exactly what step you could take unless you resort to those farther grounds, and that I think is what we are doing. Personally we are doing that now; we are drawing off from the old grounds a number of those big ships and going to far-off grounds, so that we are giving the North Sea somewhat of a rest.

Q. And that rest, coupled with the checks which you have suggested of the destruction of immature fish, may effect the purpose in your opinion?—A. Yes, it may.

We lamented the fact that we were landing so much of that small fish and I think that induced us to be more severe on the question of stopping the catch.

These reports show clearly that during the past 25 years there has been a gradual change of opinion going on in the old country on this matter until a stage has now been reached when both the fishermen and the people generally are asking for measures to be taken for the protection of the fisheries. As the hon. member for Guysborough has pointed out, the government has shown its sympathy with the shore fishermen in various ways. In the first place, when the Halifax Board of Trade asked that the government should assist in bringing out some of these trawlers from Scotland, the government promptly refused to do so. This is shown by the following letter from the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Hon. R. Préfontaine, to Mr. C. H. Mitchell, the chairman of the Fisheries Committee of the Halifax Board of Trade, in reference to that proposal:

June 5, 1905.

Dear Sir,—Referring to the matter of the introduction of steam trawling in Atlantic waters of Canada, I have an official report before me, and I do not see that any encouragement could be held out to steam trawl firms to operate in our waters. You are no doubt aware that to that destructive method of fishing has been attributed the destruction of valuable fisheries off the shores of Great Britain, and prohibitory laws have been enforced in inshore areas.

Outside the three-mile limit trawling cannot be prevented, but I am not disposed to

favour it in territorial waters or grant assistance to firms adopting that mode of fishing.

Yours faithfully,
R. PREFONTAINE.

C. H. Mitchell, Esq.,
Wood's Wharf, Halifax, N.S.

This letter shows that the government, instead of encouraging the use of steam trawlers, has taken strong ground against them; and I am quite sure that if the Marine and Fisheries Department can go further than they have gone in restricting this method of fishing, it will do so. If the department has exhausted its jurisdiction in Canadian waters and trawling can still go on beyond the three-mile limit—and this is a matter that every constitutional lawyer must admit—then the only thing that remains is the adoption of some international regulations.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Before six o'clock, I was referring to the work of some of the Royal Commissions appointed to investigate this question of the destruction of fisheries by trawlers and drew attention to the change of public opinion in the old country regarding the destructive effects of steam trawling. I pointed out that, in the earlier days of the prosecution of the fishing industry by trawling there did not appear to be the same alarm as developed itself later. At present it is generally conceded that the system of steam trawling is a destructive one. It is admitted on all sides that the inshore fisheries have suffered considerably by reason of this method of fishing, and it is only a question of degree and to what extent it shall be allowed to go on until you have the same conditions in the outer waters as now exists in the inshore waters. In the old country, it is recognized to-day that there has been a great falling off in the inshore fishing, more than any one anticipated in the earlier days of steam trawling.

Objection may be made that the natural enemy of fish is the fish themselves and not men. It is quite true that we know comparatively little of the laws which govern the relations between the different species of fish and of the causes which produce the migration of fish at certain times and the gathering of them together in large shoals at other times, and which leads to the dispersion of these shoals at other periods. Nor do we know much of what becomes of the spawn, or what becomes of the fry, but it is admitted on all sides that the quantity of fish usually taken by man is infinitesimally small as compared with the destruction in the sea caused by the fish themselves preying on one another. There is a continual warfare going on amongst the various species and descriptions of fish the one against the other. The moment the spawn is shed it is attacked by numerous small fish, then when it is hatched it is attacked by larger fish. Herring is attacked by the dog-fish and sharks. These are again attacked in turn by the various larger fish, and it is a case all around of the great feeding on the little. Still there is a proper proportion maintained and nature does provide for the maintenance of a proper equilibrium between the different classes; but when you go beyond the line and by artificial means interfere too much with nature, the result is bound to be destructive. We have found that frequently on our rivers, streams and lakes. Where there is over-fishing in any of these the time will come when nature will not be able to keep up the supply, and there is great difficulty in supplementing the loss by restocking. The time to lock the stable is before the steed is stolen, and the time to protect our fisheries is now. True there is at present very little danger from steam trawling, and I hope there will be very little danger so far as depletion goes on this side of the Atlantic. Our natural conditions are different and, as pointed out by Mr. Cowie, the season on this side in which this steam trawling can be carried on, is comparatively short and there is time for nature to replenish herself. Still there is danger, and the question is what is the remedy. Some argue this method of fishing should be absolutely forbidden. The Dominion government has power to prohibit any Canadian engaging in it. That may be very true, but will that help out the situation? There are some 30 or 40 French trawlers operating off the Grand Banks and a couple of trawlers operating in the United States. Are you going to deny to Canadians the rights which other people enjoy? If the passing of legislation forbidding Canadians from engaging in the business could prevent steam trawling altogether, that would be satisfactory, but it would be very ineffective when other countries are allowed to engage in this business. It is argued that the evil can be prevented by prohibiting the landing in Canada of fish caught in trawlers. That is a pretty strong argument, but I do not know how it would work out when practically tested. It would certainly lead to great complications with other countries. It might lead to reprisals on the part of these other countries, and I fear might not be productive of the good result desired. The only effect such prohibition would have would be that the fish would be landed, say in St. Pierre or Newfoundland or the United States, and the trawling would go on just the same. Of course the fishermen on the

Canadian side would not see the fish landing and that might relieve their minds to some extent, but the trawling would go on just the same. To forbid Canadians from engaging in that business while others were allowed the right would be of no effect. The same thing was tried in the old country. The Moray Firth was there closed to British trawlers, but the result was that in a short time the English ships went to Norway, floated the Norwegian flag, and came to the Moray Firth, fished outside the three mile limit and landed their fish, so that the only persons affected were the Scotch trawlers. The evil of trawling went on just the same. Prevent our Canadians from trawling and they will do what was done in the Moray Firth cases. They will register their trawlers in some foreign port and then fish with impunity outside the three-mile limit. So the evil cannot be remedied by prohibiting our own citizens from engaging in the business.

As regards forbiding the landing of Canadian fish caught in Canadian waters, I do not think, as I said before, that remedy would be very effective. Notwithstanding the strong feeling in the old country at present against trawling, they have not gone so far as to say that fish caught by steam trawling shall not be permitted to be landed. In 1908, the British parliament passed legislation entitled, 'The Prohibited Areas Extension Act'. Section 1 of that Act provides:

> From and after the passing of this Act it shall not be lawful to sell or land in the United Kingdom any fish caught by the method of fishing known as steam trawling, or other trawling within the areas in which such methods of fishing are prohibited by the Herring Fishery (Scotland) Act, 1889, and by laws made thereunder.

It will be observed that this Act did not prohibit the landing of fish caught by steam trawlers generally, but only fish caught in these prohibited waters, the idea being to conserve these prohibited waters. But they did not deem it wise to pass such legislation as would totally prohibit the landing of fish caught in trawlers, and I do not know that it would be opportune or wise to pass such legislation here.

What then is the remedy? The order in council of the 9th of September, 1908, prohibits fishing by means of trawling within the three-mile limit, and in the bays and harbours of Canada, but unfortunately that does not help our inshore fisheries. Off the shores our fishermen set their trawls from two to six miles, but as soon as a steam trawler appears off the coast our local fishermen are obliged to withdraw their trawls because they do not want to take any chances of having their gear worth a couple of hundred dollars or more, destroyed. True, there are not many instances of a steam trawler destroying the hook and line trawl, but the reason is that the local fishermen take the precaution of not setting these when the steam trawler is at work. They are, however, prevented from pursuing their honourable avocation, and I say a great hardship and injustice is done to them.

The remedy suggested by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) seems to be one that will go very far towards alleviating the situation so far as the shore fishermen are concerned. They are a body of men far too important to be treated with indifference and are well worthy of the eulogies paid them by my hon. friend. They have a right to exist just as well as the steam trawler.

While the shore fishermen have no objection to the trawlers prosecuting their industry, if it is carried on in such a way that there is no danger of destroying the inshore fishermen's gear or injuring the fisheries generally, at the same time, they ask, and ask reasonably, that they also should be allowed to live. This is a case of live and let live. They do not object to the steam trawler offering to take fish to be supplied fresh to the Montreal market, at all seasons of the year, which is the argument put forward by the Maritime Fish Corporation, the owners of the 'Wren,' yet they say: Let us live also. A regulation ought to be passed whereby the shore fishermen can carry on his avocation, the avocation of his fathers, an honest and honourable one, while the steam trawler carries on its work if it wants to and provided there is no danger of permanent injury to the fisheries by the trawlers doing so. That, of course, as pointed out by the hon. member for Guysborough can only be accomplished by international regulations. And there is every reason to hope that this state of things will be brought about. Trawling is not popular. It is not popular in the old country, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Guysborough. Not only Great Britain, but the continental countries as well, are passing severe legislation against it. In the United States it is equally unpopular. It can easily be shown that it involves danger to the fisheries of the country. I have every hope therefore that the other nations would join Canada in an effort to pass regulations to restrict the operations of the trawler. I understand there is an agitation on this subject in Newfoundland and that the government there has taken up the matter. So, it would appear quite feasible to bring about international regulations respecting the manner of conducting this industry. There is a precedent for it. In 1839, there was a convention between France and Great Britain and that convention passed regulations for

the control of the fisheries. It is true, we have no jurisdiction beyond the three-mile limit, but there is no reason why the several nations interested should not make an international arrangement, by which the deep-sea fisheries could be preserved and the local fishermen protected. This convention of 1839 defines territorial waters as being within the three-mile limit. But it made regulations regarding the conduct of the fisheries. It permitted trawl fishing within the limits of the two countries. It forbade trawl fishing in certain waters, while herring and mackerel fishing are going on. It provided that trawlers should keep three miles away from boats engaged in fishing with drift nets for herring or mackerel, and went so far as to provide that where trawling was going on, and herring or mackerel boats commenced fishing there, the trawlers should leave and get away three miles from them. Now, if some such regulations could be adopted by this country, the evils complained of by our shore fishermen would at once to a very large extent vanish. And surely, it is not too much to ask that the steam trawler should keep far enough away from the shore fishermen to enable the shore fishermen to carry on their work without danger of their gear being destroyed.

The fisheries of our shores, as the hon. member for Guysborough pointed out, are the richest in the world. The steam trawlers of the old country have to drag the net for a period of four or five hours, but on our shore they can only drag it, I understand, for 45 minutes,—Dr. Cowie says one hour, but I believe that 45 minutes is really the time before it is filled and has to be hauled up. That shows how much richer the Canadian fisheries are than the fisheries of the old country We have a heritage in our fisheries which we should make every effort to conserve and we have in our fishermen as fine a class of men as can be found anywhere. A class of men who are deserving of the best attention of the government. And I have every confidence that the government will endeavour to have international regulations adopted that will preserve the shore fishery. For, as I have already said, this government has shown every sympathy with the shore fishermen. When an application was made by several firms in Scotland for assistance to carry on this industry of steam trawling, that assistance was promptly refused, because the government believed that the effect on this industry was to devastate the industry. Later on, the board of trade of Halifax asked that assistance be given to the trawler that was to come out from the old country, sent by the Ross Trawling Company. I read before six o'clock the letter from the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries to Mr. Mitchell, in which the government promptly refused to render assistance. I have had to do with the department since 1908 in connection with this trawling. For, as I said before six o'clock the 'Wren' has been operating every season for the past three years off the shore of Antigonish, and I have heard many complaints on the part of the fishermen and have had many remonstrances from them, to make to the government. I have invariably found the Department of Marine and Fisheries at all times desirous of seeing that the order in council, the law prohibiting trawling within the three-mile limit should be enforced. In 1908 it was represented to me that the trawler was operating within the three-mile limit. I wired to the department, and promptly there was a telegram sent to the commander of the government steamer 'Petrel' at Georgetown, as follows:

Ottawa, October 12, 1908.

C. G. S. 'Petrel,' Georgetown, P.E.I.

You are to watch the imported trawler 'Wren' and to see that she does not infringe the law against in-trawling within the three-mile limit. Report all possible information for the benefit of the department. You will remain in commission until further orders. Acknowledge.

C. E. KINGSMILL,
Rear Admiral.

Later, in 1909, it was again alleged that the trawler was operating within the three-mile limit. It is all very well to say we have an order forbidding trawlers operating within three miles of the shore, and that anybody can enforce the law, but the difficulty is, in proving the case. But let me say right here the only effective way of guarding against encroachment is to have a government cruiser constantly on the watch of the trawlers. Prevention is better than cure in such cases. The fishermen along our shore were persistent in maintaining that the trawler was operating within the three-mile limit. From what I could gather I believe that this was the fact. A prosecution was instituted against the Captain of the 'Wren', and he was convicted of violation of the law and was put in jail. That goes to show the disposition of the department. On the 23rd of September, 1909, I wrote to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries calling his attention to the fact that it was alleged that the trawler 'Wren' was operating within the three-mile limit. On 28th September, Rear Admiral Kingsmill wired the captain of the 'Constance' to proceed to the Antigonish shore, and on the 8th of October, 1909, he writes confirming his telegram and adds:

You are therefore to keep as close a watch as possible upon her movements and do this in an unnoticeable way and with as little publicity as possible.

And last year complaint was made by the fishermen. And, I find here, among the papers brought down a letter dated August 25, 1910, from the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Johnstone, to the deputy minister of the naval service:

This department would therefore be exceedingly obliged if you would be good enough to arrange to have the fisheries protection cruiser on that portion of the coast carefully follow the operations of the 'Wren' and see that no invasion of the law is permitted by her.

It has been alleged in certain quarters that the government has been encouraging and subsidizing trawlers. I read these letters to show how unfair that charge is. Instead of assisting them, the department has shown every possible desire to protect the interests of the fishermen. They have exhausted their jurisdiction to the extent of prohibiting by order in council, this method of fishing in our territorial waters over which alone we have jurisdiction, and I feel quite confident that if any international arrangement can be brought about for the protection of the shore fishermen, it will be done.

That such international arrangement can be brought about, I have no doubt. That the interest of the local or shore fishermen will be duly safeguarded in the making of such arrangements. I have every confidence in. It is, therefore, with very much pleasure I support the resolution of the hon. member for Guysborough.

Mr. A. L. FRASER (Kings, P. E. I.). I rise mainly to give my endorsement to the views of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). The importance of this question has been pretty well set out by that hon. gentleman and by the last speaker (Mr. Chisholm), of Antigonish, and I do not think that anything I can say can add much to its weight. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and a great many of the officers of his department, I think, are pretty well alive to the importance of the maritime provinces fisheries. We hear much of the conservation of natural resources, and we wish that the fisheries, the great natural resource of the maritime provinces should also be conserved. And while I must say there is room for improvement, I trust the department will see to it that this great menace to the fishermen of the maritime provinces which has been mentioned here, the steam trawling business, now in its inception, will be dealt with at once and effectively. It is without doubt destructive, and is a serious matter to the fishermen. I have my information from the fishermen themselves, with a great many of whom I come into contact, and they unanimously express great objection to this method of fishing. They say that it is ruinous. Now, I do not know whether the department is fully alive to the disastrous effects of this method of fishing; but from the report that was read here this evening I think they cannot be well informed. It would appear that this officer of the department who was sent down there condemned his own report, because he says he takes his information from the corporation that has been referred to. He was sent down there with certain authority to examine the question and report upon it, but instead of doing so, he finds a judgment, and says that he takes his information from the captain, or the corporation of a certain fishing concern in Nova Scotia. Now such a report must be entirely valueless to the department. I did not catch the name of the officer. But I would ask the minister to weigh that report and if, as I understood the hon. member for Guysborough to say, this officer got his information entirely from the corporation that was engaged in the steam fishing, then the report must be valueless. But I can assure the minister that my information comes direct from the fishermen, and I know that when this method of fishing came into operation they were alarmed, and they have been alarmed ever since, because they consider that method destructive. The hon. member for Guysborough also read a report from a British commission on these matters, which I think is conclusive as to the destructive nature of this method of fishing. Now there was a man whose name was mentioned here, I think it was Cowie, and if I am not mistaken he was himself engaged in the steam trawling business. He reports apparently that steam trawling was not destructive. His report would be of the same value as that of the corporation who reported to the official of the department. I think Mr. Cowie was engaged in steam trawling, and if my memory serves me right, this is the same Mr. Cowie who received certain sums of money from this government for making certain investigations—the minister will correct me if I am mistaken. But according to my memory, Mr. Cowie received large sums of money for performing certain services for this government some years ago in relation to the fisheries in the maritime provinces. I would strongly urge upon the minister to take direct evidence from those engaged in the fishing, and I think he will find that this method of fishing is fraught with a great deal of harm. As to the mode of regulation I am unable to make any suggestion to the government. Another matter I would like to mention is the recent regulations made at Washington, by which American fishermen are allowed to come within the three-mile limit, or within 1,000 yards of the shore, and set cod and herring traps. As I understood the Minister of Justice the other day, he said that any one, whether coming from the United

States or from any other part of the world, could come within a thousand yards of our shores and set cod or herring traps. Now if that is the case, I believe that our fisheries will suffer a great deal of harm, and our fishermen also will be injured.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The Minister of Justice explained clearly that this regulation to which my hon. friend refers has reference only to the treaty waters, to waters on the north side of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and I think the Magdalen Islands and part of Labrador. But it has nothing whatever to do with the waters of the maritime provinces.

Mr. FRASER. I was not quite sure about it. Then this regulation only affects the treaty coasts.

Mr. BRODEUR. There should be no misunderstanding in regard to so important a question. The agreement made with the United States the other day covers only the treaty coasts, namely, part of Labrador, from Mont Joly to Blanc Sablon, and the Magdalen Islands, that is to say, coasts which are part of Canada, and which were subject to the treaty of 1818. In virtue of that treaty American fishermen have the right to come and fish only in those parts of Canada. But so far as other parts of Canada are concerned, they have no right at all to come and fish in them.

Mr. FRASER. Another thing is that under the new regulation, as I understand it, American fishermen can come in here and fish within the three-mile limit the same as Canadian fishermen, on paying a license of a dollar a year.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend is referring to the reciprocity arrangement, it does not touch the fishing privileges at all, it deals with the exchange of commodities. In the particular matter to which the hon. gentleman refers, the effect is that the modus vivendi which has been in operation now for some time, is continued, with the payment of a nominal fee. In the Chamberlain-Bayard treaty it was proposed that if free fish could be obtained the conditions of the modus vivendi should be granted to them free of charge. We have provided, not to grant them free, but to charge a nominal license fee of one dollar per annum.

Mr. FRASER. I would urge upon the government to take into serious consideration this whole question of steam trawling, and to obtain their information from reliable sources. I think our fisheries deserve to be protected as well as any other of our natural resources such as timber and coal. The member for Guysborough stated that the largest number of steam trawlers on the coast was twenty. Since then I think the number has been increasing, and the situation now demands the immediate attention of the government.

Mr. A. B. CROSBY (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I had no intimation that this resolution would be brought up to-day. Notwithstanding the fact that the hon. member (Mr. Sinclair), who introduced this resolution is the chairman of the Fisheries Committee, he did not do the members of the committee the kindness to inform them that he was going to bring up this resolution, and the only intimation we had on the subject was the fact that it was on the Order Paper. It would have been nothing but fair and courteous for the hon. gentleman to have intimated to the members of his committee that he was about to discuss this matter this afternoon, so as to give members from the province of Nova Scotia and other maritime provinces an opportunity of being present to hear what he had to say with regard to the matter, and also giving them an opportunity of discussing it and giving their opinions upon it. But it evidently did not suit that hon. gentleman to do it in that way. Therefore, we had to have it sprung upon us this afternoon, and we know very little about it other than what we find on the Order Paper. The resolution, as I find it on the Order Paper, is in these words:—

That in the opinion of this House, as the mode of fishing known as steam trawling, prosecuted by ships of different nationalities on the coast of Canada outside Canadian waters, is destructive to fish life, it is expedient, in order to conserve the deep-sea fisheries, that negotiations be opened with the view of securing an international agreement prohibiting this mode of fishing in such spawning grounds for deep-sea fish, as the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the banks of the North Atlantic adjacent to the coasts of Canada and Newfoundland.

I can endorse everything that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair) put before us this afternoon with regard to the resolution. He left nothing wanting in his arguments as to whether negotiations should be entered upon immediately by Canada with the other nations, particularly with the nation to the south of us, and perhaps France, whose fishermen resort to the bank fisheries in order to arrive at a definite understanding in regard to the operations of trawlers upon these fishing grounds. But, when we came to listen to the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm), who spoke for something over an hour, quoted a great deal of statistical information, read a great many authorities and gave us the opinions of boards of trade from every place but Canada, we found that he seemed to argue in favour of the shore fisheries and he seemed to think that a limitation on steam trawl fishing on the banks was going to help the shore fishing. If this government could satisfy the hon. member for Guysborough and the hon. member for Antigonish by simply

passing a minute of council to say that they were not going to allow any steam trawlers to fish inside the three-mile limit they certainly could not satisfy the fishermen I represent by any such limitation. Nor could they satisfy the fishermen of Guysborough, or of Antigonish, or of any county in the maritime provinces. When my hon. friends get up and try to cover their tracks in this manner they must not forget that the fishermen in the maritime provinces know something about fish if they do not know very much about parliamentary affairs, and when the time comes for them to pronounce upon the position taken by these hon. gentlemen in regard to this question they will express themselves in no uncertain way. The hon. member for Antigonish expressed the belief that the steam trawler 'Wren' was not fishing within the three-mile limit. I venture the assertion that not once, but a hundred times, he has been told that the 'Wren' was fishing within the three-mile limit. Every fisherman in Antigonish and in Nova Scotia knows that she has been fishing within the three-mile limit, taking the fish and destroying the spawning ground. If these hon. gentlemen had been sincere, if they had meant to protect the shore fisheries, what would they do? Would they be satisfied with a minute of council of this government saying that we are going to allow no steam trawler within the three-mile limit, or even within the four-mile limit? No, but if they desired to protect the fishermen of Nova Scotia they would have insisted that the government should adopt a minute of council declaring that they would allow no trawler to fish in any of the waters of Canada. The hon. gentleman did not seem to know anything about the fishery question, because he said that the trawlers would not sell the fish in the maritime provinces, but that they would sell them in St. Pierre-Miquelon. The hon. gentleman showed that he did not know much about the fishery question, and the fishermen will realize that when they read the speech which he has delivered to-night. I am sure they will, because the fishermen of the maritime provinces may not be parliamentarians, but they send a good many men here to represent them, and they are very particular what kind they send. They try them once, and if they do not do what is right they will not send them back.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Are you prophesying for yourself?

Mr. CROSBY. No, but I can prophesy for the hon. gentleman, because of the speech which he made to-night. I need not fear the fishermen very much. Now, the hon. gentleman said that the government passed a minute of council. He had very great sympathy with the government, but he did not seem to have very much sympathy for the fishermen. If he can get the government out of trouble the poor fishermen may look out for themselves. He did not seem to care anything about the fishermen. But he said that they had passed an order in council forbidding beam trawling. What else did they do? They permitted trawling up and down the straits anywhere provided it was outside the three-mile limit. But the hon. gentleman knows that they could not operate their trawls four or five miles out without interfering with the shore fisheries of Antigonish or Guysborough. Does not this hon. gentleman know that these fishermen fish outside of the three-mile limit, and that it is there that they find their best fishing grounds? Sometimes the fish come close into the shore, and at other times they are outside of the three-mile limit. These steam trawlers may go up and down the coast and destroy the shore fisheries. My hon. friend read a lot from reviews and quoted a lot of resolutions passed by everybody but the people of Canada, but the people of the maritime provinces, whose opinions he should have presented to the House. I challenge him here to-night, I defy him to contradict the statement, as I challenge the hon. member for Guysborough, that there is not a fisherman in the maritime provinces who is not against this. They are unanimous, not a single fisherman favours it, and I challenge either of these gentlemen to get up and say that I am mistaken in that view.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Who says to the contrary?

Mr. CROSBY. The hon. gentleman dare not say to the contrary, but he argues very much against that view, as I will be able to show. That being the case, was it not up to this government, in the interest of the people engaged in the fishing industry, that there should be no such thing as a steam trawler permitted in the maritime provinces? Was it not up to this government not to pass this minute of council, not to allow them to fish outside of the three-mile limit, but to prevent them from fishing in Canada at all? If they had done that would they not have saved the fishermen of the maritime provinces? The hon. member for Antigonish and the hon. member for Guysborough know something about the men who control this steam trawler 'Wren.'

Mr. SINCLAIR. No.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). No, you are mistaken.

Mr. CROSBY. Never mind, then; we will let that go for what it is worth.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It would be interesting to know who control the 'Wren.'

Mr. CROSBY. I know that the Whitmans who support my hon. friend very strongly are the most interested, they buy the fish.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I confess I did not know that.

Mr. CROSBY. I am quite satisfied my hon. friend knows very little. I know that the Whitmans who are great supporters of my hon. friend buy the fish, whether they are interested in the steamer or not. My hon. friend from Antigonish seemed to have an idea that there was a scarcity of fish and indicated that it was necessary to have steam trawlers to supply that deficiency. I would ask any hon. member if with fish, netting the fishermen from one half cent to two cents per pound, there is anything in the cost of fish that would necessitate new methods of catching them? I do not think that any fisherman in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, or Quebec will say there was any necessity for steam trawlers because we have to pay too much for our fish. The hon. members who have spoken must admit that the introduction of steam trawlers would destroy the livelihood of the fishermen of the maritime provinces. They would destroy an industry carried on by a class of men as brave as any in Canada. These men, in order to gain a livelihood, take greater risks than men in any other industry in the world unless perhaps the mining industry.

Hon. members have given at great length statistics relating to fishing in England, Ireland, Scotland and Norway, but we are here to govern our own people, to govern Canadians, and if we can do that well we are discharging our duty because these are the people most interested. The hon. members did not give us anything that was stated by the fishermen of Antigonish or Guysborough, you would think there was no one there to speak to them. The fishermen of our maritime provinces are unanimous in believing that no steam trawlers should be allowed. Therefore, I think these hon. members should make some special effort to satisfy, and do justice to these men. The only way you can do justice to them is by a minute of council or by a vote of this parliament preventing the use of any steam trawler in the maritime provinces.

As to the preservation of the fisheries on the Great Banks we have a splendid class of men who perhaps do greater fishing on these banks than any other class. We want them to be protected, and of course, it would be impossible for us to pass any legislation here that would be effective without concurrent legislation of other nations interested, particularly the United States and France, except in the ways proposed by the hon. member for Guysborough.

Mr. SINCLAIR.

But the hon. member for Guysborough might go further and make his resolution, prevent the purchase of fish caught by steam trawlers whether inside or outside the three-mile limit. We know as a matter of fact, all the fishermen in the maritime provinces know, that these fish are caught within the three-mile limit. My hon. friend can talk about a telegram from this admiral to the next one, but it is only waste of money, and we have to pay the bills ; the steam trawler goes on and brings the fish in just the same.

A word with reference to the fishing industry of the maritime provinces. On the coast of Nova Scotia our fishermen fish the whole winter through without any protection whatever. I would suggest to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he should have a few of the ships under control of his department parole the Bay of Fundy and the coast of Nova Scotia, in order to succour fishing vessels that may be overtaken by sudden gales. In the United States during the last few years they have employed their revenue cutters in patrolling the coasts in this way. This year they have had ten patrolling the coast from Cape Hatteras north. They published statistics last year showing that these vessels had saved hundreds of lives and millions of dollars worth of property. I can see no reason why the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should not have some of his steamers patrolling east from Halifax and others west from Halifax, particularly in stormy weather so that there may be some encouragement to the fishermen, and some hope that they may be brought safely to shore in case they are overtaken by storm. I am quite in accord with the resolution moved by the hon. member for Guysborough, and with all that he has said in supporting it. Nothing can be said to augment his argument. My only objection to the resolution is that it does not go far enough, and I would appeal to the hon. member for Guysborough and to the hon. member for Antigonish to use all their influence to induce the government to stop the sale in Canada of fish caught by steam trawlers. Then we shall have what our fishermen desire and must have if they are to have justice.

Mr. STANFIELD. In justice to the hon. member for Guysborough, I feel it my duty to state that he communicated to me on Saturday that he intended to bring this resolution up; so that if there is any fault it is my own.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM (Inverness). Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a few observations on the subject before the House, which is one of unlimited importance to the maritime provinces and to Canada as a whole. I take a great interest in this subject, and that interest is intensified

by the fact that 40 per cent of the people of the county which I have the honour to represent are directly or indirectly interested in fishing. I therefore desire to call the attention of the House to the importance of the industry to this country. We find that the number of men engaged in the fishing industry in Canada is something like 69,000, that the value of the fish and fish products of last year in Canada was in the vicinity of $30,000,000, and that about $17,000,000 of capital is invested in the industry. These figures show the very great importance of the fishing industry in Canada, and therefore, it is the duty of every member of this House to do what he can to preserve that industry in every respect. I understood the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby), to find fault with the government for not having done more to prevent the operation of beam trawlers within the three-mile limit. As I understand, the government passed an order in council in 1908 prohibiting the use of the beam trawl within the three-mile limit, and in doing this, they exhausted their jurisdiction. I think it is conceded by members on both sides of this House, that they could not do more than that. The hon. gentleman says that beam trawlers have not been prevented from operating within the three-mile limit. I may say that I have had some experience in that regard. I was notified by the fishermen that beam trawlers were operating off the coast of Inverness. I at once telegraphed to the department, and in reply to my request one of the boats of the Government Protective Service was sent there and could very quickly redressed that grievance had they followed up those trawlers in their operations. I am informed they did not do this as they might. With regard to the effect of the operation of steam trawlers on our fishing grounds, from all the information I can gather, it is destined to have the most destructive consequences so far as our fisheries are concerned. To show the great interest that is taken in this subject in the province of Nova Scotia, I may state that the local government of Nova Scotia then passed a resolution in April, 1908, asking this government to use all its power to prevent these trawlers from operating around the coast of that province; and every fishermen's union and several maritime councils in the province passed resolutions to the same effect. This shows the great interest taken in the question by the people of Nova Scotia generally. The operation of the beam trawler is particularly injurious to the inshore fishermen. These men, who engage in hand-line fishing, trawl fishing and net fishing, set their gear anywhere from three to ten miles from the shore. We can imagine long lines of trawls set along the shore, nets of varying lengths set at various distances from the shore, and lobster traps set three or four miles from the shore would fare when in the course of beam trawlers in operation. Even if the beam trawler never comes within the three-mile limit, a large portion of this gear extends beyond that limit, and when the beam trawler sets out shortly before dark and steams along these fishing grounds, we can imagine the result. It would be the same as it has been in the old country. The inevitable result is the destruction of all the fishermen's gear set in the ground where the beam trawler operates. It is in anticipation of this destruction that the fishermen suffer most. When they know that a beam trawler is going to visit their fishing grounds, they are obliged to remove their gear to the shore. This means that their avocation, at least for the time, is gone. They are thus discouraged and will in many cases abandon fishing for all time. I have had strong representations on this subject from the fishermen of my own county. I do not intend to heap any encomiums on the fishermen as was done by other speakers to-night. It is not necessary to do so. The world knows their many deeds of bravery, their trials and hardships. If I did, I might be charged with throwing boquets at them in anticipation of something that may occur within the next couple of years. I may say, however, that I was met by a delegation of fishermen from along the coast of Inverness a few days before I came to this House, after Christmas, and they represented to me that the conditions there were such that if the beam trawler is allowed to continue to operate along that coast, the 40 per cent of our people who are dependent on fishing must turn to something else to eke out a livelihood. With regard to the effect of the beam trawler upon the feeding grounds and the spawning ground, I know that there are reports on file to the effect that they cannot cause very great evils in this respect, but I attach a great deal of importance to the opinions of the fishermen, I have great confidence in their powers of observation, because they are people who devote their whole time to the fishing industry, which to them is their only means of livelihood, and consequently they cannot fail, possessing as they do at least an average amount of intelligence, to have the most accurate knowledge regarding the fishing and spawning grounds I am bound then to accept the honest representations of these people. When I tell you that these engines of destruction are capable of gathering even the large anchors of ships, as they have done in the last year. (and carried them to the port of North Sydney), you can imagine how the bottom over which these monsters operate must be torn up. Assuming for a moment that this takes place and I think there is no doubt about it.

what must we conclude? We cannot come to any other conclusion than that the ground travelled over by these engines must be so disturbed that the fish will no longer be found there. That at any rate is the opinion of the fishermen, and I am bound to respect their views, as the views of men who have watched the movements of the fish in such cases, and I am bound to accept their opinions on questions of nature. It may be said that a large number of steam trawlers have operated in the North Sea for a great number of years without any noticeable depletion taking place there; but, as the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) pointed out a little while ago, in order to keep up the average supply of fish it was necessary for these trawlers to go away down to the coast of Africa, and as far north as the ice will allow them to operate. It was only by these means that they could keep up the average supply of fish. They operated, not only in the North sea, but practically from the Arctic to the southern coast of Africa. I have pointed out that the result of the operation of these steam trawlers is to root up and harrow the bottom. In reply we are told that where this is done by a large number of trawlers, there has been no depletion. Well, we cannot compare our small fishing grounds with those large areas in the old country but from the Arctic to the coast of Africa. Take 15 or 20 trawlers and operate them on one of those banks on our coasts and imagine them travelling over these banks four or five months in the year, it will not take them long to cover quite an area, in fact a large fraction of our small inshore boats will be gone over, and you may take it for granted that the area they cover is going to be destroyed for quite a while. That is the opinion of fishermen, and I will accept that opinion against the reports of any scientist or anybody else with regard to this phase of the question.

Let me refer now to the destruction of small fish. We are told by one of the officers sent down to our coast that there is absolutely no destruction of the small fish by beam trawling. But this officer, Mr. Halkett, I understand, made only one visit to the fishing grounds. It is known to men who know anything at all about fishing, that there are certain sections of fishing grounds frequented by the large fish and certain other sections frequented by the small fish. Would it be a very great stretch of the imagination to think that the owner of one of these boats would steer clear of the ground generally frequented by small fish, and go to those grounds where large fish were generally found, and thus give this government inspector the opportunity to say that no small fish were destroyed. In any event I do not see that Mr. Halkett could have obtained a very thorough grasp of his subject by merely going out on one trip, and then making his report. I have often gone out in a fishing boat myself, and I invariably found that a considerable fraction of the boats' catch was small unmarketable fish. This being the case, surely it is not reasonable to suppose that beam trawlers do not catch quantities of this kind of fish when they are found by all other means of fishing. When on this question of small fish, let me say that I do not see why we should not have a reasonable proportion of small fish just as they have in the old country. But the trouble is we have not any statistics to show what proportion of small fish are caught whereas in the old country they have. In the evidence given by Mr. G. L. Alwart before the committee on the fishery investigation appointed by the British government in 1907, to look into this question of steam trawlers, he said that in January, 1902, 19,230 cwt., of immature fish were brought into the port of Grimsby; in March, following 23,770 cwt., were brought into the same port; in April, 34,000 cwt., and in May, 32,000 cwt., or in all 109,000 cwt., brought into Grimsby in these four months. It is most unreasonable to suppose that we in Canada do not have at least a reasonable proportion of small fish, and if we have the same proportion as in the old country, we can easily see the destruction wrought by steam trawling.

I have just a word or two to say with regard to the operations of steam trawlers within the three-mile limit. I am of the opinion that the steam trawlers do operate within that limit. On more occasions than one that famous beam trawler the 'Wren,' and another whose name I do not remember, operated off the coast of Inverness last year. This steam trawler would come about dark, move along aimlessly, and just as soon as night fell would drop their nets, and steam on. That I have from the fishermen of Inverness, who have watched their movements. From their statements I am satisfied that their steam trawler did operate within the three-mile limit. I have strong representation from the fishermen asking the government to send one of their cruisers down there to follow the operations of this steam trawler. That is what the fishermen want more than anything else. They recognize that this government has exhausted its jurisdiction so far as preventing the operations of steam trawlers is concerned, and what they ask the government to do now is to send down one of their cruisers to prevent that steam trawler from operating within the three-mile limit.

As far as the area outside the three-mile limit is concerned, I am in accord with the hon. gentleman who preceded me. The only remedy we can hope for is of an international character. I am satisfied there are

no other means we can use, and I am in great hopes that international regulations can be secured and that soon. As I have on several occasions said, the fishing industry of Canada depends upon some regulations of an international character by which the steam trawler will be kept away from the coast, and I trust and believe that the government will exhaust every means within its power to have such international regulations as will for all time settle this burning question, and thus save our fishing industry for our own fishermen rather than for steam trawl corporations.

Mr. J. GIRARD (Chicoutimi and Saguenay.) (Translation). Mr. Speaker, as the representative of a constituency comprising within its limits a large number of fishermen, I beg leave to say a few words in support of the resolution submitted to the House by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair).

The fishing gear and engines to which he referred were brought to my attention within the last two years by fishermen in my constituency, several of whom have not the means to secure them. These fishing engines are surely harmful and their use is likely to deprive fishermen of their means of livlihood. Apart from those trawlers which have just been mentioned, there are also what is called trap nets, used largely by fishermen from the United States. These people engage in the waters of the St. Lawrence provided with such immense traps, and often times prevent those fishing by hand from getting a living for themselves and their families out of these same waters.

Representations have been forthcoming to me that I should approach the Minister of Marine and the government in this connection and voice the well grounded grievances of the people of the north shore of the St. Lawrence from Natashquan eastwards.

I am not in a position to express an opinion as to the actually mischievous nature of the fishing engines mentioned; I have no personal experience in this connection. But if any credence is to be given to the unanimous reports of the fishing community settled over a distance of five hundred miles along the north shore of the St. Lawrence, I think I am warranted in calling on the Minister of Marine to inquire into the question, with a view to amending the regulations in regard to licenses, in such a way that the poor man may be in a position to earn a living side by side with those in more affluent circumstances.

It is stated that fast American schooners, provided with trap nets, have been observed operating along the coast, within forty feet from shore, directly opposite the fishermen's houses. Such enormous quantities were being caught, that the boats could not hold them; nevertheless they would throw any surplus overboard, rather than let these poor fishermen have any for charity's sake.

Considering these hardships, I deem it incumbent on me to request that the Minister of Marine should inquire through his officers as to what is going on in those parts, so as to find out some means of protecting the people living along that shore. After all they are Canadians. They are not all electors for the time being, but I trust they will be before long. They are Canadians of all origins, who have been settled in those quarters for hundreds of years and have developed a considerable trade in fish. On account of recent developments in carrying on the industry, these good people are liable to lose their only means of subsistence, as they are unable to compete with such powerful engines of destruction as those referred to. An attempt is made to justify the use of such engines on the ground of the needs of the general fish market. There is something in that; however, consumers would not feel the inconvenience of dispensing now and then with fish to the same degree as the poor fisherman would that of dispensing with bread.

Complaints are being forwarded from the maritime provinces. People in that part of the country which I represent have requested that I should voice their grievances before the government. That is what I have done. I have apprised the government of their views by means of records which I have in person laid before the Minister of Marine. If such representations are worthy of attention, regulations should be enacted at once with a view to protecting the poorer class against the richer, and especially against outsiders, mostly Newfoundlanders and Americans who come and fish in our waters, while Canadians are made to suffer therefrom. Under the circumstances the government should see to it as soon as possible, and find some means of protecting our people against outsiders, while at the same time keeping aloof from any international entanglements.

Mr. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to be able to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Guysborough for having brought to the attention of the House this important question of steam trawling in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence and on the banks of Newfoundland. This question has attracted the attention of the department ever since the first steam trawler came to our shores. It was in the month of June, 1908, if I remember well, that the first steam trawler appeared on the coast of Canada. Only a few months elapsed when the department, on representations which were made especially by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr.

Sinclair), found it advisable to take action in the matter. I recommended to my colleagues to pass regulations prohibiting the use of steam trawlers within the three-mile limit. That regulation provides:

That His Excellency the Governor General in Council in virtue of section 54 of the Fisheries Act, chapter 45 Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, is pleased to make and does hereby make the following fishery regulation:

The use or operation of vessels known as steam trawlers, operating beam, otter or other trawls for the purpose of catching fish is prohibited within the three-mile limit and in the bays and harbours of Canada.

This regulation was immediately put into force and we have taken the necessary steps to provide that it should be absolutely observed. Some violations of the regulations did occur on the part of the steam trawler which was then operating on the coast of Canada. Instructions were immediately given to the commanders of our fishery protection service that the vessels of the service should follow this steam trawler in order to see that the regulations were rigidly observed. As there were violations of the regulation, we took these people before the court, and, if I remember rightly the captain of the vessel was convicted and even sent to jail. That shows that the department was anxious to prevent these steam trawlers from operating in the bays on the coasts of our territory.

That shows what is the policy of the government. I may say further that the policy of the government has always been to obtain some international regulation under which these steam trawlers could be prohibited from operating to the detriment of our shore fishermen. When I was in England in 1909, I had occasion to take up this question with the imperial authorities. It was on the occasion of the Imperial Defence Conference, and Newfoundland's representative was Sir Edward Morris, the Prime Minister. Sir Edward Morris and myself discussed this question with the authorities of the Colonial Office, and we pressed on His Majesty's government the desirability of obtaining an international arrangement for the regulation of the fisheries on the banks. Our object was to obtain an international arrangement with France and the United States, because those were the only two countries who were engaged to any extent in fishing on the great banks. At that time France already had a certain number of steam trawlers operating on the banks, and the number was increasing. According to statistics I have in my hand in 1907 there were 9 French steam trawlers on the banks, and in 1908 this number had increased to 29: so in one year there was an increase of 20 steam trawlers sent from France to fish on the great banks. I had occasion also, when in Europe, to meet some people in France who were interested in steam trawling, and I found that public opinion was divided in regard to it. In the northern part of France, by which I mean that region including the ports of Dunquerque and Boulogne, the fishermen were mostly in favour of the steam trawlers. But in the southern part of France, south of Finisterre, all the fishermen, if I may judge of the views I heard expressed by a member of the Chambre des Deputès, were absolutely opposed to the steam trawlers. The other country we had to deal with was the United States. Up to the present year, I think the United States have sent no steam trawlers on the great banks or into the Gulf of the St. Lawrence, but I am now informed that during the present year a couple of steam trawlers have been despatched from Gloucester or Boston, and more are likely to visit our banks. That shows, Mr. Speaker, that the steps which were taken by Sir Edward Morris and myself in 1909 to induce the imperial government to take up the question with these two countries, was a step in the right direction, was a step which, if I may judge from the discussion we have had to-day, commends itself to the good opinion of both sides of the House. I may add that since then some communications of a confidential nature have been exchanged between this government and the imperial government on that question, and it is now engaging the serious consideration of the imperial government. Therefore, when my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) states in his resolution that steps should be taken, he is stating what has already been done by the Canadian government.

Now there are some objections which occur in considering the question of prohibition, or of regulation of steam trawlers outside the territorial limit. The first objection we met with was as to how far the territorial jurisdiction of Canada extended. There is no doubt that within the three-mile limit our jurisdiction is unquestioned; but outside the three-mile limit we have no jurisdiction. But how far have we jurisdiction in the bays? You are aware that for some years the question has been agitated in Canada and in the United States as to the extent of our territorial jurisdiction in the bays. In the case of a bay only six miles wide there is no doubt about our jurisdiction; but in bays wider than that, the question arose whether foreign fishermen could come in and fish outside the three-mile limit on each side of the bay. However, that question has been settled so far as the United States is concerned, and in a way which I am sure is satisfactory to the Canadian people. The Hague award stated that certain bays were absolutely within our jurisdiction and our

territory; as respects others, a recommendation was made that some regulation should be passed not including those bays as part of Canadian territory; and as respects others also some boundaries were fixed. So this first objection which was met in discussing the question is now decided in our favour by the Hague award. It has been said that the method of steam trawling is a great improvement upon the old mode of fishing. I do not propose to discuss that question now at any length. I may say, however, that it is considered advisable that in all matters with regard to the fisheries we should adopt absolutely the same principle. For example, we have to make regulations in some cases to limit the catch of fish. Take the regulations we have passed with regard to purse seines, with regard to traps, with regard to pound nets. In many cases we have adopted regulations to prohibit the use of certain fishing methods because they were too destructive, in order to preserve our fisheries, and in order the more effectively to regulate them. We have been adopting all sorts of restrictions in order to preserve the fisheries. Take the issue of licenses, the close seasons, the size of mesh, and the gears, which I have just mentioned and which gears have been prohibited in order to prevent a too active catch of fish. Then, take steam trawling; although this is an improvement on the old system, I should say that if this improvement is still of such a nature that it could be considered as exposing our fisheries to depletion, we should take the necessary steps to prevent the use of such engines. That is what we have done in the regulation that I have just mentioned, and that is what we have done in the representations which have been made to the imperial authorities in order to bring about a conference between the different countries interested. We have to consider three main points, first, the conservation of the fisheries; second, the interests of the fishermen, and third, the requirements of the fish trade. The conservation of the fisheries is certainly a thing which appeals to most people interested in the preservation of our natural resources generally speaking. We spend large sums of money in order to protect our natural resources, and we, at the same time, take all the necessary steps in order to preserve those natural resources. The fisheries are certainly one of the best natural resources that we have, and I think it would be a pity if all the steps necessary were not taken to preserve those fisheries.

Nothing too good can be said in favour of the hardy fishermen who daily expose their lives in order to get their livelihood. A very beautiful and interesting picture of the work and devotion of these men has been presented by my hon. friend from Guysborough, and I do not intend to say very much upon this point because he has done it in so excellent a way. But, I may say that we should always keep in our minds in the framing of our regulations and the making of our laws, the interests of those fishermen, and that is the reason which induced me to recommend to my colleagues, as I did in 1908, the prohibition of steam trawling, which I described a few minutes ago. I must admit that the requirements of the fisheries should equally not be lost sight of. The requirements of the fisheries are very important and it is acknowledged that the government, in framing these regulations, should also look to the preservation of that interest. In connection with that, I think it is only a matter of justice to read to the House a letter which was addressed to me by the manager of a company which owns the steam trawler the 'Wren.' This letter is dated about a month ago, and it reads as follows:

Maritime Fish Corporation, Limited,
St. Nicholas Building,
Montreal, December 12, 1910.

Hon. L. P. Brodeur,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Re steam trawlers. My attention has been called to a resolution proposed by Mr. Sinclair, member for Guysborough county, Nova Scotia, which is to be brought before the House of Commons, and I have been directed by the board of directors of this company to place some information before you relating to the advantages attached to this mode of fishing, with a view to developing the fisheries of the Atlantic coast.

This company purchased from the Pioneer Steam Trawling Company in May last the steam trawler 'Wren,' and prior to the time we took over this trawler, very little had been done, and the steamer was not operated for commercial purposes.

To develop a steady and uniform supply of sea fish to the inland cities, this company decided it was absolutely necessary to improve upon the methods of fishing pursued in Guysborough county, realizing the Department of Marine and Fisheries were doing their share towards the development of this industry. Prior to this time the fish dealers in the larger centres of Montreal and Toronto were dependent upon Portland and Boston for their supplies of fresh haddock and codfish, which was purely through lack of organization on the part of any company to give the dealers a steady supply. In previous years for many weeks the dealers were without fish, and at times had to pay exorbitant prices from the United States markets. We are glad to state that from May 1, 1910, the trade have been largely supplied with fresh fish from the Atlantic coast, taken by the steam trawlers operating out of Canso. This was owing to severe storms along the coast for several weeks in the month of September, and for one week at the latter part of September the

Canadian markets were absolutely and wholly supplied by steam trawler fish at from three and one-half to four cents per pound delivered in Montreal, whereas the quotations from Boston and Portland during the same period were seven and one-half to eight cents per pound.

Steam trawlers are being operated out of Grimsby and Aberdeen, Scotland, to a very large extent, and at the present time clubs of fishermen realizing the advantage this mode of fishing has, are now owning and operating these steamers. I inclose copy of a clipping taken from the Gloucester 'Times,' dated November 29, in which it refers to the third steam trawler of a proposed fleet of vessels launched in the United States. Since that time I am informed another steamer has been ordered, and if we in Canada are to compete with our friends on the other side of the border, we must have modern and up-to-date appliances.

Furthermore, from information I have been given, some thirty-five French steam trawlers operated last season on the Atlantic coast, and I cannot see that it is fair to propose legislation prohibiting Canadians from being on an equal footing with other nations.

To further illustrate to you the advantages afforded to fish merchants and fishermen operating along the coast, this company has paid to the fishermen one-half cent per pound more for their fresh haddock landed than in any previous year during the same months, and the product instead of being dried or salted as it has been in the other years, was largely disposed of in the fresh and smoked state, and the fishermen through this means have received cash for all the product offered immediately landed, whereas in other years where they were dependent upon foreign markets, the product has been held awaiting favourable market conditions.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) ALFRED H. BRITTAIN,
Director and General Sales Manager.

This letter is certainly of some importance and I thought that for the benefit of the discussion, I should read it to the House. Of course, I do not agree with everything that is included in it because I think that we could very easily get a supply of fish at all times. Of course, we must give some consideration to the representations which are made in that letter. My correspondent has alluded to what the department has been doing in order to encourage the sale of fresh fish on the markets of Ontario and Quebec. We thought that it was a very serious handicap for our fish trade that in former years the markets of Montreal and Toronto were almost entirely supplied with fish coming from the United States.

The information I had, however, was that while this fish was virtually caught in Canadian waters, most of the business on the coast was carried on by American fishermen, who were taking our fish to the American markets, Gloucester and Boston, and from there were distributing it to different parts of the United States and Canada; and it is a remarkable thing that during many years we were obliged to pay duty on our own fish, that is to say, fish caught in Canadian waters, transported to Boston and Gloucester, and then shipped from there to the Canadian markets of Montreal and Toronto. It was thought that some steps should be taken to put an end to this state of affairs. My colleagues appropriated a certain sum of money which was devoted to facilitating the transportation of fresh fish from the maritime provinces, or from the Pacific coast to the interior of Canada. I am glad to be able to state that this policy has produced very good results. I find that in 1906 there were imported into Ontario and Quebec from the United States 1,968,572 pounds of fish. In 1908 this amount was reduced to 1,180,543 pounds, and in 1910, in the last fiscal year, the amount imported was only 751,569. That shows that in spite of the increase in our population, in spite of our large consumption of fish, because the consumption has increased largely in the last few years, there has been a large reduction in imports. Why? Because we have paid to the express companies and the railway companies a part of the cost of transportation of fresh fish in cold storage and paid one-third of the cost of the transportation of fresh fish by express. Now, all the fish which is consumed in Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa, in fact in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, comes from the Atlantic provinces of Canada, being transported in the way I have just described. This policy has been very beneficial, and I hope that within a short time it will not be necessary for the government to continue to subsidize the transportation of fresh fish, because people will have become accustomed to eating fish and to receiving it direct from the maritime provinces. This shows the result of the policy adopted by the government. I do not believe that this result is due to the use of steam trawlers, but simply to the improved facilities which have been given for the transportation of fresh fish.

How shall this question of international agreement be considered? Perhaps it would be advisable for me to refer for a minute or two to the arrangements or agreements which exist in Europe upon that question. Since 1839 there has been an agreement between France and England as to the fisheries on a certain section of the Channel waters bordering those two countries. This agreement provided for the regulation of the length of beam, and the size of the mesh, and prevented any trawler fishing near a herring or net fishing boat in such a way that the objection made to-day to the use of steam trawlers on the ground that they were destroying the fishing gear of herring fishermen or fishermen using

set trawls, are entirely overcome. The regulations under the agreement are framed in such a way that it is absolutely impossible for any steam trawler to interfere in any way with the ordinary fisherman, and to destroy his gear. In 1882 the North Sea Convention was made. To this convention Great Britain, Germany, Holland, France, Belgium, Denmark, Norway and Sweden were parties. This agreement defines, first, what are territorial waters, adopting the head line theory for which we have fought so many years with the United States, and which was at last recognized by the award of The Hague tribunal. It states, also, that within such territorial waters no boat can fish except with the authority of the country adjoining these waters. It also provides that the trawl fishermen are not permitted near drift net or long line fishermen, and even that when fishermen come to fish with nets the steam trawlers must leave the bank and go and fish elsewhere. This was the agreement embodied in the North sea convention, which certainly should form the basis of any agreement which may be reached between Great Britain, the United States and France. Under this North Sea Convention and in virtue of the powers which England possessed, laws were passed in 1885 empowering the Board of Fisheries of Scotland to prohibit the use of steam trawls in territorial waters; to-day, with the exception of one place, steam trawling is absolutely prohibited in the territorial waters of Scotland. Later a regulation was passed prohibiting the landing in Scotland of fish caught by steam trawlers. But, unfortunately, and I call the attention of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Crosby) to this point, instead of helping to preserve the fisheries, this regulation has worked detrimentally to the interests of the other fishermen. In fact, the foreign fishermen who took their fish outside of the three-mile limit were prevented from landing them at any port in Scotland, and they had to go to Grimsby or some other port in England where the regulations did not apply.

The hon. member for Halifax suggested that we might have some law or regulation prohibiting the landing in Canada of fish caught by steam trawlers. I am afraid that such a regulation would work detrimentally to our own fishermen. At present they have the advantage of sending fish from the maritime provinces to the inland cities of Canada ; but the effect of prohibiting the landing of fish caught by steam trawlers, especially at seasons when they could not be caught by the other fishermen, would be that the New England fishermen would catch the fish off our coasts, carry it to the United States, and then sell it to us as American fish, and we would have to pay the duty on it. The Americans would have all the benefit of that situation to the detriment of our own fishermen. Therefore, I think we had better try to reach an agreement with the United States and with France upon some such regulation as that which exists in Europe by virtue of the North Sea Convention. If the total prohibition of steam trawlers could be agreed upon by these countries, it would be the best thing that could happen to us. But if it should be impossible to reach such an agreement, I think the next best thing for us would be to try to get an agreement such as I have just mentioned.

My hon. friend from Guysborough and other speakers have referred to the report made by Mr. Halkett, the naturalist of the department. Perhaps it is only just to Mr. Halkett, who is certainly a very good officer, in whom I have always had full confidence, that I should read his report. It is not a definite report, but only a summary of his observations. He is going to prepare a report, which will give concisely and precisely all his observations in connection with his trip on the ' Wren.' Unfortunately, Mr. Halkett has not been well for some time, he is now absent on sick leave, and his complete report has not yet been prepared. But as soon as he returns, he will be asked to prepare that report, and I shall be glad to bring it down with the other papers. In his summary report, he says :

Having carefully followed the fishing operations carried on by steam trawlers on board the trawler 'Wren,' I have to report that the complaints made against such operations are entirely without just reason. On the contrary, instead of being exceedingly destructive and wasteful, practically everything drawn up in the great net, excepting the dogfish which are entangled in considerable numbers, is utilized and turned to account, and the very destruction of the dogfish is a benefit, whilst the men are entitled to save their livers on their own behalf. I understand that until recently the flat fishes, such as the rough-dab, were thrown away; but since the establishment of the glue factory at Canso such are now sold to that institution. There is really nothing drawn up in the net which any economical fishing corporation would ever think of wasting, and certainly the captain of the 'Wren' is awake to the interests of the Maritime Fish Corporation in this respect. The bulk of the fish caught is haddock, and it is for them that the trawling is carried on. The weight of the catch of haddock was 27,580 pounds, exclusive of 3,300 pounds of assorted small ones. This numerically, judging by the respective sizes, approximately represents some 6,895 and 1,650 fish. The weight of flat fishes was 325 pounds, of the cod 150 pounds, and of the hake 1,550 pounds, or numerically 100 flat fishes, 25 cod and 100 hake. True, I was dependent on the corporation for these figures after landing at Canso; but based on my own observations on board the 'Wren,' I can vouch for the figures being approximately correct. The total weight of these was 32,905 pounds, and the number approximately 8,770. Besides leav-

ing out the dogfish there were a few silver hake, pollock, skate and gaspereau and a shad, and angler and an eel. It is difficult to form an estimate of the number of dogfish caught, but the number was very considerable. Sometimes there would be only two or three, and at other times the net seemed to have swept through a regular school of them; their livers are cut out and they are immediately destroyed and thrown overboard. Besides the true fishes there were a very limited number of squid, saved and other odds and ends like the angler, skates, &c., for making glue; and there were hardly any other invertebrates except a few worthless star fishes, &c. I will work the matter all out in a more detailed way later, but meanwhile give some broad outlines in a summary way. Occasionally, but very rarely, I saw an insignificant gaspereau or other very small fish thrown overboard, but there is virtually no waste whatsoever. The operations were carried on not closer to the land than four miles, and besides the 'Coquette' no other fishing craft was to be seen.

(Sgd.) ANDREW HALKETT,
Naturalist, Dept. Marine and Fisheries.
St. John, N.B., Oct. 29, 1910.

This report, as we see, was sent direct from the maritime provinces, and I think that before condemning it, we had better wait until we have Mr. Halkett's full report, which no doubt will give the reasons for these figures, and the circumstances which attended his visit on the 'Wren.' It is urged that the department should make some further experiments of the same kind in order to corroborate this report of Mr. Halkett. I am glad to accept the suggestion, and I shall be glad to give instructions to Mr. Halkett or to some other officer of the department to make further observations on the subject.

I wish to say a word with regard to the report made by Mr. Cowie some years ago and which was published as an appendix to the report of the Marine and Fisheries Department for 1908-9. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has referred to some figures which are given at page 378 by Mr. Cowie in order to show what has been the catch of fish in Scotland, and in the North Sea, and surrounding districts during a number of years. I think it only just to Mr. Cowie that I should refer to his valuable report. We may not agree entirely with what he says, but no doubt his services have brought a great deal of information which we all welcome. Mr. Cowie gives the following figures as to the catch, and the number of trawlers from 1898 to 1906:

	Trawlers.	Cwt.
1898..	149	778,731
1899..	207	980,326
1900..	232	1,078,164
1901..	256	1,325,072
1902..	275	1,465,017
1903..	250	1,566,870
1904..	270	1,705,633
1905..	266	1,745,481
1906..	274	1,870,517

Mr. BRODEUR.

My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) said that those figures do not show whether they represent only the catch in the North Sea or whether they cover also more distant territories. Those figures show the catch, not only in the North Sea, but also in Iceland, Faroe, and some other places. The observation has been made that those figures are not conclusive because they do not show whether the fish were caught in home waters or far away. I may say, however, that I have these figures before me, and they show that in 1904 from the home waters there were brought into Scotland 1,150,440 cwt.; in 1905, 1,066,306 cwt.; in 1908, 1,385,978 cwt.; in 1909, 1,390,833 cwt. As to the other places such as Iceland and Faroe, the quantities were as follows:

	Faroe.	Iceland.
1904..	77,151	23,209
1905..	173,311	96,261
1908..	23,438	279,035
1909..	67,073	164,749

But those last figures do not contravert the fact, which was stated by Mr. Cowie also in the same report, that the quantity of fish caught in the home waters has not been decreased, but has increased from 1,150,441 cwt., in 1904 to 1,390,833 cwt., in 1909. I think it only fair to Mr. Cowie that I should put those figures before the House in order to show that he is not at all prejudiced or biased in favour of steam trawlers.

Mr. JAMESON. When was the report made?

Mr. BRODEUR. On the 2nd of February this year.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Is it a fact that separate statistics are kept for the North Sea and outside waters? I read this afternoon a statement made by one of the representatives at a meeting in London in which he said it would be very desirable to make a change in the keeping of the statistics so that we could tell what fish were caught in the North Sea, and what in other waters.

Mr. BRODEUR. Lately the Scottish board in Scotland have been keeping separate statistics as to these different fishing grounds. I have a map here showing exactly for 1907-8 what have been the increases and decreases in those different years. I might perhaps quote some of the information given. The fishing grounds are divided in this map into different districts which are called by letter (a1), (a2), &c. down to (f2). In the southern part of the North Sea which covers from Calais to Harlingen, on the one side, and from Calais to Grimsby on the other side—there has been over that whole area a slight decrease in both 1907 and 1908. In the district called (b4), which is near the Dogger

Bank, there has been an increase in 1907, and a decrease in 1908. On the Dogger Bank, opposite Newcastle, there was a large decrease of 41 per cent in 1907 and 37 per cent in 1908. In the district called (c2), there is a decrease of 18 per cent in 1907, and of 20 per cent in 1908. There has been an increase all through. Take the district opposite Edinburgh, there has been an increase in the inshore area of 90 per cent in 1907, and a decrease of 20 per cent in 1908. In the district next to that called 'E,' there has been an increase of 80 per cent in 1907, and an increase of 88 per cent in 1908. And in district (d2), the middle ground there has been an increase of 119 per cent in 1907, and 9 per cent in 1908. I do not wish to trouble the House with further details. These figures, included in the report of Mr. Cowie show that there has not been a decrease in the North Sea, but an increase.

It has been suggested by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Crosby) that we should keep in commission some vessels to protect the fishermen. I agree with that view and have already given instructions that a vessel should be kept in commission at Canso, that the men who go out on the banks may know that they have a vessel at their disposal to protect them should necessity arise. My hon. friend from Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard) called my attention to the necessity of protecting by agreement our fishermen of the north shore. I do not see how it would come under the scope of the agreement which is contemplated as likely to be made between Canada and the United States and France in regard to steam trawling, but I will try to get more information on the subject from my hon. friend and from the records of the department, and if the features suggested can be embodied in the agreement when we get into conference to discuss the question I shall be glad to keep in mind the suggestion made by my hon. friend.

There is no objection to this motion being adopted, because already steps have been taken to bring into effect what the mover (Mr. Sinclair) has had in mind.

Mr. C. JAMESON (Digby). I fully concur in the remarks of hon. members who have spoken on this resolution, that the subject is one which calls for prompt and vigorous action on the part of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I further agree with them when they say that the result of steam or beam trawling is likely to be most serious and to have a very detrimental effect upon the future value of the fishery of Canada. I must say that when I saw this resolution on the Order Paper, I was impressed with the idea—perhaps an erroneous one—that the hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) who had given the notice was censuring, in some very slight degree it might be, the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Since nearing the minister (Mr. Brodeur) on the subject I am inclined to think that perhaps I was not very far out of the way. At all events, while the hon. member who moved the resolution evidently does not think that, up to date, all has been done that could or might have been done, the minister himself is perfectly satisfied that he has done all that reasonably could be expected of him. The resolution of the hon. member for Guysborough was as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, as the mode of fishing known as steam trawling, prosecuted by ships of different nationalities on the coast of Canada outside Canadian waters, is destructive to fish life, it is expedient, in order to conserve the deep sea fisheries, that negotiations be opened with the view of securing an international agreement prohibiting this mode of fishing in such spawning grounds for deep sea fish, as the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the banks of the North Atlantic adjacent to the coasts of Canada and Newfoundland.

My own impression is that the resolution might well have gone a little further, and besides condemning the prosecution of the trawling in spawning grounds for deep sea fish, it might have covered all those grounds in which the fisheries are prosecuted. Because, not only is the 'beam' or steam trawling of serious injury to the fishing ground as such and to the spawning grounds as such, but, as has been amply shown this evening, it is most detrimental to the interests of those carrying on the ordinary methods of fishing in the different fishing grounds within Canadian waters and outside Canadian waters. Now, I am absolutely in favour of the abolition of this steam or 'beam' trawling. I think there is no room for half-way measures in this matter, but that such measures will be merely trifling with a very serious situation. Canada to-day stands in the unique position of having in respect to some—not all—the only unspoiled fisheries yet existing in the Atlantic. We desire to do all we can to conserve these fisheries. We do not wish merely to get out of them what can be got to-day regardless of the interest of the generations to come. Conservation of the fisheries is one of the most important things that the department should work for, and it is one subject to which, I think, they have not bestowed as much attention in the past as was advisable. I may say, in this connection that, in the year 1909, the convention of the Conservative party in the province of Nova Scotia, held at Truro, passed a resolution in relation to this very subject, as follows:

We sympathize most profoundly with our fishermen in regard to the menace to our shore fisheries arising from the use of steam

trawlers. The Dominion government has failed to take action in this regard and we condemn the local government for failure to effectually urge the protection of our fishermen and express the opinion that an international treaty should be promoted and such other steps taken as may effectually deal with the question.

I read this merely to show that this subject has been a very live one for a considerable time. As far back as 1909 representations had been made from different sections of the province of Nova Scotia urging that steps should be taken to combat this danger as a menace to the fisheries, and on the occasion referred to, these representations found expression in the resolution I have just read.

Now, the damage which these beam trawls do, consists not only, as I have said, in destroying the spawning ground by tearing up the bottom, but also in the injury done to the fishermen who use what are known as trawls, consisting of long lines of fishing gear, to which at intervals shorter lines are fastened. These trawls are quite expensive, and have to be kept in suitable condition for operation. Anything which tangles or breaks them involves considerable loss to the fishermen in straightening out the trawl and repairing it. This means loss of fishing, and consequent loss of profit to the fishermen. The subject is one which calls for prompt and vigorous action on the part of the government, as a result of this steam trawling, an intolerable condition has developed in certain waters in and about the maritime provinces. I am informed that recently one of these trawlers has entered the Bay of Fundy, and has been, or is about to prosecute its operations there. I am confident that the people who have been fishing in the Bay of Fundy will be very much opposed to this invasion. I cannot urge too strongly on the department the necessity of early and energetic steps to cope with this threatened evil. Now the department has known of this condition for some time, and we cannot help asking ourselves what the department has been doing. It seems that as far back as 1909, from the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries this evening, this matter came under his personal observation, and he went so far as to discuss it with the Prime Minister of Newfoundland at the imperial conference in 1909. But thereafter, apparently, nothing has been done, the matter has been allowed to drift. To-day we find ourselves actually in the same condition as we were in 1908, so far as regards any steps taken by the department. I may say that I observe in the report of the department for the year 1908-9 some reference to the subject of steam trawling. There is a casual reference on the part of the deputy minister in his report to the minister, appearing at page XXI, where he says:

The invasion of steam trawling off Canadian shores has been introduced this season, 1908-9, by an imported trawler named the 'Wren,' which vessel was brought to this country by a Halifax company.

Immediately urgent representations were made to the department on behalf of the shore fishermen strongly remonstrating against the operations of the vessel, the objections advanced being that large quantities of small unmarketable fish were taken and wasted, and that she was destructive to the gear of the hand liner, as well as of the grounds resorted to by them for fishing purposes.

So serious were the complaints against steam trawling immediately following its introduction, that the department procured an order in council dated September 9, 1908, a copy of which is quoted. Then follows the order in council which reads:

His Excellency the Governor in Council, in virtue of the provisions of section 54 of the Fisheries Act, chapter 45, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, is pleased to make, and doth hereby make the following fishery regulation:

The use or operation of vessels known as steam trawlers operating beam, otter or other trawls for the purpose of catching fish, is prohibited within the three-mile limit and in the bays and harbours of Canada.

The report then goes on to say:

The action of the department in procuring the order in council which prohibited this method of fishing within the three-mile limit and the bays and harbours of Canada did away with any question of encroachment on the territorial waters.

Now although this statement was made in the report of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, we learn from the member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm), tonight, that such had not been the case, that even within the three-mile limit, these trawlers are still at times prosecuting their work, and that serious injury to the fishing interests had resulted therefrom. But the main thing which we note here is that as far back as 1908, the government had actual knowledge of the conditions existing in this respect, and apparently knew that some steps were necessary in order to mitigate injury or to prevent damage, and they took the course which has been stated in the report I have read. But in the same volume, issued by the minister for the year 1908-9, we find another interesting report, which was evidently considered of sufficient importance to take a place in the volume. This report is made by John J. Cowie, an officer, if not an adviser, of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, as appendix No. 20, page 373, in the report of the minister. On page 384 he makes a

statement which I will read to the House, because taken in conjunction with the action of the department and with the statement of the deputy minister, it seems a little startling, not to say inconsistent. He says:

With regard to the framing of laws for the restriction and regulation of beam and otter trawling in Canadian waters, I may be allowed to say that, in my opinion, all that is really necessary is the keeping of trawlers outside the three-mile limit along the coast, and outside of the ten-mile limit in bays, with rules providing that no trawler shall fish within at least three miles of any boat or vessel which is in the act of fishing for herring or mackerel, or within three miles of any vessel anchored for the purpose of line fishing, so that line fishermen shall not live in constant fear of having their fishing gear swept away and destroyed.

Those rules, dealing with extra territorial waters, would, of course, have to be mutually agreed to by the countries interested to be of any use. There need be no fear of trawl fishing ever depleting the sea here.

I draw particular attention to that last statement.

The conditions on this side of the Atlantic are altogether different from those on the other. In European waters, in the comparatively narrow North Sea, excessive fishing goes on from January to December by an immense fleet of trawling and other vessels, and in spite of this, the total landings, as has been seen, are actually increasing rather than diminishing. In Canadian waters, on the other hand, and even on the Grand Banks —and this should be kept in view when placing restrictions on trawling here. Owing to climatic conditions there is an enforced close time of at least three months in each year, during which little or no fishing of any kind takes place, and during which even the operations of steam trawlers would be practically stopped. Indeed the Gulf of St. Lawrence, that immense fish breeding area, is practically closed to fishing from December to May, so that the fishing grounds, even if excessively worked on during the open season, would, owing to the long rest, soon become replenished. It is, therefore, inconceivable that trawling can develop to such a degree on this side of the Atlantic as ever appreciably to diminish the extraordinary abundance of certain classes of fish such as cod and haddock in the waters of Canada, and I think we may rest assured that its fisheries will remain a splendid heritage for all time.

I quote further from page 377:

I think it is now beyond a doubt that trawling has come to stay here, and although its development will, of necessity, be slow, nevertheless, looking to the time when Canada will have many more millions of people within her borders than she now has, when railway rates have been reduced, and the distributing facilities will have been increased to keep pace with the expanding trade, I believe there will be seen a fleet of Canadian steam trawlers running in from the Atlantic grounds with daily supplies of wholesome fresh food fish.

Mr. Cowie is evidently reconciled to the continuance of steam trawling. He is an officer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and as such his words carry weight and may be said to reflect the views of the heads of that department, for they have not been repudiated by the minister.

I must say that, taking into consideration this statement of the expert of the department—I do not know whether he is merely an expert or whether he is something akin to a prophet because he seems to be usurping the functions of a prophet when he says that the fisheries upon the Atlantic coast are not going to diminish—together with what I might call the remissness of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in not taking more active steps towards devising some means for the protection of the fishermen, and the fisheries, I cannot do otherwise than come to the conclusion that the minister himself is not very much impressed with the necessity for taking any such step as that. The minister, in referring to this said in effect that unless total prohibition could be obtained the best thing to do would be to arrive at an agreement based on the North Sea Convention. I think that was the statement that the minister made. He is not in his place so I cannot ask him whether it is or not. I do not understand what he means by that except it be that unless the different countries, France and the United States, for example, are willing to unite with Canada and agree to certain regulations which will prevent the operation of these steam trawlers outside the three-mile limit, he does not know that Canada can go any further than to prevent the operation of them within the three-mile limit. In other words, nothing further can be done than that which has already been done. The minister seems to me to take an erroneous view of the matter when he says that it would place Canadian fishermen and the fishing interests at a disadvantage to take a step, with regard to the framing of the regulations, which would actually prevent the landing of fish caught by these trawlers at Canadian ports. He says that it would work out in this way, that while Canadians would be debarred from the privilege of operating these steam trawlers, Americans, under the new regulations with respect to the charge for the modus vivendi licenses, if the agreement now under consideration should pass, would come to our ports, take these fish outside the three-mile limit, carry them to the American markets and Canadians would be debarred from sharing in that profitable business. I am led to say in reply to this that, if my memory serves, a somewhat similar condition confronted the administration of the department of Marine and Fisheries a number of years ago prior to 1896. The question

was whether or not purse seining should be permitted. I believe that the fishery branch of the Canadian government, made several attempts at a conference with the United States with respect to this, and while the government of Canada contend that purse seining should be prohibited the government of the United States was not prepared to go as far as that, the result being that they could reach no agreement. Canada decided that in so far as Canada was concerned purse seining was to be disallowed. Regulations were passed which did prohibit the use of purse seines by Canadian fishermen. The United States have since agreed to this in the treaty waters. I think that to-day the question is : Is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries doing all that he should do? It is no use for us to go to others and say 'we want you to agree to certain stringent regulations' unless we are able to say that we ourselves have set our house in order. It is not worth while to ask the United States government to agree to something that we have not done ourselves. I object altogether to the United States having anything to do with the policy of the Canadian government with respect to the fisheries. It seems to me that there is too much of this deferring to the United States when it comes to dealing with our own fisheries. We are having too many joint agreements with them, too many international commissions with respect not only to our fisheries but to our waterways. Now, it is our railways. Practically we have come to the point where it is a question of the United States arranging our tariff for us. All these things should be worked out on Canadian lines, and I think the government of Canada should set a high standard if they want others to follow. I do not believe that the Canadian fishermen would find any fault with the government for saying that steam trawling should not be permitted, and I think the Canadian government should take every means it possibly can to prevent the operation of steam trawling in Canadian waters and outside of Canadian waters, and to do that by preventing the ships from landing their fares at Canadian ports.

The minister referred to a question which is a somewhat interesting one, when he stated that in the year 1907 the department had arranged to give certain assistance to the transportation of Canadian-caught fish in order to bring the fish into the upper Canadian market. Prior to that, he stated, the Americans practically controlled the fish market in central Canada. He quoted the following figures: In 1906, Canada imported from the United States 1,968,000 pounds of fresh fish; in 1908, under this new arrangement whereby Canadian fish got into the Canadian market, its import had fallen to 1,180,000 pounds; in the year 1910 this had fallen to 761,569 pounds. This statement gave the minister a good deal of satisfaction and I think there is every reason for satisfaction in that regard. But the minister omitted to state one very important thing which had led up to this condition. He should have gone a little further and explained that in the year 1907 the government of Canada increased the duty on fish from half a cent to one cent a pound, making it the same as that charged by the United States. It was that very measure, together with the assistance in the payment of the transportation charges which gave the Canadian fishermen on the Atlantic coast, entrance into the Canadian market as far as western Ontario. I remember that in the year 1906, when the commission known as the tariff commission, consisting of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) visited Nova Scotia, I had the honour of appearing before them at the town of Middleton representing the fishing interests of the county that I have now the honour to represent in this House. I then pointed out to the Tariff Commission that the fact of the United States having a duty of one cent a pound on fish as against our half cent a pound gave them control of our upper Canadian market, and that it was largely supplied from Portland, Gloucester and Boston ; also that the transportation rates were very high and that the chance of getting Canadian-caught fish in the upper Canadian market under the then existing conditions was practically nil.

I was pleased at a later date to see that the government had taken the steps to which I have alluded, and I wish to point out the results in the way of increased shipments from the maritime provinces to our Canadian markets. At page LXXVI of the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for 1909-10, I find the following figures showing the shipments of fresh cod and fresh and smoked haddock in the last ten years:—

Year.	Cod, Fresh or Green.	Haddock, Fresh and Smoked.
	Lbs.	Lbs.
1900	Nil.	7,560,625
1901	Nil.	8,691,669
1902	Nil.	7,751,883
1903	504,500	10,060,283
1904	1,238,985	9,875,700
1905	1,876,000	14,216,384
1906	2,170,695	18,246,866
1907-08	6,895,900	15,259,535
1908-09	5,432,100	11,845,619
1909-10	4,354,871	13,557,442

Within the last three years, although there has seemingly been a reduced catch (to judge from these figures) there has

been a tremendous increase in the quantity of green and partly cured fish, which has come into the upper Canadian market from the maritime provinces, a trade which has been of very considerable advantage to those on the Atlantic coast, who have secured that market.

I wish, in closing, to give to the House a description of one of these steam trawlers and its methods of operation. I shall quote an extract from the New York 'Syren,' quoted by Mr. M. H. Nickerson, M.P.P. for Shelburne in the local legislature in 1909. The extract reads:

The second largest trawler built this year by Messrs. Cochrane & Sons, of Bologne, was launched recently from their ship-building yard at Selby, the 'Canada' by name. She is described as the largest trawler afloat, and, in fact, is five feet longer than the 'Notre Dame des Dunes.' Her principle dimensions are 156 feet long, 26 feet broad, 15 feet deep moulded, and she will be fitted with powerful triple expansion engines by Messrs. Amos & Smith, of Hull, having cylinders fifteen inches, 25 inches and 42 inches by 27 inches, with a large boiler 15 by 10, and 180 pounds pressure. She has been specially constructed for the Newfoundland fishery, having large trawl winches to contain 1,000 fathoms of warp on each drum. She has also steam windlass, electric light throughout, isolated fish rooms, and in every respect has been fitted up in the most up-to-date manner for deep-sea fishing. Messrs. Wales, Dove and Company's well known bitumastic enamel has been applied to the bottom fore and aft ballast tanks, cabin, engine and boiler spacongs, bunkers, fish room, feed tank, forecastle, store rooms and plates. We understand that Messrs. Cochrane & Sons have in hand a similar vessel for Portuguese owners. Mons. J. Huret is probably the owner of the 'Canada.' He has a number of trawlers engaged in the bank fishery.

The operation of the trawl is thus described:

This trawl was an immense bag of netting, say 100 feet in length and perhaps longer in some of the latter devices, with a very wide mouth or opening on each side of which there was a board, a short wooden wall, resting on the bottom, and between them were stretched two strong ropes forming the upper and the under edge of the mouth, to which the twine was attached. There was a rope from each of these boards to a drum, to the bow and to the stern of the ship. The whole apparatus is dragged slowly along over the bottom while the ship is under headway. The same action caused the mouth to open wide, while the netting took in the fish. It could easily be seen that this device would enclose a multitude of ground fish, such as cod and haddock, and like varieties wherever found. When it bagged them it was hauled up by a powerful steam winch and the contents taken on board. When the catch was large the weight of the huge mass killed the fish and often coral and sharp stones were mixed with the fish, which only helped to bruise them more. The worst feature about it was that it destroyed a large number of small fish, which, on account of their size, were not saleable, but if allowed to grow would be saleable. It was like cropping the field before the harvest was ripe, something which would be deprecated on land was looked upon as a great stroke of business at sea.

That was in the spring of 1909, and I understand from the minister that since 1908 the number of French trawlers around Newfoundland has increased from 8 to 29, so it will be seen that this method of fishing is in vogue to an alarming extent; that wealthy interests are building up this business, that it is working to the detriment of the small individual fishermen, that the fisheries are being injured by it, that the spawning grounds are being disturbed and damaged, that the fishermen are having their gear destroyed, with consequent loss of time, that in every respect this trawl fishing must be a constant source of embarrassment to the fisherman and of injury to the fisheries.

I cannot use words stronger than those used by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) in urging on the government the necessity of taking some steps which will effectually prohibit the operation of these vessels in Canadian waters and the landing in Canadian ports of fish caught by them. If we take that stand we will meet with the approval of fishermen throughout the maritime provinces. It may be that a large interest here and there will be prejudicially affected, but I believe that on the whole the end will justify the means; that the fisheries will be conserved and that the interests of the fishermen, which are worthy of the best consideration which can be bestowed on them by this House, will be benefited. The government should protect the poor and hard-working fishermen; the men who are rich enough to build expensive steam trawlers can always protect themselves. I urge on the minister and the House that some steps be taken to protect the Atlantic fisheries of Canada by preventing the landing of fish caught in the trawls at Canadian ports and prohibiting within the three-mile limit the operation of these steam trawlers. The minister has the fisheries protection service fleet at his disposal for that purpose, and under the order in council of 1908 he has power to prohibit their operations. We have the statement of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) that these vessels have been operating within the three-mile limit and altogether we have a position that calls for prompt and energetic action on the part of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I trust that such action will be taken.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am greatly pleased with the way my resolution has been received by the minister and by the hon. members who have spoken. I was sorry

my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Crosby) should feel that I had not treated him courteously.

Mr. CROSBY. I beg to apologize. I did not know at the time I made that statement that notice had been given to the Conservative whips, and I am quite willing to apologize. I thought we had a right to know in advance that this was coming on, and was not aware that notice had been given.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am quite satisfied with my hon. friend's explanation. This resolution was placed on the Order Paper on the 22nd of November, and it was, of course, open to every member to find out on what day it would be discussed; and, as a matter of fact, the whip of the party asked me if I intended going on with the discussion, and I said I did. I supposed that hon. gentlemen who were interested in the resolution would keep themselves posted in this respect. Permit me for a moment to make reference to the remarks of my hon. friend from Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Fraser), about the new regulation under which American vessels are allowed to obtain a license for $1 in place of the old rate. My hon. friend seemed to infer that that meant that the American vessels have obtained some fishing privileges which they had not before in Canadian waters. As I understand the regulation, that is not the case. They have exactly the same privileges that they had formerly under the old license, the only difference being that whereas under the old regulation they paid $1.50 a ton in order to get a license, now they will pay the nominal sum of $1 in order to get a license. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Crosby) was somewhat excited in his speech, and showed himself anxious, or at least willing, to make this a political question. I would be sorry if we had any politics in a question of this kind. I think we ought to be able to agree on some regulation that would meet the circumstances, and I will gladly join in any reasonable proposal which my hon. friend can make that I would consider effective. I regret, however, that my hon. friend finds it necessary to blame the government in this matter, because really the government is not to blame. It has done everything that we could have asked it to do so far. It has prohibited absolutely the use of the trawler in Canadian waters. It has exhausted its jurisdiction so far as that is concerned.

Mr. CROSBY. Did not my hon. friend hear the hon. member for Inverness state that the trawlers were operating within the three-mile limit along the coasts of his county? And is he not in favour of the absolute exclusion of steam trawlers by not permitting them to sell their fish in the maritime provinces?

Mr. SINCLAIR.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I have not had any such complaint from my constituents. I keep myself very well posted with what is going on in connection with the fisheries of my county, and I can state that the order in council prohibiting the use of trawlers within the inshore waters has been fairly well kept on the coast of my county. Not later than last September I had a meeting at which nearly all the fishermen of Canso were present, and we discussed this matter, but no one made the statement that the trawler had been working within the three-mile limit, and there is no such complaint in any of the petitions from my county that are on file.

Mr. CROSBY. Are the fishermen of the county of Guysborough perfectly satisfied with the condition of things at the present time?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No, they are not satisfied. They would like to drive the trawlers off the shore altogether, and I sympathize with them in that desire, and if my hon. friend can show me any practical way in which we can control this matter better than we have been doing I shall be glad to assist him.

Mr. CROSBY. I have suggested a way in which it can be controlled—by the government prohibiting the sale of fish from these steam trawlers in the maritime provinces.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is a proposal that may be worth considering, but the hon. gentleman has not answered the minister's objection to it, that it would simply drive the business to the United States. By doing that you cannot stop the fishing; you can only stop the sale on the coasts of Canada, and the consequence would be that these trawlers would catch the fish outside the three-mile limit, take them to Boston, and from there ship them to Canada. What we want is not to stop the sale of fish in Nova Scotia—that is a very poor proposal—but to stop that method of catching fish. We do not want to drive the fish past our own coast and build up the markets of some foreign nation.

Mr. CROSBY. I will answer the Minister of Marine and Fisheries now. I believe the fishermen of the maritime provinces know more about their business than either the hon. member for Guysborough or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and therefore I take their unanimous decision in favour of absolutely excluding from the maritime provinces the steam trawler, or the beam trawler, and I ask my hon. friend if the people of his county do not desire to prevent the steam trawler selling a pound of fish in the maritime provinces.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the answer the hon. member has made to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and if you are satisfied with his logic I suppose you will be convinced. The hon. member also made a proposal which I suppose will be regarded by the Halifax 'Herald' of to-morrow as a brand-new proposal coming from himself; that is, that a patrol boat be put on the coast in order to protect the fishermen from the sudden storms that come in the winter season. My hon. friend is not very well posted as to what is going on along the coasts of Canada, or he would know that some weeks ago a patrol boat was placed at the point where most of the winter fishing is going on. I refer to the steamer '33,' which has been doing patrol work at Canso. My hon. friend comes to-day with his proposal, after this boat has been put on the patrol grounds by the government, and has done certain work, and he brings in this proposal as if it were now made for the first time.

The hon. minister said that some further investigation should be made, and some officer should be sent on board these vessels to make an investigation. I do not think that will be effective. We shall have to do something more. We would require to adopt the same system as is adopted in Great Britain, and do some experimental work ourselves. The government should take steps to find out for themselves how many of these fish are undersized and whether this trawling system is really a destructive method or not. I question if they could get at the correct facts by sending an officer on board one of these ships. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) seems to want to improve my resolution by saying that these trawlers should be prohibited from all the grounds on which fishing is carried on. I would be quite willing to agree if I thought a resolution would be effective; but the reason why I confine myself to what is described as spawning grounds, is that I wish to have a resolution adopted which will be acceptable, not only to the Canadian government, but to the governments of the United States, and Great Britain and France. If we can point out to all these that it is important in the international interests that the fish should be preserved by protecting the spawning grounds, we might get their consent to regulations for that purpose. My idea is that, in confining the resolution to the spawning grounds, it is more likely to be accepted by foreign governments than the one suggested by my hon. friend. I think the hon. gentleman ought to be more cheerful, and give credit to the present government for what it has done for the fishermen. I shall not take time just now to go into that matter, because that would be a very long story, but both my hon. friend and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) are well aware what a splendid record this government has had in the last fourteen years with regard to the fishermen. All my hon. friends have to do is to travel along the coast, and see the large number of breakwaters built to protect the fishermens' boats, expenditures, I may say, which were very severely criticised by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Let them consider again the large number of lighthouses erected, and the large number of buoys placed in the different harbours and bays, and the number of wharfs built and steamship subsidies to carry the fish to market. The fact that a freight train has been put on the road between Nova Scotia and Montreal to carry fish at low rate and high speed is something my hon. friends ought to bear in mind. All these things have been of the greatest benefit to the fishermen of the maritime provinces.

I regret that my hon. friends should look at this from a political standpoint, but I am glad to know that they will unite with me to-night in the vote, and I hope that something material will result. I trust that we may succeed in obtaining international regulations which will prohibit steam trawlers from operating in the gulf of St. Lawrence and on the banks.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. ROCHE. I beg to move that resolution (No. 12) which stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Antoine's division, Montreal, (Mr. Ames) be discharged, as my hon. friend would prefer to discuss the question raised in this motion, in the reciprocity debate.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not the slightest objection.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence between any department of the government and Mr. W. T. R. Preston, Trade Commissioner in Holland regarding the Netherlands Land Company, since the date of the last resolution adopted by this House, calling for the same at the present session; also a copy of the official document issued by the government respecting the high regard in which western farm lands are held by some of the principal loan and investment companies.—Mr. Monk.

For a copy of the curators' reports in the cases of all banks for which curators have been appointed.—Mr. Foster.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.12 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 7, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 113) to incorporate the Dominion Development Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That from this date to the end of the session, government orders, on Wednesdays, shall have precedence immediately after questions to be put by members.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There are, of course, a good many items of considerable importance still standing under the head of public Bills and orders. I am afraid that, if Wednesday is taken, these will be consigned to the scrap heap. Has the Prime Minister thought of that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am afraid there is not much help for that circumstance. As my hon. friend is aware, all the notices of motion remaining on the list have been gone over at least eight or ten times, and many of the items under public Bills and orders have been called twice. Looking over the notices of motion, I believe that not many of them are very contentious, and I still believe and hope we can get through public Bills and orders on Monday evening.

Mr. LENNOX. I would urge upon the Prime Minister not to cut these gentlemen off without notice. I do not know that I am right in reading this motion as taking effect forthwith?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. To-morrow will be Wednesday. If the Prime Minister would agree that this should not go into effect until a week from to-morrow, I should have nothing to say against it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very well. At the request of my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) I will agree that this shall commence with Wednesday the 15th of February.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We had intended to go on to-day with the reciprocity debate, but I arranged with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), that we shall take this up on Thursday instead of to-day.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO QUESTION.

Mr. GRAHAM. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to make correction of an answer given to a question put by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), with reference to the cost of the Transcontinental railway to December 31, 1910. The figures furnished to me yesterday represented the amount of money paid out to the end of last year, but did not include certain sums that have been paid in January, or that will be paid, but which belong to last year. The corrected figures give the total cost of the Transcontinental railway to December 31, 1910, as $93,920,956.16.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) is now present, I would invite my hon. friend from St. Anne Division, Montreal (Mr. Doherty) to repeat in his presence the objections which he voiced on a previous occasion to the selection of the site for the new Montreal barracks, the particulars of which I was not able to give.

Montreal, new barracks, $100,000.

Mr. DOHERTY. When this item came up on the two previous occasions we understood from the Minister of Public Works that the barracks were to be constructed at Longueuil, and that one of the important purposes of this barracks was to place a unit of the permanent force there, and to provide a military school for the benefit of the Montreal district. I inquired then whether the officers who take an active interest in militia matters in Montreal had been consulted, and had approved of the location of these barracks at Montreal, or what their judgment had been. For myself, while I do not undertake to pronounce a judgment on that matter, I did venture to point out that a military school situated so far away from the residences of the majority of the young men who would in all probability attend this school, was open to some objection, that it was a place difficult of access, and would hardly meet the want that has been felt in Montreal. If I am not mistaken, it has been found that the military school situated at St. Johns does not afford the oportunity that was expected for the young men, who I am sure we would all be glad to see taking an active part in the operations of our militia, and who we want to see afforded every opportunity of qualifying

themselves to perform their duties effectively. The situation of the school at St. Johns was found to be such as to prevent a large number of young men taking advantage of it, inasmuch as they are all engaged in business activities, and it is impossible for them, without great inconvenience and considerable loss, to absent themselves from the city. Now to overcome that objection it was suggested that we should have a military school in Montreal, but a military school at Longueuil can hardly be called a military school in Montreal. Individually, I am not familiar with the precise site on which it is proposed to erect these barracks, but I do know that the access from different portions of Montreal, I think I may say from those portions where the majority of those who want to use the school would come from, is not convenient or easy. If this school is to be available for the class of young men who are to attend it, I think it would be important that its courses should take the form of evening instruction, and if they do take that form, it will be exceedingly difficult, in many cases impossible for young men to go over to Longueuil early enough in the evening to have any reasonable time to devote to their lessons and get back home again at a reasonable hour. I do not oppose the erection of the barracks, but I am pointing out what I think is desirable, namely, that the minister should take the judgment of those officers in the Montreal district who know the needs and requirements of the class of young men who are to attend this school.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I think the points of view presented by my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) are entitled to the greatest possible consideration, and they have not escaped the consideration of the department. I can say that the officers of the garrison of Montreal, or perhaps more important still, the military district of Montreal, have been consulted, some of them at any rate, about this matter. As a matter of fact, they are interested in the establishment of a military school at Montreal, and have been for a long time. I have had an opportunity of discussing the matter with a good many of the more prominent men, and I will say at once that while they do not all approve of the location at this point—there is no one place perhaps in the city of Montreal on which they would all agree—I think, however, I can safely say that in a general way the officers of the city of Montreal, and of the military district of Montreal, will be satisfied with this location. The difficulty of accessibility that my hon. friend has referred to is an important one. But the same difficulty would exist if, for instance, the school had been located at Pointe aux Trembles, which was one of the places talked of. We own a large rifle range at Pointe aux Trembles, a few miles below the city of Montreal, although it may now be within the city limits.

That was talked of, and the present proposal is more agreeable to the officers generally, as far as I know, than the location at Pointe Aux Trembles would be. Then there was a suggestion as to Lachine, another point some distance to the westward of the centre of the city, quite as far away as the present proposed location. That proposal would have been as good as the present proposal but no better. So, upon the whole, even from the point of view of accessibility I think the present location is fairly satisfactory. Accessibility will be measured by time. How long does it take from a given point, the post office, or some central point in the city of Montreal to get to a given place? I understand that by way of the Victoria bridge at all times of the year, and by crossing the river by ferry in certain seasons of the year, the time occupied in going from the centre of Montreal to Longueuil is only a few minutes, and that the tendency is towards improvement in that regard. There is the Southern Counties railway, and there is the street railway giving direct accommodation with the centre of Montreal—better communication than there is with our rifle ranges at Pointe Aux Trembles. I think there is no serious difficulty on that ground. As far as officers outside of the city are concerned, it cannot make any difference to them and these military depots are of quite as much importance to the country militia as to the city militia.

As to evening schools and that sort of thing, I do not know what the course of instruction would be, but it would always be easy for us to arrange a course of instruction at hours which would suit professional and business men in the city, and an effort will be made to do that wherever the location may be. We had also to consider, Mr. Chairman, another matter of importance, and that is the question of expense. The government own this land. It was owned by the British war office, and it was handed over to the Canadian government at the time of confederation. It is a block of land between 100 and 200 acres in extent and, as a matter of fact, it is costing Canada not one single dollar as against the problem we had before us of purchasing between 100 and 200 acres of land in the city of Montreal, or near Montreal at a cost of $300,000 or $400,000, and perhaps $1,000,000. It seemed to me that that was a point that could not be disregarded. It is a matter of very considerable consequence, and I felt that a very difficult problem had been solved when I found this land practically waiting for us, and I thought I was acting in the public interest

as well as in the interest of the militia, to have adopted it as a site for our barracks at Montreal.

I may say that in addition to my own judgment I consulted the best military authorities we had. I consulted General Sir Percy Lake, who was here at that time, and he entirely approved, and I think I may say that it is the unanimous opinion of the Militia Council, and of the best authorities here and in Montreal that we should have pursued the course we have.

I think that perhaps covers the points raised, but I understand my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) to raise a question as to the overflow of certain portions of this land at certain times when the river is high, and as to the unsanitary conditions which might arise therefrom. It is a most important question, and it has received and is receiving the careful consideration of the department. I believe that with a very slight expenditure of money in erecting a dyke all these difficulties of overflow can be met. There is only a small portion of the land which has ever overflowed at any time, and that can be protected by a proper dyke as is done at many points on the other side of the river about Montreal itself. As to the sanitary conditions, I am informed that the greatest difficulty is with regard to the water, but, of course that is a problem which can be solved and must be solved. As to the question of getting rid of sewage there is a difficulty, but we are able to solve that difficulty, and it will be done in accordance with the most up to date principles governing matters of hygiene.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I desire, to correct a mistake which has been made by several hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this question. They speak of the site of the barracks as being in Longueuil. For instance, I heard my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) referring to it in that way. It should have been referred to as Montreal South. Montreal South is a distinct municipality, and I have received two or three letters from gentlemen protesting against it being confused with Longueuil. They do not want it to be called Longueuil, they want it to be called Montreal South because it is a distinct and a very active municipality. As regards the transportation question, as the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) has just said, access to it is easy enough now by any of the three routes available—the steam railway, the electric railway, and the ferry boat. Unless you located the site in the very city of Montreal you could not get a better place or one more quickly accessible than the site of Montreal South. If you desired to locate at Pointe Aux Trembles or any other place outside of Montreal you would have to go a long distance out before you could get as large a space as you get at Montreal South. You cannot get a more healthy place than Montreal South. It is on a higher level than the city of Montreal unless you get up on the mountain, it is higher than Longueuil, and it has a magnificent water-power to get water from. I do not think there is a place in the province of Quebec healthier than Longueuil and Montreal South. The water which flows on the south side of the St. Lawrence is freer from impurity than the water in the other portions of the St. Lawrence in the vicinity of Montreal. The minister has said truly that the question of expense is a very important one. The government own 180 acres of land there which they can get for nothing, which has been there doing nothing and giving no revenue at all. If they bought the same quantity of land somewhere around the city of Montreal I do not think they could get it for less than $300,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. $500,000.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Yes, and that is a very important consideration. I would point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty), that the men who will use that school do not all come from the city of Montreal, but live in the military district. I do not think the government could have made a better choice.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it of convenient access for the officers and men living in the city of Montreal ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. Certainly. There are four ways to get there: an electric railway service every 15 minutes, a steam railway, a ferry boat, and in winter the ice bridge.

Mr. DOHERTY. I must apologize most profoundly and most humbly to the outraged inhabitants of Montreal South, that I should have been guilty of describing them as citizens of Longueuil, I had thought that Longueuil was a fairly good, an eminent name in this country, but as a good Montrealer, I can sympathize with the desire of all Canadians to connect themselves with the name of that great city. I trust my hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion), will convey to his outraged constituents my humble apology. I would plead by way of mitigation that the Minister of Public Works told me the barracks was to be built in Longueuil.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said the barrracks was to be built at Tête du Pont, and my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty), should know where that is.

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, perhaps the residents of the city of Montreal South would rather be described as living at Tête du Pont than at Longueuil. Be that as it may, I would not venture to put my judgment

against that of the high military authorities who are said to have pronounced in favour of this location. I do not want to make any invidious comparison, but I think it will have to be conceded that the greater number of those who will use the school, live in the city of Montreal, and from that point of view, it is not unreasonable to urge that the convenience of the greater number should be a major consideration in this matter. After all, there is not much object in having a school if you do not have the scholars, and if our militia is to be what we desire, then we should endeavour to put at the disposal of these patriotic young men who devote their time and energy to the service of their country, every facility for qualifying themselves in the best manner. There is no doubt that the question of economy is also important, and it has been pointed out that this land now belongs to the Crown, and that it would cost a great deal of money to purchase property in Montreal. But, Montreal is fairly large even without going to Pointe aux Trembles or Lachine, and within its municipal area there are to be found properties of very varying value. If the purpose to be served can only be properly served by putting the school in the city of Montreal, then the country ought to be willing to spend the money. To build an establishment of this sort in a place where it will not serve its purpose, simply because you can build it cheaply, is like going to a bargain counter to buy things you don't want, simply because you get them under the regular price. Certainly if we cannot get the school to serve its purpose then we had better save our money.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). Does the hon. gentleman want the school to be built within the limits of the city of Montreal?

Mr. DOHERTY. My desire is that the school should be built in a place sufficiently accessible to the majority of those who will use it so as to produce the best possible results. I do not say that it is absolutely necessary that it should be within the limits of the city, but you can get outside the city limits without going across the St. Lawrence river. True, as we have been told, there is a railway, a ferry boat, and a tramway running to the south shore, but the ferry boat starts from the extreme end of the city which makes it quite a long journey for the residents of St. Anne, or St. Antoine, or the North End, and, the ferry boat only runs at certain intervals. Then, the ferry runs from Montreal to the very much despised Longueuil, and after you get to Longueuil, you are still quite a distance from Montreal South. I doubt very much if a large number of the officers and men could get from their residences to the ferry and across the river in less than an hour or an hour and a quarter. As to the steam railway, I would suppose that the trains are not run at hours which would enable those attending the night school to get from the city to the school and return the same evening. I am informed by those who use the tramway, that at certain hours of the day, (in the evening particularly), the tramway runs once every 40 minutes, and if one car is missed, you have to wait 40 minutes for another, which of course, would be an obstacle to attending the evening school by that means of access. On the whole, it appears to me that the location of the school would be highly inconvenient for a large number of the young men, unless they should be prepared to sacrifice their time at the occupations by which they earn their livelihod. I understand the minister to say that the officers of the district, so far as he consulted them, were not agreed on any one site in Montreal, and I would be glad to know if they did not at least agree that it would be desirable to have some site in Montreal or in the immediate vicinity of the city. Is the minister aware that the public press in Montreal has spoken upon this subject and that 'La Presse,' a newspaper which certainly is not unfriendly to the present administration, but which has given them a very consistent support, had an article on this subject since the matter came up in this House, in which it pointed out briefly, but with great force, the objections I had been making. Furthermore, that newspaper takes the responsibility of saying that the place is in a most doubtful condition from the point of view of health and the further responsibility, which I would not take, of saying that the officers or men connected with the permanent force, condemn the site as being in most doubtful sanitary condition. This responsible journal, I presume after inquiry, has felt justified in making these statements, and I need not say that they have not been inspired by me. The fact that this paper takes the responsibility of making these statements, should furnish ground for the minister to at least, promise that the grounds for these assertions shall be looked into, and that it shall be made quite certain that from the point of view of health, there is no objection to the site chosen.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will repeat what I have said in regard to the latter point: all questions relating to water supply and sanitation have received, are receiving and will receive most careful consideration. I do not think there is any difficulty with reference to these particular points. As to the question of accessibility and the view which officers in Mont-

real take of the site, several of the prominent senior officers of Montreal have told me that they prefer this site to some sites within the city of Montreal which have been mentioned. As to the means of getting to the place and the statement that there is only one car in 40 minutes, these are growing times, and I am rather inclined to think that when the military barracks and school are situated at Montreal South there may be a car once in every 20 minutes, or perhaps once in every 10 minutes. So I do not think that is a very serious difficulty.

As to the relative numbers of officers and non-commissioned officers who require facilities for teaching or training living in the city of Montreal and in the country, I think a very much larger number live in the country and therefore if we satisfy the outside portion of the militia we are accomplishing a good deal. The fullest steps will be taken to consult the convenience of officers and non-commissioned officers residing in Montreal. I cannot see why evening classes might not be held at the new school at Montreal South; there will be no difficulty in getting there before 8 o'clock or 7.30, and in getting home after 10, probably 25 or 30 minutes would be all that would be necessary to get from Montreal to school. Then it is quite common to hold classes in the great central drill hall in Montreal, and there is no reason why a detachment of instructors should not to be sent into the city at any time to suit the convenience of any officers who find it inconvenient to go to the barracks. So, taking it for all in all, I think this will be found to be an entirely satisfactory solution of a very difficult problem, one of the most difficult I have had to contend with since I became Minister of Militia. We have been talking about establishing this school at Montreal for over 14 years, and I am looking forward with a great deal of pleasure to the day when my hon. friend will have these buildings constructed and this school and barracks successfully established.

Mr. HUGHES. Last year two or three officers wrote me concerning this proposed site. Their objections were first the inaccessibility of the site, and second, the condition of the ground. It was pointed out by these gentlemen that part of the ground is very low and that part of it is a sticky clay, so that on dewy mornings, unless it were well drained, it would be a rather unfavourable ground on which to drill. I have made inquiries from some of the gentlemen representing that part of the country and they tell me that that condition extends only a short distance along the river bank and that the ground is higher and more sandy further back.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is true, it is very high ground, most of it.

Mr. MONK. I happen to be acquainted with the topography of that place, and I think there is some misunderstanding. Montreal South is a thriving suburb and the land just near the St. Lawrence is a rather favourable site, but it gets lower as you go back, and if the property in question is somewhat remote from the river there will be considerable expense in draining it. Why has the site been changed? Because at one time the government had decided practically upon a different and to my mind a very much more convenient site. Why the department should have left that site aside in order to take one much less convenient, one would like to know.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does my hon. friend say there was a site selected by the government before this one?

Mr. MONK. The government at one time selected a site on the western slope of the mountain, and it is absurd to talk of a price of $400,000 or $500,000 for that site, because that property was sold lately for $150,000 and could have been bought for less when the government had it in view. If you calculate what it will cost to build at Montreal South on account of the sanitary condition of the ground there, you will find that this government, however desirous it may be to economize, might have spent $150,000 in buying the site on the slope of the mountain and still have saved money. It is a matter of almost public notoriety that the military officers in Montreal highly approved of that site. I understood that the minister himself (Sir Frederick Borden) had visited it and pronounced it unequalled.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What place?

Mr. MONK. The site chosen at Northmount, not very far from the Hunt Club.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I never chose it.

Mr. MONK. Well, we thought it was a sure thing because we heard that the order in council had been passed.

Mr. BRODEUR. There never was such an order in council passed

Mr. MONK. Does my hon. friend deny that there was a question of this site?

Mr. BRODEUR. There was question of several sites, but there never was any order in council passed selecting that site.

Mr. MONK. That may be, but it was rumoured in Montreal that the matter had been put through with the approval of the Governor General. The site I refer to is situated within a few minutes of every part

of the city. Every car leaves there and you can get there for 4 cents at any hour of the day or night.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So every car leaves there with a transfer.

Mr. MONK. When you embark on this new railway, the Montreal and Southern railway, and get to the other side, my hon. friend knows there is still a great distance to go before you reach this place.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The electric road runs right alongside this property.

Mr. MONK. At any rate, it is quite a distance to reach from the ferry, or the starting point of this new electric road.

Mr. GEOFFRION. You can start from McGill street, in the centre of the city.

Mr. MONK. How often does my hon. friend go there?

Mr. GEOFFRION. I go there every week and I take the cars on McGill street.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that you have to get over there before you can take the railway, and you do not get a transfer. You have to go to the foot of McGill street and there take the car, and it takes you 40 minutes to get to Longueuil. I am not aware what the fare is.

Mr. GEOFFRION. It is 5 cents right to the grounds, and there is a car every 3 minutes, not every 40 minutes.

Mr. MONK. Is my hon. friend quite sure the fare is only 5 cents?

Mr. GEOFFRION. Quite sure.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me impossible to compare the two places. For the people of the city—and those who will avail themselves of the school will mostly come from the city—and for students from the country it would be vastly more convenient to have the site within the limits of the city than on the outside. I am not versed in strategy, but perhaps my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) could give us some pointers on that; but I should think that in the case of war it would be better to have the school on the top of a mountain than on low ground on the other side of the river and close to the United States. Of course, I am not talking from a naval point of view.

Mr. BRODEUR. It would have this advantage, that a navy could get there.

Mr. MONK. By the time we shall have done the sanitary work required there and other necessary expenditures, we shall have expended more than one-half of what we could have bought this place for on the slope of the mountain. We understood at the time that experts from the department, high up in the military organization, had visited that site at Northmount and had unanimously recommended it. The department has largely increased its expenditure. We are spending over $7,000,000 this year and our expenditure will soon be up to $10,000,000, as compared with the $1,200,000 which we expended some years ago.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). In what riding is Northmount?

Mr. MONK. It is just alongside the riding of my hon. friend.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). There are many ridings alongside of mine. It is alongside the riding of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is altogether too cunning. He knows very well where it is, and must not imagine that in a matter of this kind it is anxiety to have the military school in the county of Jacques Cartier which leads me to make these observations. I am very much interested in Montreal South, as I am a land owner there, and also very much interested in the progress of Montreal, and I certainly did not dream it was in the interests of the county of Jacques Cartier that I supported the very reasonable view taken by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty).

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There never was any lot of land chosen by the department as a location for a military school in Montreal. There was a lot at Lachine, and I do not know whether it is this one to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. MONK. No, to Northmount, which is on the western slope of the mountain.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There was a lot, part of the way up the mountain which I visited myself at one time, but which the general officer then, General Lake, told me was altogether too small and would not suit the purpose at all. I went and visited the lot myself, and it seemed to me not large enough. It was some 50 to 60 acres at the most, and would have cost over $200,000.

Mr. MONK. It has just been sold to a religious order for $150,000, and property has considerably advanced.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am speaking of the price put upon it at that time. It seemed to me altogether beyond a reasonable price—I do not mean for the land, but to be paid by this department for that quantity of land. I wish to emphasize the point that there never was a lot of land in Montreal or anywhere else selected for this purpose until we had decided upon this.

Mr. HUGHES. How is this property situated for rifle ranges?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is exactly opposite the Pointe aux Trembles rifle range which point is accessible by ferry, and the rifle ranges will answer the purposes of the permanent force there perfectly well.

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot refrain from expressing my gratification at finding that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is showing himself more and more in favour of military and naval expenditure —provided that the expenditure be made in his own county. He did not so express it, but the lot of land he had in mind when he spoke a few minutes ago is situated in his county, and he was willing to have military expenditure made there. Perhaps my hon. friend's attitude in opposition to military expenditure might be pleaded as justifying our refusal to select the site to which he refers—it might frighten him to see military works in his county. I should have been rather afraid that my hon. friend would take umbrage at such a thing being done. I am glad he is coming back to the idea that we might establish that school in his county, and I congratulate him on his conversion. Now, there is no doubt that the place selected is a suitable place for such a military school. The school that we have had, that at St. Johns, is situated at some distance from Montreal. It has been, and is to-day, rendering great service. Still, it was certainly desirable that we should have a military school near Montreal. For some years the question has been discussed and military authorities have been considering the question. I am glad that my hon. friend (Sir Frederick Borden) has been able to select so good a site for this purpose. A number of sites were suggested to the government. The Minister of Militia has given his best consideration to these, and has come to the conclusion that the site on the other side of the river, at Montreal South, near Longueuil, is the best available. There is a special reason which, I think, should commend it to the House, and that is the land already belongs to the government. It had been advertised for sale, if I remember well, some years ago, but we could not get the price we expected.

Mr. MONK. You can get $100,000 for it now.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a very suitable site, and one easy of access to the people of Montreal, more so than almost any place that could be selected on the Island of Montreal. At one time, there was not much communication with Longueuil from the city of Montreal. But there is now constant communication by vehicles crossing the reconstructed Victoria bridge. And the property of the government is just opposite the ferry boat landing, the ferry giving a 15-minute service during the summer. There is also railway communication. I think that, in all respects, it is the most suitable place that could be chosen. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier says that the government will have to incur large expense in drainage works and other improvements. But if we were to purchase the property the hon. gentleman has in mind there would be the same expense.

Mr. MONK. Everything is there now.

Mr. BRODEUR. Besides, it is not near the river as is the site which has been selected.

Mr. MONK. Has the government sold any part of its property in Montreal South?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not since I have known anything about it. I think there are one or two schools situated on it that have been there for many years. But nothing has been sold of late, and nothing will be sold.

Mr. MONK. Has anything been sold in the last two years?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. MONK. Has the government purchased any other property in Montreal South?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that covers all the items under vote No. 139. Perhaps we might take up No. 140 under which there are two or three military items for Ontario that stood over.

Kingston Royal Military College, additional dormitory accommodation for cadets, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does any hon. gentleman desire information as to this item? If not, it might be considered carried.

Mr. CROTHERS. We should have more information from the Minister of Militia before this is carried.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have a memorandum on the subject from the commandant of the college; but I have not it here, because I understood the reciprocity debate was coming on to-day, and so did not bring it. I am not prepared, therefore, to go on with this item; so it would be better to let it stand. I will be prepared, when it comes up again, to give all information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Better let all the military items stand.

Public Works—Chargeable to Income—Generally—Construction of immigration buildings, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to construct buildings of a smaller class required to

meet the necessities of localities, which necessities arise very often without long warning. Hon. members can understand that, as the western country is filling up very rapidly, cases of this character arise.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was spent out of this vote last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We erected a building at Unity, Saskatchewan, did some work in the Halifax detention hospital, constructed a building at North Portal, on the international boundary, put up small buildings at Wilkie, Battleford and Saskatoon, leaving unexpended of last year's vote $7,707.40.

Mr. BLAIN. Where may we expect this to be expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We expect to spend $3,100 in Edson, Alberta, that being now the point of departure for a considerable portion of the Peace River district. A road has been built from Edson, which is near the foothills of the Rocky mountains, and people are travelling from there through to the Grand Prairie, in the Peace River district. We propose expending $3,100 there, and at Entwistle, $3,100. That is all that is actually engaged.

Experimental Farms—New buildings and improvements, renewals and repairs, &c., in connection with existing buildings, fences, &c., $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a general vote for experimental farms all over the Dominion.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the minister should give us a statement of the places where these expenditures will be made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not do that, but I can say where the expenditures were made last year. We expended last year at Nappan, $343; Rossland, $39; Brandon, $864; Indian Head, $515; Lethbridge, $15; Agassiz, British Columbia, $780; Ottawa experimental farm, $11,251; additional office building, $7.517.

Mr. BLAIN. I asked the minister how he proposed to expend the amount we are now voting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give the details, for the reason that it has been customary each year to take a vote for $25,000, and those expenditures are made upon the request of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture could give us an explanation?

Mr. FISHER. This item is larger than it was last year, because of the fact that the number of farms has increased. We have added to the number of farms by purchasing a new property. The first year while that property is being equipped it is paid for out of another vote, which appears in the estimates under the heading of Agriculture, Arts and Statistics. But when the farms are established, then any additional buildings or repairs that are required are paid for out of the vote in the Public Works Department which is now under discussion. I have not with me at the moment the details how it is expected to expend this amount of money in the next year, but I will be able to give them when the Agricultural estimates are down. The buildings at the Central Experimental farm here require considerable additions and repairs, which will have to be made. Some of the houses here have got into a bad condition, and must be attended to.

Mr. BLAIN. Does that mean that my hon. friend was neglecting his duty?

Mr. FISHER. No, it means that we have been carrying them along as far as we reasonably could without making extensive repairs. But the time has been reached when an overhauling has to be done. We have expended a little from time to time. For instance, the house of the director at the Central Experimental farm will require next year a complete overhauling. Dr. Saunders has been careful not to expend anything that was not absolutely necessary, but something must now be done. This item applies, not only to the Central farm, but to all the branch farms. There was a time a few years ago when this item was only $10,000 a year; last year it was $20,000, and now we ask for $25,000. I may mention another item of expenditure. Some years ago we undertook to lay down cement walks around the buildings of the Central farm, for the reason that such walks would last practically forever. Formerly we used to lay down wooden sidewalks, which had to be repaired frequently.

Mr. THORNTON. Is it customary, after an experimental farm has been established and equipped, to charge necessary repairs to the Department of Public Works?

Mr. FISHER. We have a vote in the estimates under Arts, Agriculture and Statistics for additional branch farms that we may buy; we make the purchase of those farms out of that vote. Then as soon as the farm gets into working order, we cease to take the necessary expenses out of that vote, and this vote would apply to it as to the older farms.

Mr. THORNTON. How many farms have been established this year?

Mr. FISHER. This last year we have only established one new farm at Scott, in the province of Saskatchewan. I hope

before winter is over to get one or two more. I have also purchased two farms in the province of Quebec within the last few months. One of these is completely equipped as it was purchased, the other will require considerable to be laid out upon it, but this vote will not be applicable to that. But as soon as the farms are purchased and the necessary buildings are erected, then this vote would be applicable for repairs.

Mr. BEST. Does the minister get an estimate of the cost of the new buildings and improvements on buildings, or does he ask for a lump sum?

Mr. FISHER. The sum is based upon the estimate of the farm staff as to what will be required in the ensuing year.

Mr. BEST. Then it is only what you expect to need?

Mr. FISHER. This is an estimate of what we want to provide for.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Can the minister tell us whether this vote includes any provision for a dairy building at Agassiz, or if that has been otherwise provided for?

Mr. FISHER. The changes at Agassiz which my hon. friend refers to will be taken out of this vote.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Is it the intention to erect a dairy building there and pay some attention to dairying in connection with the Agassiz farm?

Mr. FISHER. It is intended to so rearrange and reorganize the buildings there as to establish a good dairy farm.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before you take up the next sub-item, I would like to say that the other day the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) asked whether any of the departments had purchased land from the Grand Trunk Pacific Development Company, and I told him that I was not aware of it, and said that nothing had been purchased by my department. In answer to a question, he told me that he had the Department of Agriculture in mind. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture being present, I would be very glad if he would be good enough to make a statement, so that it may go on 'Hansard' for the information of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FISHER. A little over a year ago I entered into negotiations for the purchase of a piece of land near the station of Scott, on the Grand Trunk Pacific railway between Saskatoon and Edmonton. I am speaking now from memory, but I think there are 223 acres of land which I purchased from the Grand Trunk Pacific Development Company. This area was part of the land which the company had acquired from the government under the arrangement with them for town sites along their line. I secured it from them at exactly the same price as they paid to the government, plus the interest between the time that they purchased from the government and the time at which I purchased from them, so that it was practically just taking back the land which had been granted to them under the arrangement for town sites. The land is immediately adjacent to the town site of Scott. It comprises a quarter-section, and the portion of another quarter-section, which lies between that quarter-section and the railway track. The railway track is the northern boundary, the main road out of Scott to the south is the eastern boundary, and it comprises, I think I am correct in saying, 223 acres, all of it absolutely virgin soil. None of it had been ploughed or touched until we did work on it last summer, and it is of the highest character and quality as prairie soil. I hope to be able to establish a station there, which will be of great value to the communities subservient to it. I am giving this explanation in answer to the question that was asked.

Fire escapes for Dominion public buildings, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to meet the demands for fire escapes upon public buildings throughout the Dominion. Sometimes there is a demand from the people occupying the buildings that fire escapes should be placed upon them, and sometimes the local by-laws require it. We did not spend the whole amount last year; in fact, only $478, but the chief architect tells me that it is desirable to obtain a vote for this amount so as to make provision for fire escapes as they may be required.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any public competition in the supplying of these?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sometimes, when the work is considerable, but ordinarily the work on each building costs only $100, or $150, or $200.

Mr. BLAIN. What system of fire escapes does the minister adopt? There is a considerable number of these in vogue in Canada, and I presume that the minister has arrived at some decisions with regard to them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are all of iron, and they are all of the usual character. At Longueuil public building the work was done by the Capital Scale, Brass & Foundry Iron Company; they made the fire escape of iron and erected it at a cost of $195. At Clinton there was a balcony fire escape erected at a cost of $107, and at Cornwall there was a fire escape erected at a cost of $348. I have not the particulars of that, but it was the ordinary class of iron fire escape.

Public buildings, generally, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for public buildings throughout the Dominion. It is an item which has been voted from year to year, and it is for demands that are made with respect to matters which are not otherwise provided for. Last year, up to the 27th of December, out of this vote there were paid the following amounts:—

Travelling expenses, clerks of works and officials	$ 3,593 18
Photographic supplies	303 70
King's Printer, printing and stationery	2,323 03
Telegrams	1,007 43
Sundries	367 05
Total	$ 7,594 39

Leaving unexpended on the 28th December, 1910, a balance of $2,405.61. This is used for travelling expenses, stationery and printing, telegraphy and other miscellaneous items.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister explain what the stationery and printing are required for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are required for the chief architect's office and the clerk of works offices.

Tobacco curing, experimental stations, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. We obtained $5,000 last year, but it was not expended. The Department of Agriculture are again asking for it this year. The idea is to use it for the establishment of tobacco experimental stations.

Mr. CROTHERS. Are there any such stations now, and if so, where are they situated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I might give my hon. friend the details of the expenditure in connection with this service made during the fiscal year 1909-10. At St. Cesaire, Quebec, there was erected a drying room, with two metallic ventilators, and a curing room, at a cost of $610. At St. Jacques de L'Achigan, Quebec, there was a curing barn erected, also a drying room and ventilators at a total expenditure of $586. At Colchester, Ontario, there was a curing barn erected, with a basement, two drying kilns, a rack of two arches for heating, cement floors, excavation, costing $2,636.30. At Ottawa there was some work done at a cost of $310, all out of this vote.

Ottawa public buildings, elevator attendance, $26,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Do not the owners of the leased buildings provide the elevator attendance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It depends on the lease. We occupy the whole of the Regal building and the Imperial buildings and the government operates the elevators, whereas we occupy only a part of the Trafalgar building, and the owner runs the elevator.

Mr. CROTHERS. I understood the minister to say that the foundation of the driveway was solid concrete. I have been told that it was gravel and crushed stone rolled. Which is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Solid concrete.

Mr. CROTHERS. There is a new iron fence on the parliament grounds for which I cannot find an appropriation in the estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad to have an opportunity of explaining. The old fence upon Mackenzie avenue was no longer necessary, and we moved it together with the stone foundation to the parliament grounds; using the services of our own men, and doing the job at comparatively little expense.

Heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen, $133,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Have increases of salaries been given?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In quite a number of cases.

Mr. BLAIN. How are they given?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We give such increases as we think are justifiable upon the report of the foremen of the heads of the department.

Mr. BLAIN. Have any been refused increases?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. We try to reward merit, and give fair compensation for service rendered.

Mr. BLAIN. Who are judges of that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We obtain reports from the chief architect and the foremen or superintendents, and the recommendation comes to the deputy minister and finally to the minister.

Mr. BLAIN. On what grounds were increases refused last year? Can the minister give a list of the applications for increases made, the number granted, the number refused, and the grounds for refusal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get the information as far as possible, but of course, an application may be refused without the grounds being stated.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Last year the total amount paid for this service was $118,000, and this year you are asking $133,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was for the year ending 31st March, 1910, and the present

estimates are for the year ending 31st March, 1912, and there are additional men and increases of salaries which would account for the difference.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was the $125,000 asked for last year expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is anticipated that it will all be expended by March 31, next.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How does it come that there is this large increase of $8,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can give the estimate. Coal is estimated to cost $62,655.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is coal higher?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Anthracite coal $6.90, slack bituminous $4.70, cannel $8.75, and blacksmith $7.

Mr. REID (Grenville). You are paying higher prices?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Those are the prices of the lowest tenderer, Messrs. Heney & Son. Then there is the heating of the Canadian militia building and wages.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What additional buildings are you going to heat, and employ officials in, this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Regal building, the Naval building, the new Museum, and the building which has been erected as a peat testing depot. Wages of the heating staff including coal men, wood men, &c., $46,556. Then there are contingencies which cover things for which it is impossible to provide with absolute certainty, $7,585, the total being $133,000 which it is assumed by the chief architect we will require for the year ending March 31, 1912.

Repairs, including ventilation and lighting, furniture, &c., $225,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). An enormous amount is paid each year for new furniture for these buildings, and a large staff of men is employed under this item. I have been informed that about two-thirds of them do nothing at all, they simply draw their pay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman give the names of any in regard to whom he is so informed?

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman is not sincere in saying that, it is ridiculous.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am perfectly sincere for this reason that if he has reliable information of any men on the staff of the department lying around not earning wages, I would have it looked into, and if the charge were substantiated have the men dismissed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not believe the minister is sincere when he says he would have them dismissed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. member must not doubt the sincerity of the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I forgive the hon. gentleman.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not want to break the rules of the House, but I wish to say what I think.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will not give me the names anyway?

Mr. REID (Grenville). At all events there are several hundred men employed under this item, and, as I am informed, one-half or two-thirds of these men are simply there drawing their pay. The minister asks me to give their names. In the first place it would take up two or three pages of 'Hansard' to give the names of all the men I believe are not employed. But in addition to that look at the enormous amounts paid out every year for furniture in this building. In the last five years over $1,000,000 have been paid out simply for repairs and furniture, for the buildings here in Ottawa. Is this expenditure of about a quarter of a million dollars a year to continue forever, or is there likely to be a reduction of this vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will see that this vote is not entirely for furniture. It is for repairs for furniture and also for ventilation and lighting, and different items of that kind.

Mr. BLAIN. It does not include the supply of any electric current or gas?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. The buildings are very large, they contain many rooms which are all lighted and regarding which there must necessarily be a great deal of work to be done. There is necessarily a great deal of furniture requiring repairs, and new furniture must be bought from time to time. It would be impossible for me to go into all the details. That is a matter for the committee on public accounts. If my hon. friend wishes to inquire into any particular expenditure, he can have that inquired into in the Committee on Public Accounts, where the vouchers will be produced and the officials examined and the fullest information given. As regards the employees of the department, I cannot speak as to each individual, but I do know that we have a very reliable superintendent in whom my chief officers and myself have every confidence, and I would not believe, unless my hon. friend could vouch for it personally, that there are any number of men on the staff

who simply lie around and do not earn their wages. I can give the committee a statement of how this money will be disposed of. To the clerk of the works staff for the men engaged under the clerk of works, $96,252.61; to the mechanical engineering staff, $38,688; for the purchase of lumber, paints, oil, glass, &c., and such ready-made furniture as cannot be constructed in the government workshop, $90,000, making a total of $225,000. This also covers general repairs and maintenance in connection with gas, water, boilers, machinery, lavatories, &c.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I must disagree with the hon. minister when he says that the proper place in which to bring up this matter is the Public Accounts Committee. We all know that in that committee we can only bring up item by item, and the hon. minister knows that he, when he is there, and two or three of his assistants, do all they can to block investigations.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend made that remark so often that he does not seem to realize its offensive nature. I have never observed, whenever I have been before the committee, any indication of any desire to block investigations. I am sure the hon. gentleman can have there every opportunity of investigating every one of these items if he so desires.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am sure there are many members on both sides who will agree with me that facilities have not been given by the minister and those associated with him to get at the bottom of facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend must know that I have only been myself in attendance on the committee at one of its sittings during this session. How, therefore, could I have assisted in blocking investigations?

Mr. REID (Grenville). There have only been one or two items in his department brought before that committee this session, which explains why the hon. minister was not there. I am speaking however, of past sessions. He knows quite well, that when we on this side were endeavouring to find out if there were not unnecessary expenditures in his department, there were always difficulties thrown in our way. We asked for a special committee to investigate the department, as was given in the case of the Marine and Fisheries Department, but we were refused. If a similar committee were appointed, my own impression is, that it would show that the Public Works Department is in even a worse condition than was the Department of Marine and Fisheries. My hon. friend must know that there were good grounds for an investigation. He must have felt that in the case of certain expenditures in his department, there was no doubt robbery and rascality.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nobody observed that but the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Men on both sides admit it, and the press as well. From the Atlantic to the Pacific the newspapers have been showing up these things in the Public Works Department. There was therefore, ample ground for an investigation into that department, but of course, that investigation was never given. If the hon. minister would agree to give such a commission as was appointed to investigate into the Marine and Fisheries Department, we could let all these items go through without discussion. Will he now, should we propose to have an investigation of that kind, consent to give it and thus save all these discussions on his estimates ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the proper time arrives to consider a suggestion of that kind it will be carefully considered, but this is not the time to do so; and I may say to the hon. gentleman that before he would be entitled to ask for such a commission, he must support his reason by something more substantial than mere statements in the press or mere imagination on his own part. With regard to the press, I saw myself the other day in one of the papers published in Toronto, which displays a very partisan character, a reference to certain expenditures at Dalhousie, in the way of dredging. The article had alarming headlines of the very biggest character, stating that there had been an expenditure of $315,000 in that place. But the next day, away down in an obscure column, where scarcely any one would notice it, there were about four lines pointing out that there was an error, either typographical or telegraphic, and that the expenditure had been exaggerated ten times. That is a fair example of what is often done by some of the newspapers. I should have expected a newspaper, under such circumstances, to state, under the same big headlines, that it had made a great mistake, and that a grievous wrong had been done the department, instead of putting the correction in an obscure corner where not one in five hundred of its readers would discover it. I am sincere in my statement that I think the Public Accounts Committee a most admirable committee to investigate the accounts of the deparments. Like others, my hon. friend professes to want an investigation in some different way from that provided under the usages of parliament, but I fancy, with the hope that he will not get what he professes to want, for then he will have a grievance. He would not for worlds, take up these

accounts before the Public Accounts Committee, he would not for worlds have these vouchers presented——

Mr. BLAIN. Why not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because he would have convincing evidence under oath that there could be no objection to these accounts, and that would cause him grave disappointment.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No one would be better pleased than I if it could be known that all the accounts in the Auditor General's Report represented payments honestly made in the public interest. But the minister knows that it is impossible for any person to judge whether these accounts are right or not. All we can do is to look over them, and if we see an item that looks suspicious bring it before the Public Accounts Committee. And the minister knows that seventy-five out of a hundred cases brought before the Public Accounts Committee have certainly looked very bad under investigation. He knows also that the facts discovered by the Public Accounts Committee would justify a general investigation into the department. Take this Bathurst dredging of which the minister was speaking. He knows that it was admitted in the Public Accounts Committee that through a mistake, $30,000 or $31,000 was spent that would not have been spent but for that mistake.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That all appeared before the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I admit that. It was shown that a wrong——

Mr. PUGSLEY. A wrong on the part of whom?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Some one in the Public Works Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it was a mistake on the part of the Great Northwestern Telegraph Company. If the hon. gentleman will call the manager of that company, that can be established.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There were other cases. For instance, the St. John dredging —the Mayes matter. There was a commission paid there that went to the middleman wrongfully.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not wrongfully.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am giving these items to show that we were justified, and are justified now, in asking a commission of investigation. There was the case of the saw-dust wharf where the middleman again appeared. The minister could not conscientiously state that that was a fair bargain in the interest of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Absolutely.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then I believe that the minister is the only man on either side of this House that believes it. Then, we have the Gaspereau dredging, where the minister had the report of his own engineer, stating 20c a fair price and gave it out at 90 cents a yard. These are just a few instances. Now, here is an expenditure of $225,000 a year. How are we going to investigate that before the Public Accounts Committee? Why it would take the whole session. The first thing, some one will want to know—what I have been trying to find out—what becomes of the old furniture. We are constantly putting in new furniture; what becomes of the old:

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is sold at public auction.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is there a statement of that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly, a full statement.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That part of it may be all right. Then we hear reports of there being more men than are necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend must not believe all he hears.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But I believe what I hear repeated under oath in the Public Accounts Committee. If the minister would give us this investigation by Judge Cassels, or some man of that character, all this would be cleared up, and, if it were proved to be as the minister represents it, it would be to his credit and it would save a lot of discussion on these items. I, for one, do not believe that this large expenditure is necessary. It did not cost that much years ago, and it has been increasing year after year since this government came into power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be the easiest thing in the world for my hon. friend, if he has any reason to suspect that the accounts included in this vote of $225,000 are not correct, that more men are employed than are needed, that higher wages are paid than ought to be paid, to call the proper officials before the Public Accounts Committee and learn the exact facts. The difficulty with my hon. friend is that he does not seem to wish to avail himself of the Public Accounts Committee to investigate these matters. He has referred to two or three cases which he gives as evidence of the great need of investigating thoroughly the Department of Public Works. He cites the dredging at Gaspereau, also what is known as the Mayes matter, and the dredging at Dalhousie. Is that all?

Mr. REID (Grenville). It would take me all the afternoon to give all the cases.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). These are only samples.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When you consider that there has been an expenditure of from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000 a year by the Public Works Department, I think I ought to be well satisfied that the hon. gentleman, with all his industry, with all his digging and delving into the accounts, has only been able to call attention to three items.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I could easily give more.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the hon. gentleman names these three off-hand, he, of course, gives the three that are of the most striking character. And what are they? Take the Mayes contract. It is said that a gentleman associated with him received a certain amount from the contractor, Mr. Mayes. In order that there should be any wrong-doing in connection with that which reflected on the department when it was presided over by the late minister——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order has been raised of the relevancy of this discussion. The item before the committee is——

Repairs, including ventilation and lighting, furniture, &c., $225,000.

Any arguments used should be made to apply to that subject as closely as possible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think probably you are right. I was attempting to follow my hon. friend; however, I am content to let the matter rest as it is. It is desirable that we should all promptly obey your honour's ruling.

Telephone service, $19,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Last year I raised the question about the prices of telephones, because in some places we were paying much higher for them than in other places.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman stated, if I remember rightly, that we were paying more for telephones in the government offices than private individuals were paying in the city of Ottawa; but I was able to show him that, taking all the services together, we paid less proportionately than was paid by the private citizens of Ottawa.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I notice, for instance, that we are paying $35 for a telephone in the office of the secretary of the Governor General, in the East block; we are paying $40 for the telephone of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, $40 per telephone in the House of Commons, $65 a year for the telephone in the office of the Speaker. Now, it strikes me that the government should have a regular annual rate for all telephones, the same as private citizens in the city of Ottawa. It may average a lower price, as the minister says, but I do not understand why the charges should be made in this way. For instance, in this building, for the Speaker we pay $65, for the leader of the opposition, $55; messengers, $35; Committee on Agriculture, $40; distribution office, $40; sergeant at arms, $35, and so on. Then you go over to the Justice Department, and you pay $40.

Mr. CROSBY. How many telephones are there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Altogether, 453. Desk phones, for instance, are subject to an extra charge.

Mr. CROSBY. It would be interesting to know how it comes that you have 453 telephones.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can give the details. In the Department of Agriculture there are 18; Auditor General's office, 11; Census Department, 2; Customs Department, 11; Dominion police, 13; Exchequer Court, 2; Finance Department, 11; Governor General, 11; Geological Survey, 10; House of Commons, 20, including those for the opposition as well as for the government side; Indian Affairs, 8; Inland Revenue, 14; Interior Department, 56; Justice, 18; Labour Department, 6; Mounted Police, 4; Minister of Finance, 32; Militia and Defence, 46; Parliamentary Library, 3; Post Office Department, 16; Privy Council, 12; Public Works, 58; Railways and Canals, 23; Secretary of State, 15; Printing and Stationery, 16; Trade and Commerce, 9; Senate, 7. I have all the details here, but it would take me till midnight to read them.

Mr. CROSBY. 58 for the Public Works Department; that seems to be a great number.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These telephones are used in all the chief branches of the Department of Public Works, including, for instance, the shipyard and the workshop.

Rideau Hall, including grounds, improvements, furniture and maintenance, $35,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is the department thinking of erecting a new building for the Governor General in the place of the present Rideau Hall?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend may remember that previously to my becoming minister there had been a proposition to put a new façade upon Rideau Hall, and to undertake considerable improvements, and a vote had been taken, I think, of $100,000 for that purpose. Tenders had been called for, and shortly after I became minister the tenders were opened, and I think the proposed cost reached the sum of nearly $300,000. I was of the opinion that, while extensive improvements are needed, and while Rideau Hall, as it is at

present, is not creditable to this country—I say that advisedly—it is not creditable to this great and wealthy country; yet I did not feel that we could justify an expenditure of $300,000 in making additions and improvements to the present building. I am not speaking now for the government, because the government have not considered this matter; I am merely giving my own opinion. I think probably it would be better to sell the present property, which, at a reasonable estimate, if cut up into city building lots, would easily bring $700,000. That is the opinion which the Ottawa Improvement Commission have expressed to me, and they have made, at my request, an estimate which I think is moderate. I would erect a new government house upon some commanding site in the vicinity of Ottawa, and I would erect a building which would be a credit to this country, which would be fitting for the future Governors General who come here, and satisfactory to the people of this country for the next hundred years. However, this is only my own opinion. I mention it to the hon. gentleman as a partial answer to his question, and also as an explanation why we did not go on with the proposed improvement at Rideau Hall pursuant to the vote of parliament. As I have said, that amount seemed to me more than I would be justified in placing in the estimates under the circumstances.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I may frankly say that when I go down to Rideau Hall and look at the buildings, I think they are a disgrace to this country, and not befitting the high office of Governor General. But what I object to is that every year the government comes forward with large sums for repairs and improvements to Rideau Hall. I think the amount the minister is paying annually for repairs would pay the interest on the cost of a fine new residence such as he mentions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This money is not all being expended on the building; it is also for renewals, repairs to furniture, &c.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It may be this year, but I think the minister will agree with me that there have been in the past and probably will be in the future amounts expended on that building for repairs. Instead of repairing that old building I think it is time for the minister to consider the question of providing new quarters and getting rid of these premises, probably in the way he says. If he can get $700,000 out of that property I cannot see why he should have to ask parliament for any appropriation to provide a new building. Does the minister think that amount would not be sufficient to erect a new building on another site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It ought to give a very fine building.

Dominion buildings, furniture, $15,000.

Mr. BRADBURY. Has it been definitely decided to erect a new building on Sussex street?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is the definite decision.

Mr. BRADBURY. I think it is a serious mistake for the government of this country to erect a magnificent building back on Sussex street. You have already started building on the park by erecting a hotel there, which, I think, was a great mistake, but now that it is there, I would suggest that it is only proper that this new block be built along the face of the park right from the hotel, and facing west. I think then we would get the benefit of the building, and as you have already purchased the property on Sussex street, you could do away with Mackenzie avenue, and continue the park out to Sussex street. You would then have a magnificent park with the buildings now there removed, the new building would be seen by everybody if it were placed along the face of the park. This would be a very great improvement upon the present policy of the department. I think it would be a serious mistake to spend $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 in erecting a great building back on Sussex street, and I hope the department will never agree to a policy of that kind. I believe they could erect this building along the face of the hill and it would be a very great improvement on what they contemplate doing, and it certainly would be a magnificent site for offices. Then we would have the parliament buildings all within view of the bridge. As you have started to build on that park I do not see why you should not continue as I suggest it would be very much better than what you propose.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is the last contributor to the new ideas as to the proper location for the departmental buildings. I have had a great many suggestions, but I have felt that as parliament, before I became minister, made an appropriation for the payment for the ground between Mackenzie avenue and Sussex street, and as a very extensive area of land has been bought, it was my duty to go ahead and provide for the construction of the building upon this ground. I might suggest other places in the city which, in the judgment of some people, perhaps in the judgment of myself, might possess advantages which that site does not present, but that is the site which has been approved of, it is the site which has been bought and paid for, and it is now owned by the government. Perhaps it is inaccurate for my

hon. friend to say that the buildings are to be erected on Sussex street. They are also to have a frontage upon Mackenzie avenue, and upon this park, and run through to Sussex street so that there will be a frontage on both streets. I am afraid I cannot hold out any hope to my hon. friend that the site will be changed. The present plan is to go ahead, and build upon the site which we have bought and paid for.

Mr. BRADBURY. I can only say that I think it is a serious mistake on the part of the government.

Dominion buildings, lighting, $140,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is an increase of $5,000 owing to the increase in the number of buildings.

Mr. JAMESON. I suppose that under the head of lighting one might refer to the electric wiring of this building, and particularly to that in the library. I am not sufficiently skilled to say whether it is defective or whether there is any danger of fire from it. It appears that in certain places at least it has a very exposed look, and we know that a few days ago there was a fire in the corridor leading to the library. It occurred during a time when there was a number of people about to see that it was extinguished. I do not know whether it was due to any defect in the wiring of the building, but it is a matter worthy of consideration. Perhaps the minister could assure the committee that in the condition of the wiring there is no risk to the valuable collection of books in the library.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that his attention was called to an incipient fire which might be regarded more as smoke than blaze and the best judgment he has been able to form is that probably there has been a little waste paper and somebody has thrown a match down while lighting his pipe or cigar. He does not think that it came from any defect in the electrical wiring. However, the suggestion is one that is worthy of careful attention. It is of importance that the wiring should receive careful attention. We have an expert staff whose duty it is to look after these matters, and I shall see that the hon. gentleman's remarks are brought to their notice so that if there is anything that requires attention it will be looked into.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister had a fire in his own office. Was not that from electric wires crossing one another or something of that kind?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought it was.

Mr. DANIEL. Well there must have been some looseness about the wiring in that case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there is a danger always.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I think there is more danger of spontaneous combustion than from defective electric wiring. I was downstairs at the long distance telephone when an hon. gentleman who sits close to the minister asked me to look into the room which is just beyond the long distance telephone. I looked in, and I am sure that if there is not spontaneous combustion in the building pretty soon it will be a miracle. This gentleman told me that the same condition is to be found all over the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What room is that?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Just back of the telephone.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose there was a lot of waste material in it?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It was not fit for a pig pen. That is the care that is taken of the building, and yet my hon. friend says that there are experts looking after it. All he has to do is to appeal for confirmation to an hon. gentleman who sits near him, and who knows the condition to which I refer because he spoke to me himself about it. The care which is taken of this building is the same as that which is taken of the grounds.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If there be any fault it would be with the staff of the House of Commons, and not with the staff of the Public Works Department. I will have the matter brought to the notice of the superintendent of the House of Commons building.

Mr. RHODES. I am not an electric light expert, but I can see that wires are strung in the various rooms of this building in a haphazard manner and not in accordance with the requirements of the underwriters. Of course, this building was erected years ago when fireproof construction had not reached its present development, and I believe it worthy of the attention of the minister to see that an electric wiring expert should go carefully over all the wiring in the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have an electric expert constantly engaged in that work. So long as the wires are properly insulated there is no danger, but nevertheless the remarks of my hon. friend will be noted by the chief architect, and if possible, greater precaution will be taken.

Mr. RHODES. In room 68 there are from 10 to 15 electric lights hanging by long cords which are all intertwined, and it would seem to me to be dangerous.

Mr. JAMESON. I have been told by those who seem to know that the wiring

of the building at present is not up to the underwriters requirements.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not insure our buildings, and therefore, the underwriters' experts do not examine them. The chief architect tells me that the electrician reports it is up to the standard of the underwriters.

Mr. STANFIELD. To my knowledge there is wiring in the new wing that will not pass the underwriters' inspection.

Mr. CROSBY. In the Public Accounts Committee last year the hon. member for North Ontario discovered, notwithstanding all the obstacles that were thrown in his way, that $5,000 or $6,000 of the money of the people was wrongfully paid for electric lighting of the Woods and the Canadian buildings. When this discovery was made we were promised that not only would the contract be cancelled, but that suit would be entered against the Imperial Realty Company to make them refund to the public treasury the overcharges they made. Has that money been refunded?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Two years before I became minister the agreement was entered into, and I understand that then the chief architect thought it was better to pay by the meter so that the department would be charged for the electrical energy actually used. I believe that for a while the meter would be less than the flat rate. On principle I am entirely opposed to a flat rate but so long as there is a flat rate and a meter rate I suppose it is the duty of the department to get the cheaper rate. In the case of a public utility such as electric lighting—and I wish to say this publicly for the information of the city of Ottawa and the electric lighting company—it is in my judgment a gross injustice that the ordinary householder should be obliged to pay a meter rate which is higher than the flat rate which a large consumer of electricity such as the government can get. I believe there should be one rate, and one rate only in the case of public utilities of that kind just the same as in the case of the railways, which cannot give a cheap rate to the large dealer.

Mr. STANFIELD. The railways make a carload rate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but they must give the same rate for ten carloads as for one. However, that may be, when I became minister there was rendered to my department by the Imperial Realty Company, bills upon a meter basis and those bills were accompanied by bills, on their regular account forms rendered by the electric light department of the city of Ottawa, presided over by the city treasurer, Mr. Ellis, showing the indebtedness of the Imperial Realty Company or James W. Woods as the case might be, to the city, for the amount of current consumed, based upon the meter rate. These bills were marked 'settled' by the electric department of the city; they were receipted as vouchers and they accompanied the bills which the Imperial Realty Company rendered to my department. Thus the city of Ottawa furnished those bills as being the vouchers based upon the meter rate of the amounts which the Imperial Realty Company asked my department to pay. After I became minister, the deputy minister was changed, the present deputy minister became the principal official of the department. If it had come to my notice or to the notice of the principal officers of my department that we were being charged by the Imperial Realty Company not the identical amounts which the Imperial Realty Company was paying to the electrical department of the city of Ottawa—

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). What would be the object in making out the cheques to the Imperial Realty Company, why not direct to the city of Ottawa?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Would not that arouse suspicion?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, because I would never dream that the treasurer of the city of Ottawa would issue a false voucher.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). It is only fair to the city treasurer to state that the president of the Imperial Realty Company went to him and personally asked him to furnish the amount of electricity that was consumed on a meter basis. He said he did not know what purpose it was to be used for, he had been personally requested by the president of the company to furnish the amount on a meter basis. He did not get paid for it, and did not do it with intent to deceive the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So also the Imperial Realty Company say they did not do it to deceive the department.

Mr. CROSBY. But they did deceive the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the fact is that Mr. Ellis, the treasurer of Ottawa, furnished these vouchers not simply as the amount consumed, on a meter basis, but as accounts showing the indebtedness of the Imperial Realty Company to the city of Ottawa for these amounts.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). On an ordinary form.

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the account forms they always send out showing the indebtedness of the Imperial Realty Company to the city of Ottawa for the electric current consumed at the meter rate and upon a

meter basis. It may be true, as my hon. friend says, that the treasurer of Ottawa did not intend that this should be used to deceive the department.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). He says he did not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am bound to believe him. I would be sorry to suspect people of dishonesty in face of their statements and without knowledge to the contrary, but the Imperial Realty Company say the same thing, that they did not intend to deceive the department. As a matter of fact they got the money and got it upon vouchers signed by the city of Ottawa upon the quantity of electric current consumed and charged upon the meter rate. And this is the important thing, that ever since I became minister and ever since the present deputy became deputy minister, these vouchers were rendered, and my department paid to the Imperial Realty Company the identical amount of these vouchers rendered by the electrical department of the city to the Imperial Realty Company as proofs to show that that was being paid to the city of Ottawa, the whole charge being based upon a meter rate. When the matter came on for investigation, as my hon. friend says, before the Committee on Public Accounts, evidently my hon. friend from North Ontario was furnished, and I am glad he was furnished, with the information which the proper officials of the city of Ottawa had withheld from my department.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). It was not until I saw the suspicious looking documents in your file.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman had access to all the files, we glady furnished them. When towards the latter part of the investigation it came to my knowledge that there was a difference between what these vouchers showed and what it was alleged had actually been paid to the city, and that these vouchers had been rendered to my department from time to time as being evidence of what the Imperial Realty Company was paying to the city, I asked the deputy minister to inform the committee that I would proceed to cancel the contract and to recover whatever amount had been paid by the department to the Imperial Realty Company in excess of what the Imperial Realty Company had paid to the city. In due course, after parliament rose, I had a request made to the city of Ottawa to furnish a statement of what amounts had actually been paid by the Imperial Realty Company. That statement was not furnished. I then directed the deputy minister to hand the matter over to the Department of Justice to look into the whole question, and if the department was of opinion that there was a cause of action against the Imperial Realty Company, either individually or jointly with the city of Ottawa, to take proceedings for the purpose of recovering the difference.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Have you had a report yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No report has come to my knowledge as to what action has been taken by the Justice Department, but I understood some time ago that they had been requested to allow the matter to stand until counsel for the Imperial Realty Company, then absent, returned to Ottawa. I have not recently heard what further action has been taken by the Department of Justice.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The minister was going to lay on the table the two letters that constituted a contract between the Imperial Realty Company and the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will see that they are brought here.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). We would like to see them so as to form our own opinion as to the liability of the Imperial Realty Company. Speaking of the electric light and these accounts, the minister attempts to shift the responsibility on the shoulders of the city treasurer. In my humble opinion the Minister of Public Works or his department is a party to any fraud that has been committed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not said there was any fraud, I did not use the word fraud.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). That was the inference from your remarks.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend as a lawyer knows that there may be such a thing as a legal fraud which would give the right to recover money without actual intentional fraud.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The mere fact that these alleged statements were rendered by the city to the Imperial Realty Company and be the Imperial Realty Company to the government would alone excite suspicion in any person's mind. Why the necessity of keeping two sets of books and why pay the cheques to the Imperial Realty Company and have them transfer them over to the city of Ottawa? A person viewing that transaction would at once have his suspicions excited that there was something radically wrong, that a middleman must be getting a rake-off somewhere, and consequently if any one in the department had the slightest conception of the method of conducting business properly

and economically he would have investigated the matter. Why were not the cheques made payable direct to the city of Ottawa? If there was any fraud or wrong committed on the department the department itself is partly guilty. What is the cost of lighting all the public buildings here in Ottawa?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are in the public buildings lamps to which the current is supplied by the Ottawa Electric Company to the number of 15,929. Under the contract, the first 3,000 are charged at the rate of $2.25 per annum, making $6,750.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). That is yearly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was originally a 10 years' contract. It has now expired, and has not yet been renewed. Then there are 12,929 lamps at $2, making $25,858. That is in addition to the lighting in the buildings, owned by the Imperial Realty Company. We have made a change through having cancelled the contracts under which we pay to the city a flat rate of $2 per lamp, that is for the Canadian building and the Railway Commission building. That includes all the electric lighting.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is there any meter basis or is it all flat rates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All on a flat basis.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is the contract let by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Does the minister not think that since the city has a municipal plant as well as the Ottawa Electric Light Company, we might get a more advantageous rate by inviting competition?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are just two rates in Ottawa, one flat and the other meter, and the two plants charge the same rates. When we made this change from meter to flat rate, we asked the city for the lowest rate and they gave it at $2.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The government contract is worth nearly half a million dollars. If they let that by tender, could they not get a more advantageous rate? Is it the intention to renew the contract for ten years?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are continuing under the expired contract at present. There are some questions pending for consideration which will have to be decided before we renew the contract.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is it the intention to ask for tenders before renewing the contract?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario).

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. There are two rates, a flat rate and a meter rate. I do not think it would be right for my department to go to these companies and say: True, you have your flat rate and your meter rate, but this government is too poor or too mean to pay the same rate that other people pay, and we want you to reduce it. I would not be a party to doing that.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). That objection might hold to any contracts the government might make.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. This is a public utility.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECURITY TRUSTS CORPORATION.

House in committee on Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Security Trusts Corporation.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Mr. NESBITT. I have a letter from the hon. member for Regina, who introduced this Bill, and who is not present, suggesting the name 'The Security Loan and Trust Corporation.' I do not know whether that will be satisfactory to my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) or not.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). The hon. member for Regina, when he was here, mentioned that suggestion of his clients. But the only change is the introduction of the word 'Loan.' I think the policy of this House is to confine the trust business to trust companies, and the mortgage and loan business to the mortgage and loan companies——

Mr. NESBITT. I have no desire to press the Bill if the hon. member for Winnipeg does not wish it pressed.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I think it had better stand over. No doubt, the hon. member for Regina and myself will be able to agree.

Progress reported.

MONTREAL PARK AND ISLAND RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 45) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—Mr. Ecrément.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. As the promoter of the Bill is not present, perhaps it would be better that it should stand over, as it is suggested that some amendments be made to the Bill.

Progress reported.

McCLARY MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 75) respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Beattie.

On section 1,

Mr. NESBITT. I would like to discuss this Bill before it passes, but the hon. member who introduced it is not here. I suggest we report progress.

Progress reported.

ALBERTA RAILWAY AND IRRIGATION COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 51) respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—Mr. Crothers.

On section 1,

Mr. HERRON. I object to this clause in its original form and move the amendment of which notice has been given:

That subsection (c) of clause 1 be amended by striking out the word 'Spring Coulee' in the first line and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'Cardston.'

Mr. BLAIN. If there is to be an amendment to the Bill, I would suggest that it be allowed to stand over until the promoter is present, I am not objecting to the amendment, but, as the amendment may not meet the wishes of the promoter of the Bill, and as that hon. gentleman is not present, I think that, in fairness to him, the Bill should be allowed to stand.

Mr. HERRON. The Bill stood over for consultation between the promoters and myself. They have not done anything. I have told them I was here to go on with the Bill. Apparently, they have not made any arrangement to have it stand over. If there is anybody interested in the Bill, I am prepared to go on with it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think the Bill should stand in the absence of the promoter. When the matter came up in the committee this amendment was moved. I think the Bill is a Canadian Pacific Railway Bill, and the representative of the company said they had considered the change proposed in the amendment of my hon. friend, but there were very serious engineering difficulties in the way, and they did not desire to have a change made. I think that, as the promoter is not here, it would be well that the Bill should stand over. If my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) has not already moved it, I move that we report progress.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

LAKE CHAMPLAIN AND ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CANAL COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 60) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

On section 3,

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the Minister of Railways approved that section? It seems a very important one?

Mr. NESBITT. Yes, it was approved in the committee the other morning.

Mr. GUTHRIE. This is an old charter. In former years, before there was any development required for electrical purposes, this clause was not inserted in such a Bill as this, but, during the past four or five years, they have been inserting this clause, and this Bill stood over that it might be inserted.

On section 4, consent of municipality.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the regular clause was to be inserted in this Bill. Under that clause, not only must the consent of the municipality to the works referred to be expressed by by-law, but this was to be 'upon such terms as may be agreed upon.' I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I did not catch what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) said.

Mr. SPROULE. When we discussed this Bill in committee it was decided to add to it the usual clauses attached to all Bills of this kind; that is, that the company could only enter a municipality upon receiving authority by by-law of the municipality, and upon such terms as might be agreed upon between the company and the municipality. This provides for the bylaw, but it says nothing about terms with the municipality. That is not according to the clause we have been in the habit of putting in such Bills for the last couple of years, and which were carefully considered and decided upon by the committee.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I do not exactly remember what was agreed upon; my hon. friend says something was agreed upon. I think it was only discussed in committee, and the promoters of the Bill consented to all the amendments which were proposed. Now we come before this committee, and the hon. gentleman says it was agreed that some other amendment should be made. I do not remember any such promise on the part of anybody. I think the clause the chairman has just read is sufficient. I do not see why we should drop the Bill at this stage, after all the consideration we have given it.

Mr. SPROULE. The committee discussed this Bill, and it was left to the chairman to put in the two clauses that we usually put in these Bills ; and what I complain of is that they have not been put in.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The statement of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in regard to the Bill originally is quite accurate. The Bill as drafted did not meet the views of the committee, and it was decided that the two clauses which we have adopted as a model clause should be added to this Bill. The clerk added those clauses, and the Bill did come back to the committee, and was subsequently passed by the committee, and so far as my recollection goes the clauses are the model clause.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 69) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.

Mr. NESBITT. The other evening the Minister of Railways asked that this Bill stand. I have not seen him since, and I would not like to go on with it without seeing him.

Mr. HENDERSON. On what grounds did he ask it to stand?

Mr. NESBITT. It was proposed to add an amendment, and the amendment has not been added.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought the amendment was agreed to in the Railway Committee.

Mr. NESBITT. No, it was not brought up. The amendment proposed was as follows :

The company shall not construct or operate its railway along any highway, street or other public place without first obtaining the consent expressed by by-law of the municipality having jurisdiction over said highway, street or other public place, and upon terms to be agreed upon with such municipality.

This is going through Ontario largely, and the amendment may not be necessary. It is subject to the Railway Act, and the Railway Act refers all these questions to the railway board.

Progress reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Mr. GEOFFRION.

ONTARIO AND MINNESOTA POWER COMPANY.

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 109) respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company.—Mr. Conmee.

Mr. HENDERSON. Unfortunately, I am not able to read this Bill. It is printed in French, and I would like to be permitted to peruse it. It is only printed in French, and I think we should have it printed in English before we take the second reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed by the clerk that it is printed in English, that the Order Paper contains a typographical error.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is too late, almost now, to get a copy of the Bill. I wanted to get a copy of it, but I could not get it. It was not on my file, so that I could get hold of it. It is rather late now to have the Bill handed to me at the last minute. I think we might almost say that it has not been printed.

Mr. SPEAKER. The objection is that it is not printed in English?

Mr. HENDERSON. According to the notice paper it is printed in French, but not in English.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is a typographical error. It should be English instead of French.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not printed in French?

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, then, I take the exception that it is not printed in French.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

SASKATOON AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 111) to incorporate the Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Carvell.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to oppose the second reading of this Bill, but I should like it to receive its second reading only upon the understanding that before passing this House the spelling of the word 'Hudson' would be changed to 'Hudson's.' I do not want to take up the time of the House talking about trifles, but I cannot understand what object there is, especially in an official proceeding such as the passing of a Bill through this House, in changing the good old, well-established spelling of the name Hudson's Bay. It is nearly fifty years ago since I was taught, as a schoolboy, that our word Hudson's Bay was always spelled with the 's,' whereas the United States

river Hudson was spelled without the 's'. I think that is a very good reason, if no other existed, why we should adhere to the English method of spelling this word. It is a different word, and, however much we may admire modern improvements in spelling, we cannot change the name of the great company which had its charter now nearly 250 years ago, and which has made famous the world over the name Hudson's Bay. I think the very circumstance that we have our own expression, while the United States have theirs, that it is the English language we speak, and, therefore, that we ought to look to England for our standards of orthography and geography, affords in itself reason enough why, in an official proceeding of this character, we ought to adhere to the expression Hudson's Bay, whatever newspapers and whatever other people may do about it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY.

The order for private Bills having been exhausted, House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Mr CURRIE (Simcoe). Before going on with these items, I observe that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) is spending a great deal of time on the estimates of his department. The Minister of Public Works, we know, is a very hard-working man; he is active, he gets his estimates down here, he attends to them every night, and endeavours to get them through. There are other ministers of the Crown who are in charge of departments just as important as the Department of Public Works. I am sure that the House would be very much pleased to see the estimates of some of the other ministers brought down here and discussed openly and freely, and it would be largely to the benefit of the country if such were the case. For instance, I think we should have a few nights on the estimates of the department of the Minister of Finance, so as to relieve the burden from the Minister of Public Works. Then there is also the hon. gentleman (Sir Frederick Borden) in charge of the Department of Militia and Defence, and I know that the House is desirous of discussing his estimates for three or four nights. We never have the pleasure of having him with us at all, and I am sure I am voicing the sentiments of members on this side of the House when I say that the estimates of some other department should be taken up as well as those of the Department of Public Works. The estimates of the Public Works Department pall on the taste, and I think it would be well, the next night when estimates are taken up, if we had, say, the Department of Militia and Defence under fire. Then, again, as I have said before, we would like the estimates of the department of the Minister of Finance, and we should have a few nights with the Department of Agriculture, which deals with the largest interest and industry of the country. We like to discuss these items with the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), as he is always willing to discuss them ad libitum and to give us a great deal of information. I feel convinced that the country is yearning and panting to hear from the Minister of Agriculture, and there are a great many members in the House on this side who are interested in farming matters, and who would like to have the estimates of the Department of Agriculture under review for some time. I cannot hope that the government will bring forward any estimates except those which they please, but I am sorry that they are placing the Minister of Public Works in the limelight every night and putting him to the front, so that we may smash him and do all kinds of things to him, when the other ministers ought to carry their end of the log just the same as he is carrying it. I hope that we may have a chance of discussing estimates other than those of the Department of Public Works.

Ottawa public buildings, lighting, $140,000.

Mr. GOODEVE. When the committee rose at six o'clock the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) had made a very carefully worded statement in which he endeavoured to place the responsibility for the rake-off that had been made by the Imperial Realty Company on the city of Ottawa and the Imperial Realty Company rather than on the Department of Public Works. If that statement, as made by the minister, were borne out by the evidence in the Public Accounts Committee I do not think there would be any doubt in the minds of members of this House that both the city of Ottawa and the Imperial Realty Company were in collusion to defraud this government out of a large sum of money and as such should be prosecuted. Indeed, when the minister said he had placed the matter in the Justice Department he left the inference that such was his idea. While not attempting to defend the Imperial Realty Company I must say that my conception of the evidence before the committee was that the responsibility rested solely with the Public Works Department and not with them. The evidence showed —although we could not get the correspondence bearing on it—that there evidently had been a contract of some kind by which the Imperial Realty Company was to furnish the light to these particular buildings at a fixed rate, based on the rate paid by other consumers in the city. They were justly entitled to get whatever rate they could from the original supplier of the power, and in the result they got a

much cheaper rate than they charged the government and they had a rake-off of a very large sum of money. If it is the belief of the minister that there was wrongdoing then he should have taken more active steps than to merely place the matter in the hands of the Justice Department, where it rests. We had a very similar transaction where the department installed an elevator in one of the public buildings when the lease stipulated that it should be installed by the proprietor of the building, and that case we were also told had been sent to the Department of Justice. We have to-night seen the Minister of Public Works with a remarkably tender conscience and with a remarkable idea of fair play and justice, holding up his hands in holy horror at the thought of asking a rich corporation to send in a tender for the supply of electric power. He told us that he would not for one moment be mean enough—I think that was the word he used—to ask for tenders for supplying all the power necessary for lighting all the public buildings and running the elevators in these buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend misunderstood me. What I said was that the companies had two rates: a meter rate and flat rate, and I did not think I would be justified in asking them to reduce the rate so as to bring it below what was charged to other people.

Mr. GOODEVE. We are therefore to understand that the Minister of Public Works, having full charge of the people's money would not endeavour by asking for tenders, to get the best possible price for a service which costs a very large sum annually. The minister is very solicitous about an electric light company, the stock of which is selling at $163, or 63 over par, and which is paying very large dividends to its shareholders. The minister in his tender solicitude for this company refuses even to ask for tenders as an ordinary business transaction. I happen to have some knowledge of how this matter is dealt with in my part of the country where they develop a large amount of electricity and sell the power to mining companies and others. The power companies sell at both flat and meter rates, and yet there is not a single one of these large power consuming companies in the whole of my province which is paying the ordinary flat or meter rate. They all buy it at a fixed rate per horse-power per annum and they get their supply by tender at the lowest price. There is absolutely no reason as an ordinary business transaction why the Minister of Public Works should not follow the every day business custom and endeavour to buy the power which the government requires for these services at the lowest possible rate. There is absolutely no reason why tenders should not be asked for. It is very remarkable that the minister should all at once display such an extremely tender conscience lest he should offend these people by asking them to tender for power supply at a reasonable rate to a large consumer like the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no tender feeling towards the company or the electrical department of the city. I would be quite willing to get from them the lowest possible rate that can be obtained, but what I said was that I did not think it right that the government should take advantage of its position to try and get a lower rate than other customers in the city have to pay. Some get a meter rate and some a flat rate, and if we ask for a flat rate, or a meter rate we are entitled to get the same rate as other large consumers of electricity. But we have no right as a government to get our electricity, whether by flat rate or meter rate, at one cent less than the ordinary consumer pays. My regard is for the consumers and every dollar which the government may take out of the companies is so much money charged against the ordinary consumer. There should, in my judgment be the same rate to the poor man as to the rich, to the private individual as to the government. That would be the ideal system, but if there is to be a flat rate and a meter rate then I believe these rates should be under the control of the Railway Commission and the government should not get a lower rate than any other consumer of electricity.

Mr. BLAIN. How many companies can supply power?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Two, the electrical department of the city and the Ottawa Electric Company.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the minister ask prices from both?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and the flat rate is the same for both. The Ottawa Company supply this building at $2.25 for the first 3,000 lamps and $2 for all the lamps above that. The city of Ottawa supplies the other buildings at a flat rate of $2, so that the rates of the two companies are practically the same.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the Minister ask the price at which these two companies would supply the current?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were conferred with.

Mr. BLAIN. Public competition?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Simply because there are only the two companies and we asked

them for the best rate they could give and we got it. We have done exactly what I would do if I owned a large building in the city that required lighting. They should have one price for all, whether a meter or a flat rate price.

Mr. GOODEVE. Does the minister mean seriously to tell me that if this company was asked to give a special wholesale rate for a large consumer it would affect in the slightest degree the rate that they make to the ordinary consumer? In this very transaction we find that the Imperial Realty Company, whilst charging the government the regular meter rate, was getting a very much lower rate so that they had a rake-off of $3,000 or $4,000 a year on this building alone. Surely he does not expect this House to believe that the mere asking for a tender for a large supply of power at a low rate would affect the rate charged the ordinary customer. I am amazed that the minister should advance such an absurd argument.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In this case it is alleged that the Imperial Realty Company had a flat rate, and that the bills which were rendered by the city to the Realty Company and again by the Realty Company to the government were based upon a meter rate. I do not understand that there are two flat rates or two meter rates, but that there are two rates, one a meter and one a flat. If this company, as I think it should be, is subject to the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners or the board of the province of Ontario, which I think has also jurisdiction over electrical matters, the board would allow the company a fair and reasonable profit upon its investments, and therefore, the cheaper the rate at which the government could get its electricity the higher the rate which would have to be charged the ordinary consumer in order to enable the company to make a reasonable and fair profit. The government ought not to be able to get and ought not to seek to get electric lighting or gas lighting, whether by flat rate or by meter rate, at a lower cost than the ordinary consumer pays, whether by flat rate or by meter. That is my position and that is why I have not called for tenders, but have asked the electric company and the city to give us the lowest flat rate.

Mr. BLAIN. Were they both the same?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Then why was the selection made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Ottawa Electric Company is supplying this building with light. The city already had their wires in the other building, and we thought as they were giving as low a rate as the Ottawa company we ought to continue with them.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) must not be surprised at the position taken by the minister because his policy and that of his government is entirely in opposition to public tenders. Therefore, we must expect that when my hon. friend is dealing with a matter of this kind he will not ask for public competition. We tested the House upon that question, and my hon. friend the minister is on record. I have a motion here which was moved and voted on in the House:

That all the supplies purchased for the use of the various departments of the government should be procured on the basis of public tender and contract, under the direction of a competent purchasing commission, and with regard primarily to quality and price.

I suppose supplies would mean electrical current the same as other purchases. That is the policy the opposition laid down on the floor of the House on many occasions. The minister voted against this motion, and having voted against a policy of public competition he is very fearful lest two companies in the city of Ottawa might get in competition with one another and forsooth the government might get a cheaper price than some poor individual in the city. Did any one ever hear of such a policy? Why does not my hon. friend be frank in dealing with a matter of this kind, and put the transaction beyond suspicion by asking these two companies to give tenders? He had a splendid opportunity to have public competition, he had one company competing with another in the capital city right at his hand, yet he says: Oh, no, we must not do that, we might get something cheaper than we ought to. That part of it is a brand new doctrine; the other part is an old story, the policy of the hon. gentleman and his government is in opposition to public competition, and here is a splendid exemplification of the policy; indeed it will point out to the country the difference between the policy of this government and of the opposition. My hon. friend need not be at all concerned about the citizens of Ottawa.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I venture to say that during all the years the Conservative party was in power they never asked for tenders for electric lighting, and my hon. friend cannot find a single case in any part of the Dominion where they called for tenders for lighting by electricity or gas. They took it for granted that the ordinary charge to the public was the fair and reasonable charge to pay, and he cannot say we are paying one cent more than the large consumers in Ottawa are paying.

Mr. BLAIN. When my hon. friend's party were in opposition they constantly condemned the Conservative government, because we did not ask for public competi-

tion, that was one of the chief planks in the platform of the party.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in electricity and gas. I think I am safe in saying that in 1896 the government owned the plant. When my hon. friend asked why, when there are two plants in this city, we did not invite competition, the only excuse he has to offer is that if he did, the department might possibly have got its lighting done cheaper than some individuals would. Might I ask him if he proposes to continue that kind of policy.

Mr. GOODEVE. This is no new policy of the Department of Public Works, because when discussing an item regarding the museum in the city, the minister said that the contractor had tendered too low and that the departments, in order to make up the loss, gave him extras without calling for tenders, and that contractor is still going on supplying extras on that building from year to year. With regard to the particular item under discussion, the Realty Company had a meter rate with the electric light company while charging the government a flat rate, and were making a large profit. It would appear to me, that a company, in fixing a flat rate, would base it on the maximum quantity of light that could be used and would consequently, charge more than if they charged only for the actual light consumed. If for no other reason, it would be advisable for the government to see if they could not get tenders to supply the light by ampere or horsepower for government purposes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is very difficult to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. We have been condemned because we did not get a flat rate and now we are being condemned because we did insist on a flat rate. In reply to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), I may say that, as at present advised, I shall continue to do what we have done, namely, find out what is the best flat rate and then give the contract to the company which charges the cheapest. In this particular case, both companies have the same flat rate, and so we divided the contract between them.

Mr. BLAIN. The two companies will know just how to handle the hon. minister in the future.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just as they know how to handle all other consumers of electricity.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What has become of our own electric apparatus which we had for manufacturing light in the building here ? It gave us good light, and gave it to us cheap.

Mr. BLAIN.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that was in operation about 20 years ago, and was done away with when the Conservatives were in office.

Mr. CROSBY. Before recess, I asked the minister about the contract for the Woods building and the Canadian building, and he answered everything I did not ask him about. He talked about flat rates and meter rates. I remember that when the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), was trying to find out what the Realty Company paid the city of Ottawa for lights in order to compare that with the very high price they were charging this government, the minister and everybody else in his department did everything possible to prevent our getting that information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I deny that most positively. That question came up some time ago, and the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), said I was in the committee room when objection was taken to the production of the written contracts between the city and the Imperial Realty Company. I replied that I was not at that meeting. Through the kindness of the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), I was enabled to see the appendix 3 of the proceedings of that committee, and in looking over the proceedings of the 22nd of April, —that being the day when that contract was asked for, and the Chairman ruled it out—I find I was not present. At a later meeting of the committee an attempt was made by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe), to give hearsay evidence of that contract which had been ruled out, and I objected. Any law student of a month's standing will say that I was absolutely correct.

Mr. CROSBY. I was present, and I have pretty good eyesight, and I am prepared to state that the minister was present. But that has nothing to do with the argument. Whether he was present or not, he is responsible for the Public Works Department, and the department did everything they could to prevent the Public Accounts Committee from getting any idea what the Realty Company were paying the city of Ottawa for the light they are furnishing this government. But the department, instead of acting in the public interest, and giving us an opportunity of ascertaining what we were paying in overcharge for light, did everything they could to prevent us from getting the information. We all remember that after it had been fully discussed in the House, the Deputy Minister of Public Works came into the committee the next morning and went on the stand, and the first thing he said was : We have decided, not only to cancel the

contract, but to bring an action against the Realty Company to compel them to return the money. Now, the Minister of Public Works stated just before recess that no doubt they had paid more than they ought to have paid ; but he said there was a document furnished by the treasurer of the city of Ottawa which was handed him by the secretary of the Realty Company regarding the price of light ; they discovered that this document was a false document, and yet it was upon this document that the Department of Public Works issued their cheque. Consequently somebody was obtaining money under false pretenses. Then the Minister of Public Works tells us that he has handed that matter over to the Justice Department. I say it was the duty of the Public Works Department to take up this question themselves and find out who is to blame, and compel a return of the money to the public coffers. He says now he has turned it over to the Justice Department, and he really doesn't know whether they are going to do anything or not. The department has paid over this money on the strength of a false document ; I do not care whether it was issued by the treasurer of the city of Ottawa, or at the instance of the secretary of the Realty Company ; the fact is that the cheque was issued on the strength of that false document. It is not flattering to the Public Works Department that they should have issued a cheque on a false document. Now, I want to know from the Minister of Public Works whether they intend to go after the Realty Company, or the city treasurer of Ottawa, I do not care which, whichever one is guilty of making this false document. I want the minister to tell us whether any effort is being made to punish those who were guilty, as shown by that investigation. We were never able to discover in the Public Accounts Committee what price the Realty Company were paying the Ottawa Electric Light Company for the light they were furnishing to the government. I say that the Public Accounts Committee is not a place where the government should stand on fine legal points, when we are endeavouring to get at facts vital to the public interest. There should be no objections raised in the Public Accounts Committee, particularly by a minister of the Crown, whose duty it is to guard the public interest. But our experience has been that, no matter what minister is before the committee, he acts as if he had received a large retainer in order to protect the witness who is there for the purpose of giving information. I want to know where this is going to end. I want to know whether the minister is going to continue the farce, or whether he intends to take any steps to force these parties to return the money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I only repeat to my hon. friend that the papers in the case have been handed over to the Justice Department, with the request that they will look into the case, and take such action as they may think proper to take. The Justice Department is the proper tribunal to which to send cases of this kind.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I think the minister is in error when he stated that the Conservatives were in power twenty years ago when this change was made about the electric lighting. I was here twenty years ago, and my hon. friend was not ; and I know that at that time the government generated the light in this building, and then the plant was moved down below the hill on the edge of the river. The power was at work when the change of government took place, and it was the late Mr. Tarte who made the change, and put in these lights we have now. Those are the facts, and the minister was trying to mislead the House when he stated that the change was made twenty years ago.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The expression 'trying to mislead the House' is not in order.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). If the expression 'misleading the House' is not in accordance with the rules of the House, I withdraw it. I say the minister misinformed the House when he made that statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It was not the expression 'misleading' that was out of order, but the expression 'trying to mislead.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. The information I gave was furnished to me by the chief architect. I could have no personal knowledge of the matter myself.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The change was made in 1897, according to the records, and that is not twenty years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect can remember that they had an electric light power in 1891, which would be about twenty years ago, but he is not able to state when it was changed.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The change was made in 1897, and the architect will find it in his books.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it is important, the chief architect will look into it.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Let the minister ask his chief architect if the late Mr. Tarte did not put in the present lights.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Ewart says he cannot remember when the government ceased to develop electric light. But if it is important, I will have him look up the records.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Let the minister ask his chief architect if it was not the late Mr. Tarte, the then Minister of Public Works, who put in these lights we have here now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, yes, but it does not follow that the doing away with the electric power station took place then.

Mr. RHODES. The Minister of Public Works has taken the ground that large users of public utilities should be placed upon the same footing and pay the same prices as the smaller ones, and that the government should be placed upon the same footing as a private individual. Now I do not think the great majority of business people in this country would consent to that proposition, but whether it is sound or not, I would like to commend the Minister of Public Works to the Minister of Railways, who, during the deliverance of his budget speech on the Intercolonial railway last year, and the year before, complained to the House that the government was compelled to purchase its supplies for the Intercolonial at the same price as everybody else, although it was a large purchaser of supplies, and if it were not compelled to publish the price at which they were purchased in the Auditor General's Report, they would be able to obtain goods at a lower rate than the general public. He advanced the argument that the accounts of the Intercolonial railway should not be published in that report, because the company would then be able to purchase its supplies cheaper. Only three days ago, in this House, the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) brought up the case of an excursion train being taken from Lévis to Montreal and return, a distance of some 326 miles, and that tickets were sold on that train for $1.50 each, or less than one-half cent a mile return, whereas the rate confirmed by the Railway Commission, and the minimum rate to be charged by other lines of railway was $2.70 for the same service. There was a case of a public utility, but the Minister of Railways justified the smaller charge on the ground that he was serving a larger number, that a larger number of tickets was sold, and that the government was making money out of the transaction. So on these two points the Minister of Railways is diametrically opposed to the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. SPROULE. The statement made by the Minister of Railways was an extraordinary one. He said it was not his place to try to beat any one down, or get them to lower their figures under what they were charging others in a contract like this. The principle has been recognized by this government that it is their duty not to expend public moneys, where the expenditure exceeds a certain sum, without asking for tenders. Both sides of the House have put themselves on record in a resolution to that effect. Therefore it is not for the Minister of Public Works to say, I am not going to ask this company or any other company to furnish us with light at a lower rate than they are furnishing it to other customers. His duty is to ask for tenders, and if the company is prepared to tender at a lower rate than they are selling to others, on account of the larger contract, then it is for that company to say what they will tender for, and if they tender to serve the government lower than other parties, it is the duty of the minister to accept that tender.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I would ask the Minister of Public Works to furnish the House with the date when the late Mr. Tarte made the change, and installed the lights we have now. I would also like him to say what was done with the plant the government then owned. Was it handed over to the parties who are now furnishing the light? We had a good plant and wiring, what became of them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get the details for my hon. friend.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In 1896 when this government came into power these buildings were lighted with gas. At that time the government were paying more for gas than they should, as the price of gas has gone down since. At that time the cost of lighting all the public buildings in the city of Ottawa, according to the Auditor General's Report, was $23,483, in 1896, when the Conservative party went out of power. At the present time, under the Liberal party, it is costing this country $53,000 per year to do exactly the same service as was done in 1896. In addition to that we have now electric power, should we not get that electric power much cheaper than gas?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has not been my experience.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then the minister must have been dealing an awful lot in gas and very little in electricity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have used a good deal of both.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the minister mean to tell this committee that gas is cheaper than electric power?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then why is so much electric power being developed? There is not a man in this Dominion but who believes that gas is dearer than electric power; otherwise it would be used.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in the city of St. John, I used gas before I had my house wired for electricity. I am satisfied that electric light cost me twice what gas had formerly cost.

Mr. REID (Grenville). We are speaking of Ottawa, and not St. John. I do not know anything about St. John, but I know that power in Ottawa is sold at probably $15 per horse-power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well, others can get it if the minister can not. Any manufacturing industry in Ottawa that wants power, can get it for that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You may get it undeveloped at the dam for $15.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is what it is any place. In Ottawa it is only $15 or $20 per horse-power. I would like the minister to explain how it is that he is now spending $53,000 for lighting these buildings, when it only cost $24,000 when gas was used. If that goes on each year, where are we going to end? I would like the minister to tell the committee one single item in regard to which he has decreased the expenditure or effected economies since he became minister. Can he name one single instance? If he does, I will guarantee to name several where he has increased the expenditure a good deal more, and in connection with these increases, I believe that there has been grafting, robbery and that kind of thing going on. Will the minister name one?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are just at the present time discussing the lighting of the buildings throughout Canada.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am speaking of Ottawa.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Neither in respect of these buildings nor in respect of the lighting of the buildings in the city of Ottawa, can I show a decrease for the reason that every year the number of rooms which is being occupied for the different departments of the government is increasing. Since 1896 there have been a great many hands, possibly a thousand, of clerks added to the different departments for the purpose of attending to the expanding business of the country. My hon. friend has been asleep during the past fourteen years, he does not know that the country has been growing with marvellous rapidity, that its business has doubled, almost trebled in that period of time. The hon. gentleman forgets all that.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The clerks have, but the business has not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Beyond the buildings which were occupied in 1896, we have two large buildings on Slater street, the large building on Bank street, the building on O'Connor street, the building on Queen street, and the Corry building, near the railway station. All these buildings are occupied in addition to those which were occupied in 1896. They have to be lighted and that adds to the expense. We have additional charges for gas and electricity. But let my hon. friend go any day to the committee on Public Accounts, when experts are there who know these things, and find out whether we are spending for them one single dollar more than we ought to spend.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). We have had that in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With regard to these expenditures, my hon. friend cannot expect me to decrease the cost of lighting, heating, elevator men or messengers, as all these services are increasing so rapidly. But, if my hon. friend chooses on some proper occasion, to ask as to economies, I could tell him of a great many economies which have been introduced since I became Minister of Public Works. We are making some very large savings in connection with some very important works throughout Canada.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister tells us now, that we should go to the Public Accounts Committee, and see whether there is anything wrong with regard to these items. On this very item, when it came up last year, he asked us to go to the Public Accounts Committee. We went to the Public Accounts Committee on this one item. The minister himself, admits that the item was investigated in the Public Accounts Committee. A gentleman he had there practically acting on behalf of the person who had charged the rates, was willing to second the motion——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is absolutely in error.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to know if it is not a fact.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had nobody acting there, and there was nobody acting there, as far as I know, for the Realty Company.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister knows well enough that in these investigations he has the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell), practically fighting like a tiger to try to prevent us from investigating anything.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is absurd.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is no doubt about that. Every hon. gentleman

knows it. He is there fighting in order not to get out the facts. As far as I am concerned, I believe he is there to uphold the rascality that is going on——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that language is wholly unjustified, and unjustifiable, and that the hon. gentleman ought to be ashamed of it himself.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am not ashamed to make the statement, because I know it to be a fact.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman ought not to use language of that kind with regard to a member of this House. I will call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the hon. gentleman has charged that the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell), goes there. according to his belief, for the purpose of preventing the truth from coming out in the committee.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have no hesitation in saying——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman ought to withdraw that expression, which is entirely unjustifiable.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I said that my belief was that he goes there deliberately and tries to block investigation into these cases. I believe that and as long as I believe it, I do not see that there is anything unparliamentary about it. In so far as saying that it is unjustifiable——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A point of order has been raised. The hon. gentleman is at liberty to explain his words, but until the point is decided, he may not be permitted to continue his remarks.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not know what the point is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will ask the Minister of Public Works to re-state his point of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The point of order is that the hon. gentleman was making a most improper reflection upon the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick, one that he ought not to make, and one which he ought to withdraw.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because it is an exceedingly improper remark.

Mr. SPROULE. The same remarks have been made over and over again in this House, and, if I understand the rules of order correctly, any member of the House may make them without violating any rules of order. He did not say positively that he does go there, but he said: That is my impression, that is my belief.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is what I do believe too.

Mr. SPROULE. I think such a remark permissible. He may be wrong in his judgment, but he cannot be hanged for his belief.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Objection has been taken to an expression made with regard to the member for Carleton, New Brunswick, going to the committee. When an hon. gentleman's words run over a long sentence and no specific word is objected to, it is not easy to rule. Any expression conveying the meaning or idea that the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick, was doing dishonourable or improper work, in the committee, would be out of order. If the hon. gentleman's words conveyed that impresion, they would be out of order.

Mr. REID (Grenville). You know, Mr. Chairman, what I said, and you know what I meant.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman did use the expression that the hon. member for Carleton went to the committee with the intention of covering up rascality, it would be wrong.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not say that. What I said was——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has a right to state what he said, and whatever he says he said will be accepted as his statement.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What I said was that when the hon. member for Carleton was in the committee he was at least not assisting us to get at the facts in the way he should. I am not reflecting on the hon. member for Carleton personally because every person knows that any lawyer could be employed, without reflecting on his reputation, to defend a murderer or anything else.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has a right to state what he said, but until the point is finally decided he has not the right to proceed with an argument. As the hon. gentleman put it, I do not think his statement now is out of order.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Thank you.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the hon. member (Mr. Reid) makes a still worse reflection on the hon. member for Carleton, because he now asserts he went there as a lawyer.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No, no.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not so understand him.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). He said any lawyer could defend a criminal.

Mr. BARKER. The Minister of Public Works declared that the hon. member (Mr. Reid) ought to be ashamed of himself, and I submit there can be no doubt as to the impropriety of that expression.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood the hon. member (Mr. Reid) to say that the hon. member for Carleton went to the committee for the purpose among other things of covering up rascality, and if he said that I thought he ought to be ashamed of himself. The hon. member (Mr. Reid) says now he did not say that, but he intimated that the hon. member for Carleton is employed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not say that.

Mr. COWAN. You have already ruled Mr. Speaker that the hon. member for Grenville has not made an improper reflection on the hon. member for Carleton and therefore the Minister of Public Works is not justified in making such a statement.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not say the hon. member for Carleton was employed to go to the committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the expression that the hon. member ought to be ashamed of himself was intended to convey the idea that he had been guilty of dishonourable conduct, then it would be out of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I will withdraw, but wait a moment. If the hon. gentleman from Grenville solemnly assures this committee that he did not say that the member for Carleton went to the committee to hide rascality, then I feel I should not have used that expression towards the hon. member for Grenville and I withdraw it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the minister deny that when this fraud was exposed in the Public Accounts Committee last year the committee practically unanimously agreed that it should be condemned and the minister cancelled the contract and admitted he had not made a good bargain. How would it be possible for the Public Accounts Committee to investigate every item of the expenditure of $100,000,000. I appeal now to the Minister of Finance because I believe he wants to help these items through and desires to see honest expenditure. The Minister of Finance must know that there was rascality shown up in the Public Accounts Committee, and I would ask him, as I asked the Minister of Public Works this afternoon, to appoint Judge Cassels a commissioner to investigate the Public Works Department, just as he investigated the Marine and Fisheries Department. Judge Cassels' report would satisfy not only the members on this side but the public of Canada generally. Of course when I preferred this request to the Minister of Public Works he raised the objection that everything had been straight and that we had not shown any wrong-doing. The Deputy Minister of Finance is present at every meeting of the Public Accounts Committee watching the proceedings, and I am satisfied the Minister of Finance will not stand up here to-night and declare that everything has been found straight and right in the Public Works Department. I think the Minister of Finance will admit that we have proven that rascality and graft has been going on in that department. Would it not be in the interest of the public to have the Minister of Finance grant a commission of inquiry? Should he do so, speaking for myself, I am satisfied the members of this side would cheerfully let the items go through, if we were promised an investigation by Judge Cassels, an upright and honourable man who is in no way connected with the members on this side of the House. Cannot the Minister of Finance grant that simple and reasonable request and let us see how it will work out? I appeal to him to do so.

Mr. FIELDING. I was not present when my hon. friend made that request to the Minister of Public Works, and I did not hear the minister's reply, but I think it was probably a wise and proper one.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But the Minister of Public Works said there was nothing wrong in the Public Works Department.

Mr. FIELDING. That was a good reply.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, and the same reply was made as to the Marine and Fisheries Department.

That was the defence always given by the government, that there was nothing the matter with the government; everything was all right. But when a commission investigated the department it found that there was no conscience in that department at all. It is useless for us to go over the condemnation meted out to the government by gentlemen appointed by themselves to investigate one department. My hon. friend has the same excuse now. The Minister

of Public Works said there was nothing wrong, that no investigation was required, and the Minister of Finance states: Whatever the Minister of Public Works said this afternoon I will endorse. That shows the great faith the Minister of Finance has in the Minister of Public Works. It is well known that the people of Canada are not satisfied with the various departments. Something went wrong with the department of the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy). I am not charging him, because I suppose most of the wrong-doing occurred before he assumed that position, but that hon. gentleman said that the investigation in the Printing Bureau proved the country had lost $70,000 by irregularities in the department. These are the things that have aroused suspicions in the country. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) has asked for a general investigation into the Public Works Department. If there is nothing wrong in that department my hon. friend will not suffer. One department had to bring bookkeepers from New York at a cost of $50 and $75 a day per man and expenses to look into the bookkeeping of the department. I thought that Canada was as well versed in bookkeeping as the United States, but the minister was careful not to allow any Canadian to look into that department. He said in effect that there was nobody in Canada equal to the occasion. They found all this wrong-doing. The opposition now want an investigation into my hon. friend's department. The hon. minister states there is nothing wrong, but we are very suspicious that there is. If there is nothing wrong my hon. friend will not suffer. Why not have a general investigation, which will avoid all this detailed criticism? In the Public Accounts Committee it was found that a man who had been supplying goods to this government without public competition bought an article for $325 and sold it to the government for $960. Before we secured the cost price we had a discussion in the committee and hon. gentlemen opposite said: Do not allow this gentleman to tell how much this article cost him, that would be prying into his private business, and a resolution was put to the committee to that effect. The Finance Minister, whose duty it is to take care of the finances of Canada, voted against allowing that man to tell how much it cost when he was making a profit of 187 per cent. I would think the Minister of Finance would be glad to shift some of the responsibility on the Minister of Public Works, who bears it so gently.

These are some of the wrong-doings that have been found by the investigations made by this side of the House and by gentlemen appointed by this government. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) is asking for the appointment of a public commission to investigate this department generally, avoiding these detailed investigations here, a commission which will be able to lift the lid when the government are not there to hold it down. I thought the minister was going to accede to that request, but I misjudged him, as I have done before. I hope now, that having heard this statement of willingness from this side to assist him in satisfying the public, who are rather suspicious of my hon. friend's department, perhaps not suspicious of himself, he will grant the commission. To-night we asked to have public competition in the supply of light. He says: Oh, no, that is against the policy of my government; we do not want public competition. We want to ask people to give prices, and he says he is a little fearful lest we shall get a lower price than the private individual. If the minister grants an investigation and it is found that there is nothing wrong he will have support in the future from this side that he cannot have now, when his department is surrounded by suspicion.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am surprised the minister did not state whether he believed there had been anything wrong in the Public Works Department. He must have got information from his deputy minister, and these facts must have been brought to his attention. The very item we are on was before the Public Accounts Committee last year, and I would ask whether the minister heard the result of that investigation? At the same time last year there was another investigation about a firm in Montreal, the Lymburner firm. The minister must admit that that firm was getting about 200 per cent profit. Every one on this side expected that when it was shown that that firm was charging such prices the Public Works Department would cease doing business with them, but to our surprise we again find the name in the accounts of this year. On finding the high prices charged by this firm we got the accounts and we found that the goods were bought from Lymburner, and certified by a man named Lymburner. We brought him here and found that he was a shareholder and director of the company from whom the department were buying these goods, receiving money as dividends from the firm from which he was buying goods as agent of the department—and he must have been receiving good big dividends, judging by the prices the government paid. He was appointed at $1,300 a year by the Public Works Department as inspector to certify that goods he was purchasing from his own company were correct and the prices fair and just. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, who is leading the House to-night, and should answer, if he considers—

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Were not tenders and prices asked for from

two or three different firms, and was not the tender of Lymburner, Limited, the lowest?

Mr. REID (Grenville). The way in which these tenders were asked for——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Please answer my question.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As far as my memory serves me, the Lymburner, Limited, were not the lowest tenderers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman's memory does not serve him rightly because they were.

Mr. RHODES. In the matter referred to, public tenders were not called for. There was a letter purporting to contain a tender sent by the firm of Millen & Thom, for the sum of $520 for repairs to be done a certain elevator in the old examining warehouse in Montreal, the exact date of which letter I have forgotten. But ten days later another letter came from the firm of Lymburner, Limited, tendering for the same work for the sum of $506.50, which was immediately accepted. These were the only tenders received; but according to the evidence of both the Lymburners there were 20 firms in Montreal capable of performing the same kind of work. Under those circumstances it is perfectly just and right to say that no tenders were called. Even if it could be said that tenders were called, the evidence on the face of it would go to show there was collusion.

Mr. REID (Grenville). After a statement of this kind, does the Minister of Finance think it unreasonable that we should ask for an investigation? Is he willing that irregularities of this kind should be allowed to continue in any public department and the finances of this country wasted in this manner? This is only one sample, we have named others, and if the Minister of Finance wants more we can give them. I would like him to say if, from the investigations which have taken place in the Public Accounts Committee and from what he has heard in this House, he thinks that everything has been going on right in the Department of Public Works. If not will he give us this one chance to show the real condition of affairs; and if the Public Works Department can show a clean sheet after such an investigation, we shall be quite willing to let the Department of the Secretary of State and the others go scot free. If the hon. the Minister of Finance is not afraid to speak, he ought to have no hesitation in giving a reply.

Mr. KYTE. With respect to the transaction referred to by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) I beg to remind the committee that the circumstances were not all disclosed in my hon. friend's statement. Mr. Lymburner, the inspector, said that he sent out four different notices to parties engaged in that kind of work, that he received only two tenders, and that the contract was awarded to the lowest. And Mr. Lymburner has stated that he had ceased to be a director of the company the moment he became an employee of the department.

Mr. RHODES. On the contrary, the evidence on oath of that gentleman was that he is still a director and has been since the incorporation of the company.

Mr. GERVAIS. A shareholder.

Mr. RHODES. And a director.

Mr. KYTE. He had been at one time the managing director.

Mr. RHODES. And is still a director.

Mr. KYTE. And is still a stockholder of the company.

Mr. RHODES. And a director.

Mr. KYTE. Furthermore it was disclosed that the work was done at the lowest cost at which such work could be done in Montreal. Nor was there any attempt made by the hon. member for Cumberland, who was conducting the investigation, to prove any overcharge. I am confident that the evidence when reported to the House, will disclose that the work was done at the lowest price obtainable and that Mr. Lymburner had certified that he had no other interests in that company than that of a stockholder.

Mr. NORTHRUP. This incident is an illustration of the old saying that the unexpected generally happens. The result of this discussion has been, in my judgment, to give us in the last fifteen minutes the most important announcement made on the floor of parliament in the last 15 years. Ever since 1896, we have been taught to look on the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) as the watchdog of the treasury, the one man in the cabinet whose honesty was to be depended upon to prevent the squandering of public money in the departments of colleagues less scrupulous than himself. To-night, however, the Minister of Finance repudiated the idea that at any time he was ever the guardian of the treasury and states that he is merely the receptacle of the opinions of his colleagues. If any one of his colleagues says: 'Everything is right in my department' then, according to the Minister of Finance, his sole duty is to accept it. Now, I have either correctly or incorrectly given the statement made by my hon. friend. There is no member of this House who would be less willing than myself to misrepresent him in any way: and if I have in any degree misunderstood and consequently misrepresented his statement,

I shall with pleasure give way and allow him to correct the understanding I took from the statement he made on the floor of this House.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not quarrelling with the hon. gentleman's version of what I said. My statement will appear in 'Hansard' and will speak for itself and I am willing to be judged by it.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Unfortunately it is impossible for us to have the 'Hansard' report at this moment, but every hon. gentleman present who heard the statement made will judge the Finance Minister by it, no matter what 'Hansard' may say. I say that the statement he made when appealed to by my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) to consent to an investigation into certain departments on the grounds alleged by my hon. friend, namely, that the conditions, the transactions and the figures of these departments justified investigation—when that appeal was made, the Minister of Finance had but one answer. That answer was this: I have been told by my colleagues that these figures are correct. Am I right or wrong in that statement?

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman says he does not care what 'Hansard' may say. I do. 'Hansard' will report what happened, and I am content to be judged by it.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I agree with every word that 'Hansard' says to-morrow; but I am speaking of the present, of to-night, and I am speaking in the presence of hon. members who heard the statement made by the Minister of Finance. And what do we in this House care for what 'Hansard' may say to-morrow? Does the hon. gentleman expect that the unrevised version of 'Hansard' will give a different statement from that which rang in the ears of every hon. member of this House a few moments ago? What about this reference to 'Hansard'? Either 'Hansard' will be correct or it will not. If it be correct, it will bear out the statement I have made. If it does not, I say it will be incorrect, and I speak in the hearing of those who heard the hon. gentleman. I say that the hon. gentleman, when appealed to as 'the watchdog of the treasury,' repudiated responsibility as watchdog—he is not even an alarm clock; it is for him merely to accept the accounts handed in by his colleagues. 'Hansard,' I hope, will report my words as well as those of the Minister of Finance. But the crucial matter is that this House has, for the first time in its history, heard a Minister of Finance deliberately state on this floor that he practically has no responsibility whatever for the accounts of his colleagues so long as they tell him those accounts are correct. And think of a minister of Finance who is the only man out of two hundred and twenty members of this House who does not know that the accounts have not been correct for years gone by! Can any man possibly have attended the meetings of the Public Accounts Committee, year after year—and I have seen the Minister of Finance there—when accounts were investigated and not know that accounts were brought before this House that were not correct? Yet the Minister of Finance, knowing that these accounts are not correct, is prepared, in the face of this House and before Heaven, to say that he has no further responsibility to this House and to the people of Canada than to accept any statement made to him by any of his colleagues. The question before the House is a comparatively small matter, a mere question of expenditure. But I think the House is to be congratulated that, in the discussion of this comparatively small matter, we have had enunciated by the Minister of Finance a principle which the people of this country will understand and remember—that, since the year 1896, there has not been anybody in charge of the Department of Finance, and that the minister had no responsibility to anybody in this country except his colleagues. We understand now why the Farmers Bank was chartered.

Mr. BLAIN. There are other people in Canada who made the request of this government to have further investigation of these departments, including the Department of Public Works.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) wishes to continue the argument on that line, I have to remind him that the item before us is that of lighting the Dominion buildings at Ottawa. Unless the arguments can be made somewhat applicable to that subject, I cannot allow the discussion to take a wider range.

Mr. BLAIN. I obey your decision, Mr. Chairman. We are discussing the question whether there should be an investigation of this lighting or not, and whether an investigation should be by this House spending hour after hour upon it, or whether it should be by commission. And I was pointing out that other people have suggested that a thorough and public investigation should be made, and this I substantiate by reading a statement of the commissioners who investigated the Marine Department:

> Your commissioners regret having been unable to investigate the condition of things in some of the other departments. But to do the work with any pretensions to thoroughness would take much more time than would probably be agreeable to the government.

That is the statement of gentlemen appointed by the government to investigate one department. If they had reached the department having this lighting in charge, I suppose they would have said they regretted they had not an opportunity to go into still other departments. To have matters of this kind cleared up and to allay public suspicion, this side of the House moved a resolution asking for an investigation into all large spending departments which would include the lighting contracts. I need not put this resolution again on 'Hansard;' the Minister of Finance remembers it well, and so does the Minister of Public Works. In the face of that statement by gentlemen appointed by themselves, that other departments required investigation, we on this side put ourselves on record as asking for a thorough investigation of the Public Works Department and others. This was moved in 1909. And what did the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works do? Why, they recorded their votes against the resolution, declaring that, no matter what the commissioners said, they found no wrong-doing in the Marine and Fisheries Department and suggested in their report that there is wrong-doing in other departments and regret very much that they had not the opportunity to investigate it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They did not say, I think, that there was wrong-doing in other departments.

Mr. BLAIN. That is what they said :

Your commissioners regret having been unable to investigate the condition of things in some of the other departments.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman said that they reported that there was wrong-doing in the other departments.

Mr. BLAIN. What else would he take out of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not take out of it what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) stated.

Mr. BLAIN. If the hon. minister feels that everything is right in his department, why refuse the investigation?

Mr. PARDEE. No necessity for it.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) said, before the investigation, that there was nothing wrong in the Marine Department. But his friends the commissioners said there was something wrong and that the department had no conscience. But the point is that we are asking that in such matters as this lighting contract there should be an investigation. A year ago we asked for a commission of investigation, and I was much surprised that the Minister of Finance should vote against it. I had a great deal more confidence in him, and I thought he had more confidence in the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) than there would seem to have been at that time.

Mr. LALOR. They got into trouble with one commission, and they did not want any more.

Mr. BLAIN. Exactly. Suppose the opposition were to move for an investigation into my hon. friend's (Mr. Pugsley's) department, where would he stand? Has he the same policy now? He has learned some new things, I am sure. We have had him before the Public Accounts Committee, for instance, on the sawdust wharf. He knows the weak points of that wharf as well as the strong ones. And the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) knows it too. That wharf is in the eastern part of Canada, and he is always anxious to protect the eastern part.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend's (Mr. Blain) friends in eastern Canada never give me that credit.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not know what credit the minister has, but I know what he does; when we ask for investigation he refuses not only by speech but by vote. I suppose we are to go on without public competition for lighting for my hon. friend is opposed to investigation, and to public competition. Therefore, the friends of this government must be fed with contracts. When the Minister of Public Works is asked as to competition, he says: We have a list, and we ask those upon the list to tender. One hon. gentleman has shown that there were twenty people ready to tender. Why did not the minister put the whole twenty on the list, or, better still, advertise publicly, thus brushing away all suspicion with regard to his department that the public interest is not maintained?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no list, I think, but Mr. Lymburner said his authority was to buy from anybody at the cheapest possible rate, and he thought he had secured sufficient competition by these circulars.

Power for running elevators, stamp-cancelling machines, &c., $32,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is an increase of $7,000 owing to the increase in the number of buildings throughout the country.

Mr. SPROULE. We ought to have some information as to where these are.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the cost of electric power for running elevators and other machines in the public buildings throughout the Dominion. It is estimated that the power for elevators now installed will cost $25,820, and for those being installed $4,320. I cannot give further details, because these are simply buildings throughout the whole Dominion.

Mr. BLAIN. What course does the minister pursue in towns where there are two lighting plants, as, for instance, in the city of Brantford?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure that what we do is to get the lowest price from the companies, but we do not advertise for tenders.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not? Are you afraid you will get it too cheap?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We could not possibly get it cheaper than we do. My hon. friend knows that these companies have just two rates, a flat rate, and a meter rate, and whichever of these rates is applied it is the same to everybody.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not call for tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We could not get a reduced rate.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister has not tried.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know perfectly well we could not do it. I have here a list of these buildings throughout the Dominion for which this $32,000 is estimated. It takes in the parliament buildings and many other buildings in Ottawa, and the public buildings in many cities throughout the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the fixed rate for power?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The average rate is about $30 per annum per horse-power.

Mr. SPROULE. A pretty high rate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at retail, I think.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister speaks of there being only the flat rate, and the meter rate. And, if I understood him correctly, he gave the flat rate as $2.25 a lamp.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The company rate here in Ottawa is $2.25 per lamp for the first three thousand lamps, and $2 after that. From the city we get a straight rate of $2.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister said that is as low a rate as he could expect. How does he account for the fact that in the town of Orillia they sell at $2 per lamp even if a man takes only four or five necessary to light a small house? Speaking with the mayor of Orillia, he told me that they were paying expenses and making a good profit besides; they did not require that the consumer should take 2,000 or 3,000 lamps before getting the benefit of this rate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do I understand that a man can get enough to light a small house for $8 a year—four lights at $2 apiece?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes. And I have known it to be as low as $1 a year. But I think that that is below the rate at which it can be furnished to-day. But the point in this case is the point of public competition. There are many places where competition is not possible, but there are other towns and cities that have two or three plants, and, in such cases, I regard it as the duty of the Minister of Public Works to ask for tenders. If that were done, no one could reasonably find fault; but, so long as he does otherwise, there is a suspicion that he has not done his whole duty.

Rents, &c., $260,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for payment of rents during the next fiscal year of buildings leased for the public departments in all parts of the Dominion. This takes in the whole of the Dominion including the city of Ottawa. Perhaps I might give the list to the committee: Nova Scotia, Halifax, examining warehouse $1,000; penitentiary 24 cents—I do not know what that means; North Sydney, engineer's office $120; Prince Edward Island, Charlottetown, engineer's office, $200; Grand Falls, post office, $120; St. John, customs house, water lots, $22; immigration detention building, $2,105.37; Quebec, $15,861; Ontario, $184,847; Manitoba $4,304; Saskatchewan, $7,487; Alberta, $11,760; British Columbia, $2,700; Peace River district $300. That makes a total of $233,099.11. Then, for phones the total is $1,737.65.

Mr. GOODEVE. I would like to ask the minister if the same generous rental is paid in outside places throughout the Dominion that is shown to be paid in the city of Ottawa?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps I might better answer that question in another way, by saying that the same economy is observed in the city of Ottawa as is observed throughout the Dominion, and if my hon. friend will take the rentals we are paying throughout the Dominion for accommodation for custom houses and post offices I think he will see that we are very prudent and economical; in fact, some people may say that we are too much so.

Dominion buildings, salaries of engineers, firemen, caretakers, &c., $235,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the purpose of paying salaries in Ottawa and throughout the Dominion. I have a list for the different provinces of the engineers and caretakers and their salaries. I will not read it to the committee, because it would take several hours, but if any hon. gentleman wishes to inquire as to any particular matter I will be very glad to give him the information.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to hear about Manitoba.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will give the information to my hon. friend with pleasure. In Manitoba we have 32 engineers, firemen

and caretakers to whom we pay $23,366, or that is the estimate of their salaries for the coming year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Are these engineers employed entirely in public buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In public buildings.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not on dredges?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. About what figure do you pay your caretakers in these buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Amherst we pay $400; Annapolis, $400; Antigonish, $400; Arichat, $150; Baddeck, $250; Bridgewater, $400; Glace Bay, $600; Halifax, $750. I think we pay a little more when we get west of Lake Superior. At Winnipeg we pay the engineer at the old post office $960; firemen, $720; elevator man, $650; electrician, $1,080, and so on.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these certificated engineers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The engineers are all certificated, but the caretakers are not.

Dominion cattle quarantine stations, renewals, repairs, &c., $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That amount is required by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we ought to have the Department of Agriculture here to explain it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This vote is required to make provision for the construction of corrals and dipping vats along the boundary line between Canada and the United States, and the maintenance of cattle quarantine stations generally throughout the Dominion in a proper state of repair and efficiency during the fiscal year ending March 30, 1912. The whole is in accordance with a request made by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture. He has written a letter in which he urges that this amount should be placed in the estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these dipping stations does he propose to build along the boundary?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has not given the information as to those. Perhaps my hon. friend will be good enough to allow me to get the Minister of Agriculture to give him the information when his estimates are under consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting to the item, but we would like to know what they are doing in other lines, because some people think there is a good deal of danger of importing disease.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have these stations in a number of places in the different provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. What do each of these stations cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From $500 to $600 each. We may have to erect one on an emergency and a vote has to be available. I will get the particulars for my hon. friend when the agricultural items are under consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. We are running business without a quorum, and I am afraid I will have to draw the attention of the chairman to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There are 20 members present.

Mr. SPROULE. It will be distinctly understood that when the agricultural estimates are up, we will get all the information about this vote ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is clearly understood.

Yukon public buildings, $75,000.

Mr. SPROULE. We ought to have some information about this. The population is constantly decreasing and the expenses are about the same.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have the details here as to the cost for each building. We have been paying Mr. Bertrand, agent for the department, a salary of $4,000. He is clerk of works or superintendent of buildings, but he is leaving the Yukon and I think he intends resigning his position. If so, one of the other officials will discharge the duties of the office and it will not be necessary to fill Mr. Bertrand's place. There is a reduction of $5,000 on this vote.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you providing for a salary of $4,000 for that office next year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total vote is reduced by $5,000. We will not have Mr. Bertrand's salary to pay, although we may have to pay some other official a slight increase for looking after the work.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not what I asked. Are you providing for a salary of $4,000 for the man who fills this office ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am unable to tell my hon. friend without going into details. The result is a total of $5,000 less than last year. One official, Mr. Bertrand, has resigned, and we expect to have his duties performed by another official, possibly at some increase in salary.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not give the slightest information in regard to his salary. Does it account for the reduction of $5,000?

Mr. BLAIN. What is the population now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know exactly. It has declined from the boom days, but there is considerable permanent mining, hydraulic mining, and, I think, in some parts of the district, quartz mining.

Mr. BLAIN. The department is expending a good deal there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but we are making reductions. The services of quite a number of officials in the Interior Department have been dispensed with, and we are dispensing with the services of one of our most heavily salaried men.

Mr. GOODEVE. Is the post office building for which there is a vote of $13,000 a government owned building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. GOODEVE. How many employees are there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a caretaker at $160 a month, a night caretaker at $160, a charwoman, and then this vote includes the lighting service, fuel, water and scavenger service, &c.

Mr. GOODEVE. Would the postmaster live in the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no memorandum on that point, but I assume not, because I presume the caretaker lives there.

Mr. SPROULE. A very commonplace man who is reliable will do quite well as a caretaker, and here you are paying two men at the rate of $1,920 each per annum. In many post offices in the east the caretakers live in the building and receive very small salaries. Formerly, we paid very high salaries in the Yukon and were told it was owing to the high cost of living, but that the expenses were coming down. I should think that you could get good, useful, reliable men to do the work there for one-half the money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not think so; that would be about what we pay in Winnipeg. In the Yukon the conditions are not pleasant and wages and expenses are very high, so that for these positions we have to pay good salaries. I do not think we could get reliable caretakers in the Yukon for less than we are paying. In the east we get them in many cases for $400 or $250, but in the west we have to pay more and in the Yukon we have found it impossible to get reliable caretakers for less than we pay.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they reside in the building or not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can obtain a memorandum of that from the department.

Mr. SPROULE. I heard it stated recently that the population of the Yukon is now between 2,000 and 3,000 people. Some years ago we were told the population was 20,000 people from all over the world, and that it was necessary to keep a large staff there at high salaries, because of the unsettled condition of things there and the danger of the turbulent element. We are told that we have to pay them very high figures because everything is very dear there, but the population has been growing less and the revenues have been diminishing, and there is no reason why the numbers of this force should not be diminished. Yet we keep up the same number from year to year, and every year we are given the same reasons, namely, that it is necessary in the interests of peace and safety to keep up the number. Yet we are told by men from Dawson that that city is just as peaceful as Toronto or Montreal. Why there should not be a greater reduction I do not understand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The country is very remote, and it is difficult to get into it and out of it. In the winter you have to take a journey of a good many miles until you strike the railway at Whitehorse. It is a part of the country where people do not like to live, unless attracted by mining and work incidental to that industry. I do not think it would be possible to get caretakers for less than we are paying these. The suggestion of my hon. friend that we should reduce the number of employees is however, worthy of consideration. The department of the Interior has made considerable deductions. We are dispensing with the services of one of our highest priced men, who has resigned, because he got tired of living out there.

Mr. BLAIN. Have you given him any other office ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not so far as my department is concerned.

Mr. BLAIN. In any other department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not that I am aware of. That will make a saving of $4,000 very nearly. He was clerk of works and superintendent of buildings and general agent of the government in connection with expenditures.

Mr. GOODEVE. I have no objection to paying good salaries and I quite understand that the conditions out there are peculiar, but it would be well for the minister to look into this question and see how it is this building requires so many employees. $13,000 seems a pretty large amount apart from the other salaries paid.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I had the privilege the summer before last of spending 10 days in Dawson City. The public building contains the post office, customs house and

Inland revenue office, and quite a number of officials are housed there. Dawson is one of the most important post offices in the Dominion, from the fact that large quantities of gold are sent through it.

Mr. SPROULE. But what have the caretakers to do with that ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. These caretakers probably also act as night and day watchmen. I think they do not live in the building, as there did not appear to be room there for them, and their salaries, when we consider the enormous cost of living out there, are not large. Half of that salary in the city of Ottawa, would be very high, compared with the full amount out in the Yukon. Of course the population of Dawson has been decreasing, but I think it has arrived at the point now where the decrease will cease, especially as hydraulic mining is increasing and large companies are in operation there. In my department there, the inspector of weights and measures gets a salary of $2,500 and he may possibly resign because he claims he cannot live there on that figure.

Mr. SPROULE. I can quite understand a man like that requiring to be extra well paid, but I do not see that a caretaker is at all in the same category.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. These may not be ordinary caretakers, but watchmen and very capable men.

Mr. SPROULE. A caretaker is simply there to look after the building. Even though he cannot write his name, he may be more reliable than many a B.A. You can often find a man working as a road-maker, or drain-digger, who is as reliable as the most highly educated man you could choose. It is not fair to compare the inspector of weights and measures with the caretaker of a building. We get little information from the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) when we ask whether this man lives in the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand the minister to say he does not.

Mr. SPROULE. No, he does not state that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think he does.

Mr. SPROULE. I must accept the evidence of my own ears rather than the recollection of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I said that from my inspection of the building my impression was that he did not live in the building—there was no room.

Mr. SPROULE. We have heard it stated here that a rent of $40 a month for living quarters in any ordinary public building would be a reasonable figure. If a man were living there and had a family he would have his rent free, and, even counting this at $20, it would be a considerable sum which should be taken into account. And there is also his fuel, light and other things which add a good deal. We have not known whether these caretakers get these perquisites or not. Comparing with what is paid for this class of men throughout the country generally, it would seem that we pay a high figure. I know that for years we have been paying high salaries out there. The minister says they are trying to reduce them as well as they can. In 1909-10 the expenditure was $80,000, in 1910-11 it was the same, and in 1911-12 the estimate is $75,000, a reduction of $5,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Could the minister, on a future day, give us the total expenditure and total revenue of the Yukon?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That covers more than my department, and I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should move for a return.

Mr. BLAIN. If the hon. gentleman is unwilling—

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am willing to give anything in my own department.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman give the total revenue and expenditure of the Yukon in his own department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will make a note of that.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 8, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

PROTECTION OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 114) to provide for the protection of railway employees. He said: The object of this Bill is to provide protection and accommodation for the carpenters who are employed on the different railway systems of this country. They have complained to me that, though they are permanently employed on the various railways, proper accommodation and protection are not provided for them. The object of this Bill is to compel the companies to

provide such accommodation and protection. I understand they are negotiating with the companies at the present time; and though I informed them that it was impossible for this legislation to pass the House this session, they requested that the Bill be presented and printed.

Mr. MACDONELL. Does the Bill apply only to carpenters employed on the railway?

Mr. SMITH (Nanaimo). Yes, those engaged in repair work.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterik].

EUCHARISTIC CONGRESS AND THE MILITIA.

*Mr. HUGHES:

1. Is the government aware, as alleged, that a body of the Canadian militia from the 10th Hussars, in uniform and armed, as well as a corps authorized and armed under the Militia Act, the Papal Zouaves of Quebec, both turned out and received the Papal Legate with a salute, and acted as a guard of honour to the ecclesiastic on the occasion of his visit to Quebec during the past summer?
2. If so, were these corps authorized by the government to so turn out?
3. Will the government ascertain by whose authority such corps were turned out?
4. Is it in accordance with the Militia Act and the King's regulations and orders, for troops to turn out on such occasions?
5. Is there any objection to regiments or other bodies of troops in uniform and fully armed, turning out and doing honours to the Grand Masters of the Loyal Orange Association or other good and true men, as well as forming guards of honour, and marching on the 12th of July, in the processions of the Loyal Orange Association, an association whose object is the perpetuation of the principles of civil and religious liberty?
6. Why was there no guard of honour to meet and act as escort to the Right Honourable and Right Rev. Bishop Ingram, who came to Canada as the accredited representative of His Majesty, King George V., during the past summer?
7. Is it the intention of the government to inquire into the irregularities which occurred during the past summer in the use of troops in connection with sectarian demonstrations, and discipline those who have transgressed the law?
8. Is it the purpose of the government to require that no bodies of troops shall be permitted to take part, armed and in uniform, in any procession or demonstration not under the auspices of the state, without special authority from the government?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. The corps turned out for a voluntary church service.
4. The service was performed as a voluntary church parade, and not officially recognized or approved.
5. Answered by No. 4.
6. The matter was never brought up.
7. There was no transgression of the law, therefore, no inquiry is needed.
8. All necessary instructions are contained in the Militia Act and King's Regulations and Orders.

CANADIAN CONTINGENT TO THE CORONATION.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. What rule or principle will the government adopt in selecting the officers and men of the Canadian contingent to the Coronation?
2. What will be the probable number of officers and men of said contingent?
3. What other persons will be selected to represent the Canadian government?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My deputy informs me that the answer was sent in last week in the regular way.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I inquired of the clerk, and he cannot find it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will make further inquiry.

GUNS AT ESQUIMALT.

*Mr. BARNARD:

1 Has the government removed from Esquimalt either or both the large guns left there by the imperial authorities, and which were intended to be mounted at Signal Hill?
2. If not, has the government any intention of moving either or both of said guns?
3. What is the reason of such removal or intention to remove, and where is or are such gun or guns to be removed to?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Matters relating to the defence of the country are not made public. These are among the most powerful guns in the Dominion of Canada. While I have to say this publicly, I would be very glad to acquaint my hon. friend privately what the intention of the government is with reference to these guns.

Mr. BARNARD. Is the minister of the opinion that he can move one of these very heavy guns without the country knowing anything about it, particularly through a considerable section of the population?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As I stated to the House last year in answer to my hon. friend, the matter has been considered by the department in connection with the War Office, and a final decision has been reached as to what shall be done with the guns. I am prepared to tell my hon. friend exactly how the matter stands, and to show him the papers and all the correspondence; but I do not think it is desirable to publish them.

DOMINION LANDS IN PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN.

*Mr. LAKE:

1. What were approximately the gross receipts, cash and scrip, on account of Dominion lands revenue for the province of Saskatchewan for the twelve months ending 31st December, 1910?
2. What was approximately the cost of administration in respect of the same for the said province?
3. What was approximately the cost of surveys in the province for the said period?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. $1,163,597.18.
2. $264,600.
3. $195,692. This expenditure does not include anything for administration expenses at Ottawa which during the year ended the 31st December, 1910, amounted to $883,427.24.

IMPORTATION OF CANNED PEAS.

*Mr. MARSHALL:

How many cases of canned peas were imported into Canada in the fiscal years 1908 and 1909, giving the countries from which they come, and the amount received from each?

Mr. PATERSON:

Canned peas are not separately enumerated in the classification of imports. They are included in the item 'Vegetables, and baked beans in cans or other air-tight packages, n.o.p.' and it is impracticable to segregate the peas from the many other articles in the item.

APPLICATION FOR HOMESTEAD BY GEO. BELLEROSE.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster):

1. Upon what date did Mr. George Bellerose make application for homestead on which he has since resided in Chilliwack district?
2. If existence of timber lease is the reason for delay, to what extent does timber under lease encroach on homestead applied for?
3. If not dealt with before proclamation of proposed new regulations, in what position will this application be?
4. Is it the intention of the minister to deal with this application before the new regulations are proclaimed?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. According to the records here, George Bellerose first wrote on the 8th January, 1900, asking for entry for the south half of section 19-22 E.C.M. There is no record here of his having made a formal application for entry for any portion of this land outside of the timber berth in the manner provided, nor does it appear why he has not made a formal application.
2. Timber berth 55 covers 10 acres in the south-east corner of the said land, and has not been open to entry.
3. An informal application or an application not granted has no standing.
4. The case of George Bellerose and a number of other settlers along the edge of timber berth 55 are now under consideration.

TIMBER LICENSES IN NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT.

*Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster):

1. Have any petitions been received against renewal of timber licenses for berths Big A, Little A, and B. 61, in township 29, New Westminster district? If so, by whom signed, and what are the grounds stated?
2. What reply if any has been made to the petitioners?
3. Has any official of the government made a report recently on these timber berths? If so, to what effect?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. A petition was received dated April 2, 1910, signed by W. R. Barge and 166 others, residents of Rosedale and Chilliwack, citing that it had been heard that an application for extension of time on certain licenses covering timber berths known and described as big 'A' and little 'A' and 'B. 61' was being considered by the department, and asking that no extensions be granted on the said licenses on the ground that the land covered by said licenses is very valuable for agricultural purposes, that the best timber was taken off several years ago, and that the development of the surrounding district is retarded through the fact that this particular land is withheld from the privileges of settlement.
2. The petition was replied to 18th April, 1910, setting forth that while the department has full appreciation of the position of the settlers in question, and every desire to meet their wishes, at the same time the department is equally charged with the administration of the timber as well as that of the land, and that arrangements were in course to have inspections made of these, and other berths similarly placed, with a view to giving special consideration to the relative claims and necessities of conflicting land owners and limit holders.
3. Timber berths 61, 'A' and 'A' (6) were examined by H. C. Wallin an official of the department, who reported September 15, 1910, concerning the timber thereon that there could be cut of fir, 7,551,200 feet board measure; cedar 2,304,440 feet board measure; hemlock 440,320; total 10,295,960.

INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANCE.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Upon what basis or principle are medical men who attend to the Indians paid, is it per capita, by salary or number of visits and attendance, and distance necessary travelled?

2. Do such physicians furnish their own medicines, or are such furnished at the expense of the department?

3. How many Indians are in the reserve at Bear river, Nova Scotia?

4. Who is the medical officer attending the Indians on the reserve, when was he first appointed, upon whose recommendation, how is he paid, how much was he paid last year, and how much has he been paid since his first appointment?

5. How far does he have to travel from his home to visit the reserve, and how many visits did he make last year?

6. Are all the Bear river reserve Indians located on Bear river reserve? If not, how many are located elsewhere and where?

7. Do they have the services of another medical officer? If so, who is he, when was he first appointed, by whose recommendation, what was he paid last year, and how much has he been paid since he was first appointed?

8. What other medical officers are employed by the government to attend Indians in Nova Scotia, what is the date of the appointment of each, the number of Indians under the professional care of each, the distance in each case from the home of the medical officer to the reserve and the salary or yearly allowance to each for such medical services?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. The principle governing the payments to doctors attending Indians depends very largely upon the conditions and circumstances of each case as to whether they shall be paid by salary or by fees.

2. Physicians who are paid a salary supply the medicines prescribed for Indians. In other cases the medicines are paid for by the department.

3. Eighty.

4. Dr. L. J. Lovett; in 1887. His appointment was made at the request of the agent. He is paid salary; $250; $3,336.02.

5. From one to three and a half miles to visit the Indians at their different residences. He reported 248 visits, as well as considerable office attendance.

6. No; eighteen reside at Weymouth.

7. Yes. Dr. E. J. Elderkin is the medical officer for about 35 Indians residing at Weymouth and vicinity; in 1890; his appointment was made at the request of the agent; $100; $1,725.93.

8. The other medical men are as follows:

Names of Medical Officers in Nova Scotia.	County.	Date of Appointment on Salary.	Number of Indians.	Distance to Reserve—Miles. (Approximate.)	Annual Salary.
					$ cts.
C. P. Bissett, M.D	Richmond	May 14, 1897.	104	8	250 00
W. A. Dymond, M.D.	Lunenburg, East.	Jan. 15, 1908.	14	2	50 00
C. G. Donovan "	" West	Feb. 22, 1910.	62	7	50 00
J. L. Churchill "	" "	Dec. 17, 1908.	10	25	50 00
H. Jacques "	Kings	June 9, 1898.	78	18	50 00
J. A. Macauley "	Inverness	May 15, 1897.	38	6	75 00
D. McDonald "	"	Mar. 11, 1909.	122	2	175 00
D. M. McDonald "	Victoria	Apl. 15, 1897.	97	10	325 00
D. K. McIntyre "	Cape Breton	June 3, 1897.	244	2 to 30	350 00
W. H. McDonald "	Antigonish	July 31, 1902.	227	10, 16 & 18	250 00
E. D. McLean "	Hants	May 5, 1899.	85	5	150 00
J. McKenzie "	Pictou	Sept. 27, 1907.	172	4 & 12	200 00
S. N. Miller "	Annapolis	July 1, 1903.	22	3	50 00
F. A. Rand "	Cumberland	" 1, 1904.	103	10	200 00
R. Withers "	Annapolis	Dec. 7, 1897.	45	2	50 00
F. S. Yorston "	Colchester	May 18, 1897.	100	1, 18 & 20	150 00
C. H. Morris "	Hants	Dec. 30, 1890.	35	4 to 10	75 00
J. W. Smith "	Queens	Nov. 18, 1902.	56	4	100 00

EXPORT OF PLOUGHS.

Mr. NEELY:

How many ploughs manufactured in Canada were exported to the United States in the years 1909 and 1910 respectively, and what was the value of these exports?

Mr. PATERSON:

The number and value of ploughs (Canadian produce) exported from Canada to the United States during the fiscal years ended March 31, 1909 and 1910 respectively was as follows:—

	No.	Value.
1909	213	$3,936
1910	389	40,539

WOOD ISLAND LIFE BOAT.

Mr. DANIEL:

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries recently installed a new motor life boat at Wood island, Bay of Fundy?

2. If so, what are the dimensions and the description of the new boat, and of what material is the hull constructed?

3. How many persons will she be able to accommodate?

4. How many compose her crew?
5. Where was she constructed, and what was the total cost of the boat?
6. What speed is she expected to develop, loaded, under moderate sea conditions?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Yes.
2. Length, 26 feet; breadth, 7 feet; depth amidships, 2 feet 9 inches. Motor surf boat. Wood.
3. About 20.
4 and 5. Government shipyard, Sorel, P.Q. $2,571.10.
6. Nine miles per hour.

SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar):

What amount is still owing by the farmers of the west for seed wheat, oats, barley and flax supplied them by the government?

Mr. OLIVER. On the 31st December, 1910, $195,444.49.

OSHAWA CUSTOMS COLLECTOR.

Mr. HUGHES:

1. Has Mr. G. F. Blamey, collector of customs at Oshawa, been retired? If so, why?
2. Does the government consider a classical poet a suitable appointee to succeed Mr. Blamey?
3. Who has been appointed?
4. What salary had Mr. Blamey?
5. What salary has the new appointee now, and is he promised an increase? If so, to what sum?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. Mr. Blamey has been granted leave of absence for six months from December 1, 1910. He will be placed on the retired list at the expiration of such leave. Mr. Blamey is 77 years old, and is being retired on account of age.
2 and 3. Mr. L. C. Smith is now employed as acting collector of customs at Oshawa, and is considered to be suitable for the position.
4. $1,300 a year.
5. Salary $1,300 a year now. The question of an increase in the salary has not been considered.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the full names of the permanent or temporary employees appointed at Montreal since the 1st of January, 1904, in the Post Office Department, the Customs, Inland Revenue and Public Works; the age and place of residence of these employees at the time of their appointments, the dates and nature of changes, promotions or increases of salary granted these employees since their appointment.—Mr. Gervais.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and correspondence between the Department of the Interior or any of its officials and Mr. J. Krenzer, or their solicitor, or one Mr. Wolf, and of all reports of the officials of the said department respecting the south half section 28, township 27, range 18, west of the 2nd principal meridian, and also all correspondence, letters and telegrams between the department and one Thomas Greenway or his brother, respecting the said lands, and all corresponrence between the department and its officials respecting the said lands; and all papers, reports, correspondence and documents put in the files of the department since the 1st of April in relation to the dispute between said Krenzer and said Greenway.—Mr. Staples.

SALE OF FLOUR AND MEAL.

Mr. STANFIELD moved:

That it is expedient to provide that when flour or meal is sold or offered for sale by the bag, there shall be plainly stamped or marked on the bag the name of the manufacturer or packer and his address, and the weight of the contents and of the tare of the bag.

He said: Mr. Speaker, chapter 85, section 163, of the Revised Statutes provides that every barrel of flour or meal shall contain 196 pounds, and every half barrel 98 pounds, but there is no provision for selling flour or meal by the bag. In my own county, as well as in other counties, I have heard complaints made that millers put up flour, and more particularly corn meal, in bags of different weights. They are supposed to put 98 pounds in a bag, but farmers have told me that when they weighed these bags they found as little as 91 pounds. The House can readily see that the consumer is losing considerable by this method. The amendment I propose to make in the Bill which I shall introduce, if this motion is adopted, is that every manufacturer or packer shall stamp plainly on the bag his name and address, and the weight contained in the bag. The reason that I did not think it would be wise to make a standard weight is that flour, particularly, is sold in half bags, quarter bags, and, I believe, in eighths, and it would be pretty hard to amend any statute so as to provide for conditions of that kind. If the House will allow a Bill for this purpose to be introduced, when it reaches the committee stage, we will discuss the question more thoroughly.

Mr. FISHER. I see no objection to this resolution, as I understand from the hon. member (Mr. Stanfield)) that it is introduced with the purpose of founding a Bill upon it, and, of course, we will have full opportunity of discussing the details of that Bill. I take it that the hon. member is proceeding in this way because it is a subject that has reference to trade and commerce, and consequently a Bill has to be founded upon a resolution. With that understanding, and leaving the House full opportunity to discuss the principles of the Bill, as well as its details when it comes before us, I see no objection to passing this resolution.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. SPROULE. Would that apply to a great deal of the flour that is shipped in from Manitoba and elsewhere in bags? Flour comes in by the carload in that way. Would it apply to all that, because it would make a very great difference to the manufacturer of flour?

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend had better address his question to the mover of the resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that if this resolution were passed a Bill founded on it would come under the purview of some department of the government, and the minister at the head of that department would be the one, from whom we would expect to get information and advice. I do not know whether the hon. member (Mr. Stanfield) has considered that or not. But it would entail a considerable amount of work, in my judgment, if this Bill became law. While it is the usual practice that flour is sold by the hundredweight in bags and there is an amount allowed for the bag itself neither the weight nor name is marked on the bag. They sell the flour bag and all, and new bags are coming into use all the time, and I take it they would all have to be stamped. I do not know whether it applies to anything else except flour and oatmeal ; I suppose it would not apply to bran or shorts?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. What about corn and what they call cream of wheat which is sometimes sold by the hundredweight. I am not saying the principle is not right but if it applies to all these things it would cause a good deal more trouble to the miller.

Mr. STANFIELD. The object of this amendment is to protect the consumer and not the miller who is quite able to take care of himself.

Mr. FISHER. This legislation is an amendment to the Inspection and Sales Act which comes under the Department of Trade and Commerce, and the details would have to be considered by that department. The general principle that everything sold must be what it is represented to be is a good one ; and is embodied in our present legislation. The practice of selling flour and meal in barrels has changed of late years so that it is now generally sold in sacks ; and I understand the hon. member (Mr. Stanfield) wishes to apply the rule to the sack, which is to-day the law in regard to the barrel. If it does not unduly interfere with the course of trade it might be well to extend this good principle in the manner proposed.

Mr FISHER.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a great deal of flour sold in paper bags running from 20 to 100 pounds.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know whether the hon. member (Mr. Stanfield) intends to apply it to paper bags or not.

Mr. STANFIELD. Bags of flour generally have the weight marked on them and the complaints made to me refer more particularly to cornmeal.

Motion agreed to.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

Mr. MONK moved :

That the Select Committee of this House, named during its last session to investigate the different systems of proportional representation, adopted or suggested elsewhere, as an improvement upon our present methods of election, with power to extend said inquiry to all the various forms of the proportional representation laws proposed or in force, and with power to send for persons or papers and to employ a shorthand writer and to report from time to time, be reappointed, and that the said committee be composed as heretofore of the Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Messrs. Burrell, Kyte, Magrath, Turcotte (Quebec), Wilson (Laval), and the mover.

He said : The object of this resolution is merely to reconstitute the committee on proportional representation which was appointed last year but had not time to finish its labours before the end of the session. Some evidence was taken then but there are still witnesses to be examined and important evidence to be adduced. The same members as last year will compose the committee.

Motion agreed to.

DAMMING THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) moved :

For a copy of all correspondence, memoranda, reports, memorials, plans, orders in council, treaties, conventions, agreements, documents and papers of every kind, touching any proposal or Bill to erect dams or other similar works across the River St. Lawrence, or part of the said river, at or near the Long Sault, or in the vicinity thereof; including all statutes of the state of New York and of the United States of America relating thereto, and all Bills now before the congress of the United States of America touching the same, and all the proceedings upon all such statutes and Bills.

He said : It is reported in the press that the Bill to which this motion has relevance or some similar Bill has been defeated in the Senate of the United States, but I am not clear as to what the exact situation there is. However that may be, it is desirable that we should have all these papers before the House in order that the country may be in a position thoroughly to compre-

hend the whole situation as it has developed in the United States if ever a similar proposal should be renewed there or in this parliament. I would not care to associate myself with the view which was presented in this House a few days ago. That if the United States did not decrease the level of the water in the River St. Lawrence we have no standing whatever to make a protest against the creation by any corporation formed in that country, of obstructions across the river. I rather regret that the Minister of Justice seemed to adopt that view. The channel which has been alluded to is one which, under the terms of the Ashburton Treaty, must be free and open forever to the people of both countries. As I understand the argument which was made in this House on the occasion in question, it amounted to this, that if the level of the water is not raised beyond a certain height, the United States can do anything they like in that channel, provided they afford us another channel; if they establish a private canal, and close the channel up altogether, they are at perfect liberty to do so, and we have absolutely no right, and no standing under international law or otherwise, to make any remonstrance whatever. I would not be inclined to regard the situation in that way. I would consider that we would have a right and a duty to protest if that channel were interfered with by a corporation or by the United States government. They could not possibly be the sole judges as to whether navigation was interfered with or not. They could not possibly arrogate to themselves the sole right to determine whether navigation had been interfered with by the substitution of another channel. Such a statement of the case appears to me an unreasonable one, and I am bound to say that it is not one that I would have expected the government of this country to make through the mouth of the Minister of Justice or through the mouth of any other member of the cabinet. However, that may be, I would think it desirable that the documents alluded to in this motion should be brought down and laid upon the table of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no objection whatever to the granting of the motion of my hon. friend. On the contrary, I rather welcome it, and the government will spare no effort to have as complete a record as can be made, so that we shall have before us in due form the exact situation, commencing with the Ashburton Treaty, so that we may ascertain, as far as we can, what our rights in the matter are, and how far they have been complicated or helped by subsequent legislation. Of course, the preparation of such a return will take some time. As to our rights under the Ashburton Treaty, I would not care to express an opinion at this moment. The Minister of Justice, who is an eminent authority on questions of this kind, apart from his official position, has given his opinion. My hon. friend, who is also a high authority in his profession, has given another interpretation of the law; but, happily for us, whatever opinion we may entertain, I have reason to believe that the Bill which has been the cause of all this excitement, has met a reverse at one stage of the proceedings.

Mr. FOSTER. What may be thrown out at one time by a branch of the United States legislature may pass at another time, so that a temporary relief should hardly be looked upon as a shelving of the whole question, and I can conceive of no stronger argument, on the part of the promoters of the same company, or of a similar company, before a committee or before Congress, than the statement which has been made by the Minister of Justice here. I am not a lawyer, and I do not like to interfere between two lawyers when they disagree; but, even as a matter of law, the Minister of Justice thought that he was absolutely correct. It seems to me that there was nothing to call forth that expression. If it happens not to be correct, and I hope it does not, and it does not seem to be common sense that it should be, we have put a little piece of machinery into the hands of those who are in favour of interfering with the rights of navigation beyond certain limits which we may find it very difficult to meet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not admit that at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the policy of my right. hon. friend to admit anything.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is the policy of my hon. friend to suggest anything.

Mr. SPROULE. I rather imagine that that Bill was thrown out at Washington because of the discussion which took place here the other night and the strong pronouncement then made against the principle of allowing such corporations the rights which that Bill contemplated this corporation should have. When we were discussing the fact the other night, if I understood the gist of the argument, it was contended by some parties that because it was proposed to generate power on a branch of the river that was on the American side, and passing through American territory, neither the International Waterways Commission, nor this House, had any right to interfere. Provided that the level of the water was not raised in the main stream or any branch of it in which navigation was being carried on or

could be carried on. But there were many in this House who held that one branch of the St. Lawrence river was the same as another, and that if we put an obstruction across one branch, it was equivalent to putting an obstruction across the whole stream. I drew attention to this point in the Railway Committee in connection with a Bill giving power to erect a bridge across the Niagara river, which is a navigable stream. It was contended that Canadians did not navigate it, but that Americans did, and that because the plans of the bridge were submitted to the Minister of Public Works, that was sufficient to safeguard the rights of both countries. I contended that it was not, and I contend so still. Since we have an International Waterways Commission, in my opinion, before we pass any legislation affecting those rights, it should be brought to the attention of that commission, so that we may have their views upon it. In this case the approval of the committee was given to the proposed legislation notwithstanding the fact that the Niagara river is a navigable stream. I think that was wrong and out of harmony with the principle discussed here, and I believe generally accepted the other night. If we can get any additional information on this subject from the papers to be brought down, it is very desirable that the House should have it, because we cannot too soon have some international understanding as to the extent to which those rights can be interfered with under corporate powers given by this House or by legislative authority in the United States.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The other evening I think the Prime Minister stated that he understood that the Bill which was then before Congress was intended to dam only a part of the Sault, that is the South Sault. Now, I have before me the Bill, which I see by the newspapers has been thrown out, and it is as follows:

S. 10558.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

January 30, 1911.

Mr. Oliver introduced the following Bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Commerce:—

A BILL

To provide for the improvement of navigation in the St. Lawrence river and for the construction of dams, locks, canals, and other appurtenant structures therein at and near Long Sault, Barnhart, and Sheek islands.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the Long Sault Development Company, a corporation organized under a law of the state of New York, entitled 'An Act to incorporate the Long Sault Development Company, and to authorize said company to construct and maintain dams, canals, power-houses, and locks at or near Long Sault island, for the purpose of improving the navigation of the Saint Lawrence river and developing power from the waters thereof, and to construct and maintain a bridge, and carry on the manufacture of commodities,' which became effective May twenty-third, nineteen hundred and seven, its successors and assigns, be, and they hereby are, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate for navigation, water-power, and other purposes for a period of ninety-nine years a dam or dams in so much of the Saint Lawrence river as lies south of the international boundary line between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada, near Long Sault, Barnhart, and Sheek islands, either independently or in connection with like works now erected or to be erected in so much of said river as lies north of said international boundary line, with a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto, and a lock or locks, a canal or canals, and other structures appurtenant thereto; provided, that such dam or dams, lock or locks, canal or canals, and other structures appurtenant thereto, except as herein otherwise provided, shall be constructed, maintained, operated, modified, or removed in all respects subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend an Act entitled "An Act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters,"' approved June twenty-third, nineteen hundred and ten: provided further, that such bridge or bridges and approaches thereto, except as herein otherwise provided, shall be constructed, maintained, operated, modified, or removed in all respects subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March twenty-third, nineteen hundred and six: and provided further, that the Secretary of War shall cause a survey of that portion of the Saint Lawrence river to be affected by said improvements to be made with a view to securing a navigable channel, suitable for commerce up and down said river, from a point opposite the western end of Croil island to a point opposite the eastern end of Barnhart island, together with plans and specifications therefor, and all rights herein granted to the Long Sault Development Company shall be conditional on its improvement of said channel at its own expense, in accordance with said plans and specifications, said channel to be completed simultaneously with the other works herein authorized, all expenses connected with such survey and the preparation of such plans and specifications to be paid by the said company, its successors, or assigns.

Section 2. That said Long Sault Development Company, its successors and assigns, shall be subject to the provisions of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain relative to the boundary waters between the United States and Canada, proclaimed by the President of the United States on the thirteenth day of May, nineteen hundred and ten.

Section 3. That the actual construction of the works hereby authorized shall be com-

menced within two years and shall be completed within fifteen years from the date of the passage of this Act; otherwise this Act shall be void, and the rights hereby conferred shall cease and be determined.

Section 4. That if said Long Sault Development Company, or any other company or companies acting with it in such development, shall develop power by the construction of works, a part of which shall be located north of the international boundary line, at least one-half of the power generated shall be delivered in the United States. Provided, that when in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the chief of engineers use cannot be found in the United States for the full share thus assigned to this country the surplus may be temporarily diverted to Canada, but shall be returned to the United States when in the opinion of said officers it is needed. Provided further, that nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the importation from Canada of the whole or any part of the power generated from any of the said works in the St. Lawrence river.

Section 5. That should the works hereby authorized be or become at any time, in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the chief of engineers, inadequate to accommodate, or an interference with, the navigation of that portion of the St. Lawrence river affected thereby, said company, its successors or assigns, shall, under the supervision of the Secretary of War and the chief of engineers, make adequate provision for the accommodation of navigation; and should said company, its successors or assigns, fail so to do, the United States government shall, under the supervision of the Secretary of War and the chief of engineers, do anything required to make such provision for navigation, and the expense thereof shall constitute a debt of said company, its successors or assigns, and a lien upon all its property.

Section 6. That the Long Sault Development Company shall execute a bond obligatory on itself, its successors and assigns, with good and solvent sureties in the sum of five hundred thousand dollars, payable to the United States, for the use and benefit of the riparian and other landowners in and along the St. Lawrence river conditioned to pay all damages that may accrue to them, or any of them, by reason of overflow, ice jams and other causes produced by the erection or maintenance of said dam or dams, and the work of construction shall not commence until said bond is executed and approved by the Secretary of War and deposited in the War Department.

Section 7. That the right to alter, amend or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved, and the United States shall incur no liability because of the alteration, amendment or repeal thereof.

That is the Bill which is now before the Senate in Washington, and I understand the one that Congress has thrown out. There are one or two points in connection with it to which I would draw the attention of the Prime Minister. It refers to the treaty proclaimed by the President, May 13th, 1910. They make no reference whatever to the Ashburton Treaty. As I remember the International Waterways Commission Treaty was dated January 11th, 1910.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was put in force by the President on May 11.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Prime Minister will notice that this Bill gives them power to improve the navigation of the St. Lawrence river and to develop power from the waters thereof. It also says they are authorized to construct, maintain and operate for navigation, water-power and other purposes, &c. I mentioned to the Prime Minister last year that the intention of this same company was not only to develop power, that of course is the main thing they have in view, but as I had heard privately from those behind this Bill, to build a canal from the point where they are erecting this dam down to Lake Champlain. This place, Massena, is the last American point on the river, from there down, Canada has both sides of the river, and if they were allowed to let so much water run down and build a canal from Lake Champlain they would make that the foot of navigation for the Americans, bringing grain from Chicago and the west. The minister will remember that discussion, and I do not think any one in the House gave us the impression that there was any truth in that report. The other evening, I happened to be on the train, and, meeting the secretary of the International Waterways Commission, I asked him if any such thing had ever been brought out before their commission. He told me that it had been, that plans and all were submitted to this International Waterways Commission, and that our side of the commission had reported against it, and that that report was in the Public Works Department. Should that be the case it is a very serious thing, I think, for our great St. Lawrence route; for, if they get that dam and get the canal through such as I mentioned last year, then grain coming from Chicago, Duluth, Port Arthur or any of the upper lake ports can be taken right down to Massena. I asked the secretary how long the canal was. I have forgotten the figures he gave me, but it is not by any means a long canal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. From Oswego?

Mr. REID (Grenville). No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not heard of any thing but Oswego.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not hear of it until the other evening. The secretary gave me the name. The words 'Lake Champlain' form a part of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who is the secretary from whom the hon. gentleman got his information?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think his name is Coté.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No such report has come to my notice.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It may be that he is wrong.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He is mistaken.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It may be so.

Mr. BRODEUR. Can my hon. friend be referring to the canal which has been chartered between Montreal and St. Johns, which has the words 'Lake Champlain' in its name? But it has no reference to the subject of this motion.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No. But this same company applied for a charter last year, and I believe, at the time, it was proposed to give them power to dam the St. Lawrence river; but I heard at the time that their whole scheme was to run a canal from where this dam would be, down to Lake Champlain, thus diverting the traffic that now goes to Montreal. If this were true, it would be a very serious thing, and if it were brought to the Prime Minister's attention, the obvious result of such a scheme would surely weigh with him to prevent it being carried out. I mention this to-day so that when the matter comes up again, these points may be considered, for these men are sure to come here again and want a charter, and, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), has said, they are not going to stop with this year's results at Washington. I draw to the attention of the Prime Minister the statements that have been made to me. I did not ask Mr. Coté to give me any private information; it was a public matter so far as I knew; I was simply discussing this question and asking what the commission had done. I certainly do not wish to reflect upon Mr. Coté.

As to this whole question, we on the St. Lawrence front, feel very strongly. It does not make any difference to me personally, because I am quite a distance from it; but we feel that the great St. Lawrence route should be kept as it is. The steamers stop at Prescott, which is the terminal point from Toronto. Passengers all change there, and it is the very fact of these rapids being there, that brings thousands and thousands of people down that river every year. To give the whole channel into the control of a private corporation, is something about which the people there feel very keenly. In fact, they feel that the Prime Minister will not agree to any such proposition. The damming of the South Sault, which the Prime Minister mentioned the other evening, is also very important. I have talked with engineers of repute on the subject, and they claim that if you raise the river the fifty feet or whatever may be necessary, it is going to throw the water round into the North Sault, and you cannot tell what the effect may be. Has the Prime Minister ever seen the plan showing the exact location of the islands? A glance at the map would show that if you dam the South Sault, the water must go by some other way. And we are not going to get any benefit from it. We cannot get the power, for the power is on the American side. The whole St. Lawrence at that particular point is on the American side. Even the North Sault, the rapids down which the Richelieu boats go, is on the American side. If we allow the river to be dammed at that point, we are simply under their control. At the time of the Ashburton Treaty, the parties who framed that treaty certainly went into the matter very carefully and protected our interests at that time. The only reason I can see that has been advanced either to this House or to the country why that charter should be granted is, that power is wanted at Cornwall, Morrisburg, Iroquois, Prescott, Brockville and Kingston. If you go east of the easternmost of these places, you have the Beauharnois canal, and all the powers developed about Lachine. So, I think they have plenty of power there for many years. So far as Cornwall is concerned, I understand that there is no great cry there for more power. I understand that in Cornwall there are some who would like to see the dam go on for the local benefit that might arise in the way of more manufactures or something of that kind. But I do not think the town is suffering for want of power. As to Morrisburg, they are absolutely against this proposition. Even if there were a power line run in there, they could not use more than a few horse-power. The Hydro-Electric Commission is trying to arrange power for these places. In Prescott, in which town I live, we are anxious to get power, there is no doubt about that. But to-day you could not sell 500 horse-power in Prescott. While they are very anxious for power, yet they are down on this proposition to dam the St. Lawrence. Speaking from what I have heard, Brockville, while anxious for power, is not willing to contract for more than 1,500 horse-power with the Hydro-Electric Commission. Kingston, I understand, wants several thousand horse-power. If we have a little patience, I believe that within the next year or two we shall have all the power we want in these places, and much sooner than we could get it by the project of damming the St. Lawrence. They tell me, and I think it is true, that they are developing some power here at Ottawa. The distance from Ottawa to Prescott is 52 miles. From Prescott to where this dam on the St. Lawrence would be built, is at least as far as

that. They are not any nearer to Prescott than we would be from Ottawa. This power will go all over the country. Then there is another power that is being developed; they are getting things in shape, and expect within twelve months, to have from 8,000 to 10,000 horse-power developed north of Kingston. They are trying to make arrangements with the Hydro-Electric Commission to run a line to Kingston, and down to Brockville and Prescott. These powers we have in our own country, they have not been taken up before, and I am quite satisfied that if this matter is held back for two or three years, the towns from Prescott to Kingston will not have any trouble. Kingston is the largest place that wants power, I suppose Kingston might take from 6,000 to 8,000 horse-power. I believe that Kingston is to-day in a position to get that power delivered—the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty), will correct me if I am wrong.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Where from?

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is a company that runs a line from Trenton, they have 100,000 horse-power. Now, I will tell the Prime Minister why I make that statement. A short time ago representatives from Kingston, Gananoque, Brockville and Prescott, and I think the reeves, met a representative of the Hydro-Electric Commission, and the object, I understood, was to find out how much power each municipality would take so he could give them a rate. I saw these gentlemen when they were returning from Toronto; I met one of them with whom I am well acquainted the solicitor for this company, who was there in behalf of this company to oppose the Hydro-Electric scheme, and he told me that his company were prepared to furnish Kingston with all the power they wanted, provided Kingston would give them the absolute franchise, for $25 per horse-power. He gave me the impression that the Kingston people did not want to go into that scheme because they thought the power from the Hydro-Electric would be cheaper. If that is the position of things, it will work out all right in the end for Kingston. Now since these powers are close enough to be developed, and to be brought into these places, and will be brought in within the next year or two, I think we in this House need not pass any legislation of this kind. It may be that in twenty years from now the position of this country will be changed. But unless there is some strong reason why that Bill should be passed in this House other than those I have mentioned, I think this government and every member of this House should strongly oppose it, and leave our rights to that river just as they are at the present time. Therefore, I hope the Prime Minister will do everything he can to leave us exactly in the same position we are. Perhaps he has already done it, I do not want to ask him to reveal any state secret, but I hope he has wired Ambassador Bryce to ask the President not to allow that Bill to go through at all, but that the rights we have under the Ashburton Treaty may be preserved to us intact. I am satisfied if the Premier does that, the Bill will never go through the American Congress, and I do not think these people would trouble this House again at any future time. The men who are promoting this scheme are very persistent. They were in my county, and they didn't hesitate to say that they had a million dollars, or two million dollars if necessary, with which to put this Bill through. They were up along the whole country, talking to the people, trying to raise an agitation, and to force the members from that region to put this Bill through. I think the means they took were as unfair as were ever resorted to by the promoters of any Bill.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). I am glad of the opportunity of saying a few words for the purpose of affirming the position I took when this question was discussed the other night in the House. I was then opposed both by the Minister of Public Works and by the head of the government. I was proceeding with an argument when I was interrupted, and was told that this power on the Long Sault had already been conveyed to a corporation. I began to argue that under the Ashburton Treaty the Crown had not the power of conveying that property without the consent of the legislature, and I was told by the Minister of Public Works and by the Prime Minister that the legislature had already consented to a conveyance. I was astounded at the time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say that.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The Minister of Public Works said it, and I thought the right hon. gentleman assented. I took the opportunity of looking up the case, and I found that no such power had been given to any company in the world for the use of the Long Sault canal. My position then was perfectly right. Under the Ashburton Treaty, navigation and what is essential to navigation, is reserved to the people of this country, and the Crown cannot convey it. What the Crown did convey in reference to that work near Sheik island, is the right of user to the surplus water, the discharge of the by-wash that is used for the purpose of keeping the level of Sheik island. There is a certain by-wash passing down there, a surplus of water. That water, so far as it did not interfere with navigation, was leased to an individual or to a corporation. The Act of parliament was simply an empowering one, giving to the corporation the

right of doing what the individual, or the party to whom that property was conveyed, had the right of doing.

There is that further right because the parties who leased that particular property from the Crown had in mind the contingency that perhaps they might not have water enough. The original idea of building the canal there was to utilize what is called Hoople's creek. The idea was to deepen and dredge Hoople's creek so as to utilize it for the purposes of navigation instead of building an outside embankment. Under the contract with this corporation the government have given them the right to deepen that creek to any extent they like and the use of whatever water may be diverted from the St. Lawrence. That power is given to this corporation but it does not interfere at all with any of the rights which we have under the Ashburton Treaty. Every one knows that the particular part of the St. Lawrence between Sheik island and the north shore was utilized for the operation of a little mill owned by Mr. Snetsinger. That mill was expropriated when the canal was being built and taken over by the government. It was to a certain extent utilizing that power, or the power which has been developed by the erection of a dam. The ownership of that power rests with the people of Canada and the people of the United States, and it cannot be taken either by Crown-gift, or in any other way, unless with the consent of the legislature of this country. It is true that under the treaty we have given to the International Commission the right of deciding what shall be done with these particular waterways, how they shall be utilized, and to what extent we have a right in them. My hon. friend who spoke before me referred to those powers as being situated in the United States, and he said that if the water was dammed the power would be of great benefit to the United States for the simple reason that the body was situated on the United States side. That question arose in connection with the power question at Niagara Falls. It came before the Waterways Commission, and I think they arrived at a perfectly proper and right conclusion when they determined that no matter whether international waterways diverged in their course to the south or the north, or whether the large body of water was situated on one side or the other a moiety of the power should belong to each country, and that each would have a common interest in it. So that, if any dam be erected on the south side for the purpose of utilizing that power, a moiety, or half, would belong to each country, and they would not be allowed to utilize it by the Waterways Commission in the first instance unless they had received the assent of this parliament and of the Congress of the United States. So, I think it is perfectly secure. The possibilities of the future are very vague and uncertain as to its ever being utilized as a power. The United States Senate has thrown out the Bill but it is quite true that it may be introduced again. No power can be given to that company unless with the consent of this legislature and especially unless with the consent of the government and the consent of the Waterways Commission. I think the day is far distant when such a consent could be shown to be advisable. If we want power in this country, as my hon. friend says, there are hundreds of other places which can be utilized, the development of which will not interfere with the scenic grandeur such as that which characterizes the St. Lawrence. There are other places where power can be as cheaply developed and at the same time without spoiling the natural beauty of the place. This is an heirloom that ought to be kept for the people of this country. With reference to navigation, this is one of the wonders of the trip down the St. Lawrence that annually attracts more passengers than anything else, and unless the gravest and most serious reasons are shown from an economic point of view that it is in the interests of the country that this dam should be erected, I think the unanimous opinion of the country from one end to the other will be that we should leave this place in its present state of nature.

Mr. R. SMITH (Stormont). Mr. Speaker, I happen to represent the constituency in which it is proposed to construct these works. I have observed that in the discussions which have taken place in this House, and other places a very great deal of misapprehension often occurs as to the actual situation, and as to what is actually proposed to be done. In the first place, if I caught correctly the purport of the Bill which has been introduced at Washington and which has been read by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), the proposition there is to dam the whole St. Lawrence. If that is the proposition I do not think that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) would argue for a moment that that could be done at the instance of the United States authorities without consulting the parliament of Canada. As I understood the remarks of the Minister of Justice the other evening, he contended that it would not be impossible for the American government to give the necessary authority for the damming of the South Sault alone without consulting the government of this country. Now, in giving that opinion I observed that the Minister of Justice compared the South Sault with the channel of the river that had already been dammed by this government in the construction of the

Cornwall canal, and he apparently drew the inference that because that had been done without consulting the American government the same rule should apply to damming the South Sault under the authority of the American government. I do not know how familiar the Minister of Justice may be with the facts as they exist at that point, but I certainly know that there is no comparison at all between the two streams. The channel of the river which was dammed by the Canadian government is an entirely different stream from the channel of the South Sault. The South Sault is a channel that has always been navigated by steamers on the down trip. It is navigated to-day by ships of our own country as well as by ships of the United States ; in fact, I think, although I will not be positive in the statement, that any boat that navigates the big Sault on the Canadian side can navigate the small Sault on the American side of the river. So, the situation is entirely different with regard to the channel of the river that was dammed for the purpose of the Cornwall canal. That is a channel that has never been navigated by any class of vessels except by the flat bottomed scows which in early days, before any canal was built there at all, were towed along the banks of the river by horses. No steamer ever ran up or down that channel that has been dammed by the Canadian government. I think that possibly that circumstance was not called to the attention of the Minister of Justice, and that if it had been he might have drawn a distinction between the damming of one channel and the damming of the other. There was a great deal of alarm on the American side of the river at the time the Canadian government proposed to dam that channel. I cannot remember that there was any official opposition, but I do know that there was a very strong agitation on the American side of the river, that the American government was appealed to, and I understand that in some way or other the American government took the necessary steps to investigate and satisfy themselves that no possible damage to navigation could occur from the blocking of the Canadian channel that was dammed for the purpose of the Cornwall canal.

Mr. HUGHES. At what point did this blocking occur that the hon. gentleman speaks of?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). I refer to the Sheik island dams which block one of the channels of the river on the Canadian side. That is a very small stream. It was navigated at one time by those flat-bottomed scows that were towed by horses but steamers never navigated that channel.

Mr. LENNOX. At what time did this agitation take place? Is it of recent date?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). The agitation took place at the time it was proposed to construct the Sheik island dams. I do not know that it ever went to the extent of an official inquiry on behalf of the American government, to the authorities here, but the hon. gentleman from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) would know that, because, when the dam was commenced, I think he was Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. member for South Lanark has stated that the Act incorporating the St. Lawrence Power Company did not give authority to create any of these dams, and in that opinion I entirely concur. I do not think there ever was such a dam in contemplation then, and I do not think the wording of the Act in any way authorizes the damming of the St. Lawrence at that point. What was in contemplation was a different scheme altogether, and the dams that were referred to were the wing dams which were to be thrown out into the stream for the purpose of diverting the water. What I think is very clear is that there is no authority from the Canadian parliament whatever to create those dams that have for their object the complete damming of the St. Lawrence river. As I understand the Ashburton Treaty, we have the same rights of navigation on all these waters as the Americans themselves have, regardless of whether the channel happens to be in American or Canadian waters. A great many people talk of these channels being entirely in American waters, but as a matter of fact every vessel that navigates the Big Sault has first to go through entirely Canadian waters, and after it goes through the rapids it crosses into American waters. There is no such thing as navigating the Big Sault without being at one time in Canadian territory and at another time in American territory. In the Big Sault channel of the rapids themselves is entirely in Canadian territory.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman means that they are on the Canadian side of the open channel between Long Sault island and the Canadian shore?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). Yes. The channel at that point on the Big Sault is entirely in Canadian waters, and, of course, the South Sault is entirely in American waters from start to finish.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). There are no American waters, or Canadian waters, under the Ashburton Treaty ; both countries have an equal right to navigate.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). I am referring to the boundary line

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman understands the situation, and I would ask him if it is not a fact that on account of the winding of the river there is a point

in the rapids where the whole of the channel is wholly in American territory?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). Yes. After you pass through the rapids proper you cross at the head of Barnhart island, which is an American island, and from there down the channel is between Barnhart island and the American shore, entirely in American territory. There is a small channel called the Little River, which is not navigable even for canoes, and which goes between Barnhart island and the Canadian island called Sheik island. I think, therefore, it is quite clear that before any complete damming of the St. Lawrence river can be accomplished there must be authority given by the government of this country. The question has been raised as to whether that authority can be given by the Governor in Council without submitting it to parliament, or whether parliament has to be consulted, and that is a question I shall not deal with on this occasion. The Minister of Justice, as I understood him the other evening, confined his remarks to the damming of the South Sault alone. If what he set out on that occasion is good constitutional law, namely, that the Americans can do that without consulting us at all, then it is rather an unfortunate position for us. If they can dam it without consulting us at all they probably will not be under the necessity of dividing the power with us. I hope the Minister of Justice is not right in that respect, because it is possible to develop very considerable power by the damming of the South Sault alone, and if we have the right in common with the Americans to the navigation of these waters we probably would have the right to say they could only dam them upon the terms of giving us one-half of the power. Representing as I do the constituency in which this development is supposed to take place, I am exceedingly anxious to know that if there is any development of any kind on either channel we should have one-half of that power available in my part of the country. I am in hopes that in view of the difference between that channel and the channel that was dammed by the Canadian government, to which I have alluded, the Minister of Justice will be able to form a different opinion from that which he expressed in the House the other evening. Now, it has been represented by the engineers that some 500,000 horse-power can be developed at that point by the damming of the whole channel, and they tell us that about 60,000 of that 500,000 can be developed in the South Sault and the remainder in the Big, or North Sault. I am not here to-day to say that I desire the Bill before the authorities at Washington to go through, or that I desire any scheme to go through, because, first and foremost, I want to know the terms. If, without injuring navigation, we could develop 400,000, or 500,000 horse-power in the St. Lawrence river at that point and could secure one-half of that for Canada, and could secure at the same time the absolute control of that power for all time, so that Canadian consumers could have it upon proper terms, then I say I am in favour of any scheme of that kind. But I am not in favour of any scheme that will hand over to an American corporation all this power; to do what they like with it, to take it to the American side, or to control and monopolize it for all time. A scheme of that kind I would think it my duty to condemn. But if power can be developed upon the terms of securing one-half of it for the Canadian people for all time, so that there can be no monopoly, then I am in favour of such development. If 60,000 horse-power can be developed in the South Sault it follows that 440,000 horse-power can be developed on the North Sault. If we leave the South Sault out, and if there is development on the Big Sault, the South Sault will supply all the needs of navigation, just as they have it to-day; it will accommodate every vessel that navigates the Big Sault, and will leave an open channel to prevent all this flooding that some people are so much afraid of. In that way they could develop 440,000 horse-power without interrupting navigation at all, or closing the natural channel of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman's remarks are very interesting and very instructive. Would he specify from what point to what point the dam would be built?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). Just where the promoters suggest: across the Large Sault from the foot of Long Sault island to the head of Barnhart's. That would dam the Big Sault. Then if you dam from the foot of Barnhart's to the Canadian shore you have a dam across the whole northern channel, and you leave the southern channel, that is the South Sault, entirely open for navigation without obstructing the Richelieu boats, or any boats that would navigate that river. Then you would have an open channel which would absolutely prevent any such flooding as has been feared by the people of Morrisburg and by the people in the county of Grenville. Now, that is a scheme which I would like to see carried out, provided it could be carried out on the terms I mention, that is, that absolute security would be given that one-half of the power would be available for all time in Canada, with proper authority given to this government to enforce that, and proper regulation of the rates by our Railway Commission or some other competent authority. We would then have the opportunity of controlling for all time one-half of the water-power in case the pro-

moters refused to carry out that part of the bargain. In fact, I think the only permanent security we can have that one-half of the water-power developed would be available for Canadians would be that we would have the opportunity, without calling upon the owners, of tapping that channel ourselves and creating one-half of the water-power. If that power were vested in the government, there would be an absolute security that our right to one-half of the power would be conserved.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Suppose the power were developed, where is the present demand for power, and is it not a fact that there is a lot of power in the St. Lawrence within 30 or 40 miles of Cornwall?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). I will answer my hon. friend by citing the case of Messina, which, before the creation of its water-power, was not any larger than the town my hon. friend represents, Prescott. There was not a single industry there. Some English capitalists started to construct a power canal right opposite Massena, and everybody wanted to know what they intended to do, as nobody within many miles of Massena wanted power. The company went on and built the canal, and to-day the very agitation which we hear so much about is due to the fact that 60,000 horse-power is not half enough for the village of Massena.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then the hon. gentleman is asking for this power in order that it will build up Cornwall?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). I do not know whether it would build up Cornwall any more that it would build up Prescott, because all that would be necessary to carry the power to Prescott would be to run two wires along the shore.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The power would be cheaper at Cornwall?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). There would be just the difference between transmitting it five or six miles to Cornwall and about 50 miles to Prescott. In fact, there would be power enough developed to supply every town in eastern Ontario, and at a price that no power which my hon. friend has in mind could compare with at all. The development of the whole of eastern Ontario depends on how cheaply the power could be had.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the hon. gentleman in a position to state what the effect would be on the river above the Long Sault island? How far up would the dam affect the stream, and what would be the effect of it in the flooding season in the spring?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). As a matter of fact, we do not have a flood season in the spring along the St. Lawrence river. That is one of its peculiarities. The difference in the height of Lake Ontario and Lake St. Francis varies only three or four feet from one season to another. The only season of flood on the St. Lawrence is in the middle of the winter, caused by the ice jamming for a time in the narrow channel of the river, and thus causing the water above it to rise.

Mr. HUGHES. It occurs when the ice is breaking up.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). Not when the ice is breaking up. The ice jams occur usually in the month of February. The hon. gentleman asked me how high we proposed to raise the water. The stipulation that was made by the Department of Railways and Canals was that under no circumstances should the water be raised high enough to interfere with the Cornwall canal, which is supplied above the rapids. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton last year discussed the possibility of the water of the St. Lawrence rising so high as to cross to the Ottawa river.

Mr. HUGHES. No, flowing into the Raisin above Lancaster.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). The absurdity of that will be readily understood when we remember that under the conditions imposed by the Department of Railways and Canals the level of the water in no case is to be as high as the level of the Cornwall canal. At all events, if the South Sault were not dammed, there could not be any danger of flooding at all, because it is an open channel of the river.

Mr. HUGHES. There is now considerable water flowing down the present channel. If the South Sault is dammed, will there be certainty that the current in passing down between the Long Sault and the Canadian shore would deflect off towards the American shore between Barnhart island and the Long Sault, and thence between Barnhart's island and the American shore. Would there be left a sufficient stream between Barnhart island and the American shore for purposes of navigation? Would not the tendency be to send a large portion of that water down between Barnhart island and Sheik island and thus make it impossible to navigate between Barnhart island and the American shore?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). The engineers state and the charts show that at present, there is 40 feet of water down that channel. It is not proposed to stop the flow of water down that channel. These are submerged dams and the head above will send a large supply of water over the head of the dams. It is not supposed to be a dam that will stop the river, it is a dam put at the foot of the rapids raising the

water a certain height and allowing it to flow as before.

Mr. HUGHES. It would only raise the water to the head of Long Sault island.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). Yes, I think two feet lower than the head of the Cornwall canal. There is a possibility of generating an enormous amount of power at that point without even interrupting the running of vessels down the Long Sault rapids. I believe there is a possibility of devising a scheme by which that can be done, so as to ensure to Canada for all time her full share of one half that power, and so regulating it that there can be no monopoly and that the power will be available to all the people of eastern Ontario upon terms so advantageous as to induce the establishment of the largest kind of manufacturing industries in eastern Ontario.

Mr. HUGHES. I understand part of the proposition is to dam the channel between Barnhart island and the American shore and drive the stream down between Barnhart island and Sheik island. I understood that was part of another proposition.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). That is slightly wrong, there is no proposition to dam between Barnhart island and the American shore.

Mr. HUGHES. Between Barnhart island and Long Sault island. We must use the channel between Barnhart and Sheik island as a navigable channel. It is now the International channel, although there is very little water in it.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). No.

Mr. HUGHES. If the proposition is to dam between Sheik and Long Sault islands and between the foot of Long Sault and the mainland, where is the water to go ?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). My hon. friend is wrong. My statement is that the present scheme, if carried out in its entirety, is to dam from the American shore to the foot of Long Sault from the foot of Long Sault to Barnhart and from the foot of Barnhart to the Canadian shore. That would be a complete dam of the whole St. Lawrence. If the company were to leave out the first of these links, you would leave one channel absolutely free and only lessen the amount of development by 60,000 horse-power.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman proposes to leave the American channel open all the way down ?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). That is what I would like to see.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont).

Mr. HUGHES. Leave the American channel the navigable channel ?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). Exactly. My hon. friend may say that is objectionable, because it makes the channel an American channel, but my hon. friend will remember that at present the only channel we have is partly an American channel, one portion of it is American and the only change in that respect would be to make the American part of our channel a couple of miles longer than it is to-day, and of course that would be nothing one way or the other. I am afraid that my ideas are not the ideas that would meet with the approval of the promoters, because I am sure that from the point of view of their own interest, they would desire first and foremost, to dam the South Sault because damming the South Sault would immensely improve the power they already have at Massena. They have had difficulty there. They cut quite a long canal across country from the head of the Long Sault rapids to the power plant at Massena, where they discharge into the Grass river, the Grass river again discharging into the St. Lawrence, some little distance below. By damming the South Sault, they would raise the water at the entrance of that canal, and they expect, I believe, to stop the difficulty in connection with ice jamming into the head of that canal. They expect to somewhat curb the flow of ice there. Thus they have the double object of developing another 60,000 horse-power in the South Sault, and also increasing the head and increasing the facilities for getting more power in the power-house they have already constructed.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it the hon. gentleman's opinion that the Americans have authority and power to-day to dam from Long Sault island to the American shore ?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). No, I said I understood the Minister of Justice had said so. I am in hopes that the Minister of Justice is in error on that point. I do not intend to set my opinion up against that of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. HUGHES. They would then have the same power to dam between Barnhart island and Long Sault island ?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). I must leave that question to be argued by the Minister of Justice. I am in hopes that the Minister of Justice, upon examining the difference between the stream which has been dammed by the Canadian government and the South Sault, which it is now proposed to dam, will find that a distinction can be drawn and that the rule applicable to the stream dammed by the Canadian government would not necessarily be applicable to the South Sault. I am in hopes that on

a careful examination, the Minister of Justice will find that the difference between those two streams is a justification for arriving at a different conclusion from the one he announced the other night. If we have absolutely no right to prevent the damming of that stream we can get no power; if we have, we can make it a condition that from whatever development is made of the South Sault, Canada will have her share of power.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I certainly think we are indebted to the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Smith), for the very lucid and interesting statement he has made with reference to this question, and I think we have also to congratulate the hon. member upon the candour with which he dealt with the question. It is not at all pleasing to us upon this side of the House, upon any occasion to differ, as to a matter of law, with a gentleman so eminent in his profession as the hon. Minister of Justice, but it is made clear by the statement of the hon. member for Stormont, (Mr. Smith), that there is absolutely a necessity of placing ourselves upon record upon the important question of the relative rights of Canada and the United States in connection with the St. Lawrence river. The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Smith), has pointed out circumstances that I cannot say I noticed before, if I understood the hon. gentleman aright, namely that the Minister of Justice spoke of damming the whole St. Lawrence river.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). I understood the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) to be referring only to the South Sault.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, as the hon. member for Stormont (Robert Smith) corrects me, I recognize that that is the way the Minister of Justice put it. He spoke of damming the South Sault alone. And the hon. member for Stormont points out that what was proposed by the company was to dam the whole way across the St. Lawrence river. The company that applied to the American Congress the other day of course only asked Congress for power to dam from the American shore northwards to the American boundary. But they have in contemplation, and it is provided for by their Bill, to extend the dam northward from the international boundary to the Canadian shore. The first clause of the Bill which has been before Congress reads:

That the Long Sault Development Corporation. . . . its successors and assigns, be, and they hereby are, authorized to construct, maintain and operate for navigation, waterpower and other purposes for a period of ninety-nine years a dam or dams in so much of the Saint Lawrence river as lies south of the international boundary line between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada near Long Sault, Barnhart and Sheek islands, either independently or in connection with like works now erected or to be erected in so much of said river as lies north of said international boundary line, with a bridge or bridges and approaches thereto, and a lot or lots, a canal or canals, and other structures appurtenant thereto.

So, this company has in contemplation, finally if they achieve their ends, the complete damming of the St. Lawrence river. And that is the proposition we are up against yet, though the situation is somewhat relieved by the circumstance that Congress has thrown out the Bill for the time being. But I am not sanguine enough to believe that they will not come again. So long as they have such friends in the Canadian government as some of the ministers of the Crown showed themselves to be last session—and I see the hon. gentleman who was most conspicuous in that behalf is present this afternoon—so long as they have the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Pugsley) to advocate their claims as strongly as he did last year, and to fight for them against the interests of Canada, we may expect that these gentlemen will come again.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And the member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee).

Mr. LENNOX. The member for West Lambton was only a 'subsidiary company' in this matter. Of course, he did his best, but without the active, energetic and powerful influence of the Minister of Public Works, aided by the night sessions we had last year, when we endeavoured to protect the rights of the people in this great international boundary water—

Mr. PUGSLEY. In addition to the wilful misunderstanding as to the effect of the Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know whether the minister is right in saying that he wilfully misunderstood the Bill or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was not referring to himself.

Mr. LENNOX. I would not have imputed that to the hon. gentleman. I know he is wily, astute and smooth—yes, and as an hon. gentleman near me suggests, oily—but we would not impute to him that he wilfully and intentionally misconstrued the effect and purport of the Bill. Now, we are indebted to our delivery for the present time, I regret to say, speaking from the national standpoint, not to any action of the government, but to the efforts of the opposition in this House,

and the circumstance that the American Congress, realizing the enormity of the proposition, has seen fit, for the present, to reject it. The hon. member for Cornwall also pointed out the circumstance that hon. members supporting the government, if not members of the government—yes, I remember now, even a member of the government—tried to becloud the facts. He pointed out that this little trickling stream north of Sheik island, and that has been closed for the purpose of improving conditions on the Canadian side, never was a navigable part of the St. Lawrence river in the true sense in which we speak of navigation. The hon. member for Cornwall points out that scows could, with difficulty, pass up and down this channel, but vessels never followed it; and so the inference plainly is that you cannot draw any parallel between the important national works we have executed many years ago upon the Canadian side and the gigantic scheme for purely corporate and personal ends which is proposed to be launched on the American and Canadian sides at the present time. The hon. member for Cornwall also pointed out what I am indebted to him for knowing—it may have been known to many other members of the House, but I did not appreciate the point before—if I understood him correctly, the rapids of the Long Sault are entirely in Canadian territory. Was I right in so understanding?

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). Not exactly: but the rapids of the Big Sault. The South Sault is in American waters.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not exactly familiar with these terms. The rapids of the Big Sault are entirely in Canadian territory, and every vessel, whether Canadian or American, passing down the river, must pass through the rapids of the Big Sault before it comes into the American part of the channel.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). Provided they select the Big Sault. They may select the South Sault.

Mr. LENNOX. For the purposes of the greater needs of navigation, as I understand it, the Canadian part of the boundary waters must be used as well as the American part.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). If the hon. gentleman will allow me: I said I did not think there was much difference in the size of the vessels that can navigate one or the other. Practically the vessels that can navigate either can navigate the other. There might be a slight difference.

Mr. LENNOX. Speaking candidly, I am indebted to my hon. friend for puting me right on these matters, with which I do not profess to be familiar. It is not mere empty compliment for me to say that both by reason of his familiarity with the territory, and by reason of his facility of expression, the hon. gentleman has certainly added very much to the store of knowledge that we have upon this very important question. Now, the circumstance I have just pointed out is an additional reason why I propose to object to the line of argument taken by the Minister of Justice the other day, and in saying that we are—aside from conventions of recent date—practically at the mercy of the United States as to what should be done with the St. Lawrence river.

I listened with attention to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and who has evidently given this matter a good deal of consideration. His opinion is that it would probably be in the interest of both Canada and the United States that the scheme proposed at the present time should be carried out, but with this qualification, that he would leave open the channel which lies immediately alongside the American shore. He thinks it would be in the interest of Canada and of the United States to dam the St. Lawrence river from the Long Sault island across to Barnhart island, and then across to the Canadian shore. True, the hon. gentleman qualified his opinion by saying that such a scheme should be subject always to the paramount consideration of navigation; in other words, that provided we can still effectually navigate the river, both Canada and the United States would be benefited by the development of the enormous amount of power, some 460,000 horse-power, to be equally divided between the two countries. With that part of his argument I cannot agree. I am entirely opposed to damming the St. Lawrence river by any private or corporate scheme. I believe that, having regard to the great gift of providence in the possession of the St. Lawrence river, in view of the increasing interest and benefit it will be to the people of Canada as a navigable water, having regard to the fact which is being emphasized all the time that water navigation is beyond all comparison cheaper for bulky commodities than is transportation by rail, we never should consent, to the damming of that great river. Although we have for the moment escaped the assaults of this enormous company which stands behind the Long Sault Development Company, with its capital of $50,000,000, buttressed, fortified and encouraged by certain patriotic gentlemen on the Canadian side, endorsed as it is by the Minister of Public Works—although we have for the moment escaped from these people, it is unfortunate indeed that the Minister of Justice threw out the remarks he did the other night, telling the people

of the United States for all time to come, by the voice of the Canadian Minister of Justice, that we are practically without remedy as regards the broadest and most important feature of this international question. The Minister of Justice started out by telling us that this was a matter of international law. That is all right. But he followed that by asking: What is international law? And he replied that international law was an indeterminate thing something that it is almost impossible to find out; in other words, that no one can say what international law is. Well, Sir, that is a new doctrine. It is true, as the Minister of Justice said, that international law is not contained in any statute, and it is equally true that many questions of international law may arise upon which there has been no decision, matters of new import may arise in reference to boundary waters which have to be construed and determined by analogy and upon principle. But to tell us in effect, as he did, that we are practically at sea as regards anything to guide us in this matter, I venture to say will be found upon investigation not to be correct. I venture to suggest to the Minister of Justice, that since many rivers are international boundaries in Europe and other countries, the question of what are the rights of the parties on each side of the river, is not a new question by any means, although it is new in this particular phase. A large and important volume of international law, and of views and decisions on similar questions, have been recognized by nations and will be found applicable to the question here under discussion. Be that as it may, whether the law laid down by the Minister of Justice is correct or not, I regret, speaking from a national point of view, that the Minister of Justice has declared to the people of the United States, as a rule which they will invoke in future, that we are practically at their mercy in reference to this matter. He says that aside from convention we are practically helpless, that the only remedy for us is expostulation, that as suppliants only can we endeavour to prevent whatever the United States may determine to do in reference to this matter. Well, I do not think so. If I say it outspokenly, I say it all the same with due deference to the great legal learning of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. But I venture still to say that we are not in the hands of the United States in that regard. The law of nations is as strong in support of justice now as it ever was. It has been many years since when a small community could not rely upon securing their rights at the hands of a larger community, if they could show that their cause was just.

Now the Minister of Justice proceeded to point out, by inference if not in words, that by reason of the fact that we had dammed the channel upon the north side of Sheik island, we were powerless, even as a matter of justice and fair-play, to protest against the damming of the waters south of the international boundary. I deny that proposition altogether. Why, what the Minister of Justice subsequently read put that question at rest. It showed that by the recent treaty, provision was made as to the future, that, although all cases that had already occurred were closed, as to the future neither party could interfere with the height of the water upon either side, recognizing by the treaty to which the Minister of Justice referred, that we were conceded, if we did not originally have it, the right to have matters remain in statu quo, and that, as far as our damming of that little trickling stream at Sheik island was concerned, it had nc bearing at all upon the question of the damming of those navigable channels which the development company seeks power to dam at this time. The Minister of Justice, in an elaborate and very carefully worded argument, referred to Article III. of the new Waterways Treaty, for the purpose of emphasizing and fortifying his position that we are absolutely at the mercy of the United States, except in so far as the matter can be regulated by section 3 of the Waterways Commission and that section 3 only applied to the question of the height of the water. The Minister of Justice sent forth to the United States—and it will be of record there for all time to come in their archives and will be invoked, as I would remind the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, against us either in reference to this river or other rivers when we come to appeal to the provisions of the Ashburton Treaty—the solemn declaration that we have practically no control over this great international waterway except such as is provided for by section 3 of the Waterways Treaty—a statement, as an hon. gentleman reminds me, that it is in the interests of the United States people, and not only that, Sir, but a statement that it was absolutely unnecessary to make, and which has almost the force and effect of a statute when you come to negociate with a foreign nation upon a matter of this kind in the future. By the sturdy opposition put up by His Majesty's loyal opposition we succeeded, first, in repelling the efforts of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) last year in support of this measure, which was absolutely against the interests of the people of Canada, and although we may have, by our timely note of warning the other day, done something to prevent this measure from being passed by the United States Senate, yet the evil remains, and in all future discussions between Canada and the United States in

settling these boundary waterway questions, we, on this side of the House, when we are on the right of the Speaker, as well as hon. gentlemen who are now carrying on the affairs of the country, will be confronted by the utterance of the Minister of Justice made upon that occasion. Let me read just a line from what the Minister of Justice said:

The provision of article three of the new Waterways Treaty is to the effect that in addition to existing obstructions, no further obstructions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line —and the whole river is a boundary water from main shore to main shore—no new obstruction on either side affecting the natural level or flow of the boundary waters on the other side of the line shall be made except by the authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada, within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval of the International Joint Commission.

I wish to point out here that the wording of this section is that no new obstruction shall be made. The minister proceeds to say:

Now the wording of that exception plainly implies that each country, within its own jurisdiction, has the right to authorize obstructions in waters such as these.

That is the conclusion that the Minister of Justice laid down the other day, that is the statement that he sent forth to the United States. He says:

Now, the wording of that exception plainly implies that each country, within its own jurisdiction has the right to authorize obstructions in waters such as these. No new obstructions, it says, shall be made affecting the natural level on the other side of the line except by the authority of the United States or the Dominion within their respective jurisdictions.

So the argument of the Minister of Justice, as you will remember, Mr. Speaker, and as it has gone on record, was that we are practically at the mercy of the United States except as to whatever relief we can get out of the third section of the treaty referred to, and that section is confined solely and exclusively to the question of the height of the water. That, I venture to say with great deference, is not the law. I pointed out then to the Minister of Justice the provisions of section 7 of the Ashburton Treaty, and it is only fair to say that upon that being called to his attention, the minister, in a very faint way, it is true, suggested there might be some possible relief there. The hon. gentleman asked me to read the provision of the Ashburton Treaty, and I read it now as I read it the other day.

Mr. LENNOX. Does my hon. friend think that that provision which deals with the question of the height of water only, supersedes article seven of the Ashburton treaty? Does that provision, just read, supersede article seven of the Ashburton treaty? It does not seem to me that they refer to exactly the same thing.

Mr. GRAHAM. What is article 7?

Mr. LENNOX. The article my hon. friend has read, which provides that the channels of the St. Lawrence shall be equally free and open to the ships, boats and vessels of both parties.

I put in the words 'and open' because they appear in the Ashburton Treaty, but they were omitted from 'Hansard.' I am glad that my hon. friend from Stormont (Mr. Smith) very concisely, and in a manner which I could not hope to emulate, but of which I entirely approve, has called the attention of the Minister of Justice to the very important statement he made upon that occasion. I feel that, coming from the hon. member from Stormont (Mr. Smith), it will have, perhaps, more effect than if the criticism came from me. I sincerely trust that in order to mitigate as far as may be the difficulties that have arisen from the statements of the Minister of Justice, that, if he thinks the circumstances such as pointed out by the hon. member from Stormont (Mr. Smith) justify it, the minister will take an early opportunity of correcting what I venture to think is an erroneous impression as to the relative rights of the United States and Canada.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I think there is no practical utility in discussing at the present time the general merits or demerits of damming the St. Lawrence river at the Long Sault. There is no proposition, at any rate at present, before us, or any tribunal so far as I am aware of for the building of a dam in Canadian waters, or upon the Canadian side of the boundary. The only room at present which existed at all for discussing this scheme was in reference to the proposal to dam the south channel at a place which was solely within United States territory. If the morning newspapers are correct, that proposition has been defeated in the United States House of Representatives, and is at an end for the present at all events. But with regard to that proposal, in the discussion which took place in this House on Thursday last, I expressed the opinion which I entertained as to the legal rights of Canada to interfere, or to take exception to what was proposed. I was speaking altogether, of course speaking altogether, of the proposal to build a dam wholly upon United States soil and upon that side of the boundary, and speaking of that proposal without any reference to the continuation of that dam by the building of additional or subsidiary structures at some future time upon Canadian soil, I was looking at the matter as though it were an independent proposition to dam this southernmost chan-

nel of the St. Lawrence upon United States territory alone. Looking at it from that point of view from the standpoint of international rights, the position which I took was that in the absence of a treaty—supposing there was no treaty affecting the matter at all—there would be no ground upon which we could in any way interfere. But that is a purely academic situation. There are treaties, and, therefore, it was of interest to consider what our situation would have been had there been no treaties only with a view to showing what the foundation might be of any rights which we possessed. Taking the treaties as they stand—both the Ashburton Treaty and the treaty of last year with regard to international waterways—they make our rights in this matter, it seems to me, reasonably clear. I was somewhat astonished in looking over the 'Hansard' report of the debate which took place on this subject last Thursday to see the impression which my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) had derived from what I said, and I am afraid from what I have been able to gather of what has been said to-day, that my good friend from Stormont (Mr. Smith) has not comprehended as I would have wished him to have comprehended what I then said. I certainly meant to make it as distinct as words could be that the rights of navigation were supreme, and that if this proposal interfered with navigation there was an end of the matter. We then have undoubted right to object, and in everything which I said on Thursday last I was basing my remarks upon the supposition that the promoters were able to do what they wished to do without affecting navigation in any injurious way. I think I was clear upon that. At column 2969 of 'Hansard,' after discussing the question whether or not the level on the Canadian side would necessarily be raised by this work, and after stating that assuming the level on the Canadian side was not raised when the interests of navigation are the only things to be considered, I said:

That is exactly the situation under the existing treaties. The right of navigation is paramount and that right is secured. That right exists in this United States channel which it is proposed to dam, just as it exists in the old channel between Sheik's island and the mainland of Ontario which is to-day utilized as part of our Cornwall canal. The right of navigation is secured by treaty and is not proposed to be interfered with. On the contrary, it is proposed to be helped according to the plans of the promoters, and unless the right of navigation is interfered with, or the level altered on our own side, we have, under existing treaties, no cause to object.

Now, with regard to the paramount right of navigation, the language of the Ashburton Treaty as given to the House in the debate to which I refer by the hon. gentleman from North Simcoe, secures to us an equal right with the right of the United States. Some gentlemen who participated in the debate last week seemed to entertain the view that the terms of the Ashburton Treaty precluded the placing of any obstruction in navigable waters, and secured forever the free and open navigation of the whole of the waters of the St. Lawrence from main shore to main shore. I do not think that is the language of the treaty. The language is, speaking compendiously, that the channel from main shore to main shore shall be equally free and open to the ships, vessels and boats of both parties. It might be paraphrased in this way: shall be as free and open to the ships, vessels and boats of one party as to those of the other party. So long as the equal right to the navigation of the channels on either side is afforded by the country in which those channels are, to the boats, vessels and ships of the other country, I see no infraction of the terms of the Ashburton Treaty. We did not consider, when we shut of the channel between Sheik's island and the county of Stormont, that we were encroaching upon the prohibition of the Ashburton Treaty. We turned that channel into a canal. We left it, as we found it, as free and open to the navigation of the United States vessels as it was to the navigation of Canadian vessels. It might have been argued that we were obstructing the navigation. True, we did build an embankment across the entrance to it, and in that sense we prevented any one coming from the main channel of the Long Sault with his boat into the Canadian channel to the north of Sheik's island.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Had we not a canal to the north of Sheik's island before the Ashburton Treaty?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Our canal was on the mainland to the north of the channel which in a state of nature lay between Sheik's island and the mainland. Our canal opposite Sheik's island was cut out of the mainland.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Had we not a canal before the Ashburton Treaty?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I think very likely. What I am pointing out is that long after the Ashburton Treaty we, for our own purposes, obstructed the upper entrance into the natural channel which lay between Sheik's island and the mainland, and, by a dam which we built from Sheik's island to the mainland, prevented any vessel coming into that natural channel from the main stream.

Mr. HUGHES. Was that act in contravention of any treaty between Canada and the United States?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I think not. I think we had a perfect right to do it, because after it was done we left the navigation of that channel as free and open to the United States as it was to us; and, on exactly the same principle, so long as the United States leaves its southernmost channel as free and open to us as it is to them, I cannot see how the terms of the Ashburton Treaty are interfered with. We have, however, not only the Ashburton Treaty, but we have the recent Waterways Convention, under which this very stream, from main shore to main shore, is to be forever free and open and common to the ships of both nations for the purposes of navigation. Navigation is made the paramount consideration under the Waterways Treaty. The new International Commission is told by that agreement between the two nations that its first consideration, apart from the use of water for domestic or sanitary purposes, is to be the use of it for purposes of navigation. The use of it for purposes of manufacturing power is an after consideration altogether. Now, by that recent treaty we have additional rights. We have not only our former right in regard to navigation maintained and confirmed, but we have the additional engagement on the part of the United States that although their government or Congress may authorize such an obstruction as that which is proposed, that obstruction cannot be allowed to be built in the river if the effect of it will be to alter the level on our side, unless the assent of the International Commission is first obtained. That is an additional protection and safeguard, and, in what I said on Thursday last, I was not for a moment losing sight of the paramount interests of navigation. On the contrary, I thought I was putting them in the forefront in saying what I did, speaking throughout on the assumption that the interests of navigation would not be in the least degree impaired by this proposed work. With regard to the sharing between the two countries of power, if power is to be created at this place, this is not a matter which is dealt with by any existing convention between the two nations as far as I am aware. It is a matter for subsequent negotiations and if possible agreement; and if it ever becomes a question of building a dam on Canadian territory to supplement or improve the dam which has been suggested to be built on United States territory, there will certainly be the very best opportunity on our part to make terms and conditions. But until there is a practical proposition of that character before this House for consideration, it seems to me that the discussion of the matter is entirely of an academic or theoretical nature.

Mr. C. J. DOHERTY (Montreal, St. Anne). Mr. Speaker, I need not say that I very much regret if I misapprehended the effect which the hon. Minister of Justice intended to convey in his observations of the other day, when I understood him to lay down the absolute proposition that we were not entitled to complain of the obstruction of these channels, though he did make a proviso to the effect that that was so, so long as the navigation was not interfered with; and I think that I acknowledged that. But it seems to me that we on this side were not mistaken in taking it that the hon. Minister of Justice laid down the proposition that, in the existing circumstances of this matter pending before the American Congress, where authority was sought on the part of a private company to dam the channels on both sides of the Long Sault island, we have no ground, whatever, to intervene or even to expostulate. I understand the hon. Minister of Justice to-day to contend that in his observations of the other day he did not go so far as to say that if there was danger that there was a question of obstruction of navigation, we had absolutely no ground to stand on. He says at page 2971:

> In the circumstances which exist, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be difficult for us to frame any line of diplomatic objection or remonstrance which would have any effective foundation. It could at once be answered by the United States that, under the terms or our treaty, we have the right to consider the advisability of doing this, and you are perfectly protected by the creation of this International Joint Commission upon which you are equally represented.

So I think we were at least excusable for understanding that the Minister of Justice, with all the circumstances just as they stand before him, had committed himself to the proposition that we had absolutely no ground upon which we could stand to intervene to claim protection for any right of ours in connection with the proposed barring of these two channels. That seemed to me at the time, and I must confess it still seems to me, a rather extraordinary position to take on the part of the government that is charged with the protection of the interests of this country. Here was a proposition to bar or dam these channels. It is quite true, if I understood properly the reading of the Bill to-day, that the company that asked for this right to dam these channels, did say that they were going to make some other provision whereby, notwithstanding their damming the channel, a means would be afforded for navigating one of those channels; but surely Canada was interested, and is interested in that measure or would be still interested if that measure were still being proposed, and I think it is not going too far to say, we should be consulted as to whether this method which this company was saying it was going to pro-

vide in lieu of leaving us facilities for navigation, such as they would have been if the channels were left free and open, was, or was not sufficient to effect the purpose. That was a matter of very vital importance to Canada. I do not think it is necessary to go so far as to interpret the terms of the Ashburton Treaty as meaning that these two channels must remain absolutely in the condition in which they were at the time the treaty was made. I quite recognize that there might be some interference with those channels which would not affect their availability for purposes of navigation, and I would not be interested to contend on behalf of Canada that, assuming that what was going to be done, was going to leave those channels available for navigation, we would need to resist what was going to be done. But that is one thing, and it is another thing to say that when it is proposed to dam these channels, to take away from us the right given us under the terms of the treaty (and that is justified by the suggestion that something else is going to be provided, that would be just as good) that we have no interest in that proposition, that we have no locus standi before the body that was called upon to give those powers, that we have no right and no interest to be heard before that body before it decides upon the essential question of whether this damming of the channels, which prima facie, is an interference with navigation, is, or is not, in view of the particular remedies which this company says it proposes to give, going to produce an interference with navigation and an interference with our rights. While I still fail to see in the statement of the Minister of Justice to-day any withdrawal of that utterance, I do not think that our right to be heard upon this matter, to look into this matter, to point out, if we so ascertained that the proposition did involve an interference with navigation, is at all diminished or affected by what the Minister has just said. It might be that, upon our being heard, we might satisfy ourselves that there was no interference with navigation. That might happen, but assuredly, it was a matter in which we had a vital interest and in which I would think the government would have felt it incumbent upon them to see that those interests were protected and that we were heard before this matter was disposed of in the manner proposed.

In so far as the Minister of Justice bases the proposition that we have nothing to say with regard to obstructions to be made in these two southern channels on the ground that they are entirely upon American territory, and upon the fact that we constructed a canal which obstructed the channel between Sheik island and the mainland, it seems to be only necessary to point out that the provision of the Ashburton Treaty said absolutely nothing about the channel between Sheik island and the mainland to make it quite clear that what we did to that channel can afford no ground for arguing a similar right on the part of the United States to do the same thing in the other channels. Because it is a remarkable fact (presumably attributable to the reason suggested by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that the Cornwall canal existed before the Ashburton Treaty), that the Ashburton Treaty makes no reference whatever to that channel between Sheik island and the mainland. It is not a treaty for the purpose of establishing equal rights for both parties in the waters of both parties; it is a specific provision to secure to Canada equal rights of navigation with the United States in channels which are in the United States. It is not at all a mere reciprocal arrangement that the river shall be, from side to side, equally free to the navigation of both parties, it is a provision for Canada that the specified channels in the St. Lawrence on both sides of the Long Sault island and of Barnhart island shall be equally free and open to navigation. So that what we did on the channel between Sheik island and the mainland could have no possible bearing on what the United States had the right to do on the two channels with regard to which they had bound themselves that they should remain equally free and open to navigation to the vessels of our country and of theirs. There is absolutely no parity in the situation. It might be so if we were governed solely by the recent Boundary Waters Commission Treaty.

As regards the argument that the words 'equally free and open,' do not give us a right to have these channels remain absolutely open just as they were, as I said a moment ago, I do not think it is necessary for the purpose of supporting the rights of Canada to go so far as to contend that the words mean that the two channels are to remain just as they were with no obstruction in any portion of them. On the other hand, do I understand the Minister of Justice seriously to contend that provided these channels are equally closed to both countries, this treaty has not been violated? Has the United States, which has agreed with us that these channels should be equally open to the navigation of the vessels belonging to citizens of both countries, a right to say to us: Well, if we do dam the channels they are just as open to you as to us. But they are not open to anybody at all. I hardly think that such an interpretation would be seriously contended for. I quite understand that it may be consistent with what is stipulated there that some modification, or

obstruction if you will, in some portion of these channels might exist, and that we would be without ground of complaint, provided always that they remained open to navigation, and just as open to us as to the citizens of the United States. I must confess, though we have sometimes heard some criticism of the contentions which our American friends make upon diplomatic questions, I do not believe, so far as my knowledge goes, that they have ever resorted to what would seem to me to be such a manifest quibble as that, and I would be sorry to attribute to them the capability of seeking to encroach upon our clear rights by resorting to such an argument as that.

To sum it all up, this seems to me to be the clear situation. We are precisely with regard to the United States, and with regard to these channels, in the position of a man whose neighbour has undertaken with him that two roads running over the neighbour's property should be for all time as free and open to the party in whose favour the obligation was contracted as to the party who owned the land; and in that situation the neighbour who has consented to these roads running over his own land, proceeds to build barricades across them, and he couples that action with the statement: Well, I am making a gate there, and I will pass you around by some backway, you will get out of this in some way or other, and I will be just as much impeded by this as you will be. The man who has this right of passing under that state of affairs, sits back and says: Well, I have nothing to say, that is no affair of mine, I have no ground to stand upon. That individual in that position would consider he had no rights, no possible ground even of remonstrance or of expostulation, and that it was for him to sit there with his eyes blind to what was going on, trusting simply that when it was all done some sort of a passage would be given him. Now if we carry that out, if we were dealing with an individual, I am very much afraid that when the individual came later to complain, it would be said to him: You sat by and you saw all this done, and you made no complaint. True, you had a right, but you have acquiesced in all this, you have absolutely allowed the proprietor of these roads to go to great expense in making these obstructions, but you never said a word, you are too late now to complain. It seems to me that is precisely the position that is created by this government for Canada in connection with this matter. Now is the time, when these things are proposed, now is the time for us to come forward with the affirmation of our right to be consulted with regard to what is going to be done affecting navigation. When we are face to face with a prima facie obstruction affecting navigation, it is for us to insist that we have an opportunity of satisfying ourselves that navigation is not going to be interfered with. Fortunately for us the Congress of the United States appears to have been more careful of our interests, at all events, their action would indicate a greater carefulness for our interests than seems to have existed in the minds of the government.

What seems to me is the key of this whole thing is the fact that we are not dealing with any mere general disposition giving equal rights in these boundary waters to both countries; but we are dealing with specific legislation to create a right affecting navigation in waters almost exclusively if not exclusively within the territory of the United States. Of course, I do not argue that if the United States proceeds absolutely to obstruct these channels, if they say they won't abide by the treaty, that we have any very effective method of securing our rights short of the last resort. But I do not think we should assume as towards these people that they have any deliberate desire to violate our rights in the matter, that they are not willing to hear us when we have such a manifest interest in this matter, and that they are not prepared to respect our rights if we put them properly before them. To do so would not only be most offensive to them, but if that is our frame of mind on the subject, why, it is a matter for surprise that we should so recently have made another treaty with them; because if we assume that they will be untrue to their obligations under the Ashburton Treaty, what reason have we to believe they will be true to their obligations under the recent Waterways Treaty? There is another thing I want to add. I think the argument of the Minister of Justice to the effect that our right under the Boundaries Treaty to have the commission pass upon the question of obstructions to be created in the future, is limited to cases where those obstructions affect the level of the water upon our side, is an additional argument showing the urgency of our intervening in this particular matter before the thing is carried out at all. Of course, I am not in a position to say whether what is proposed will or will not affect the level of the waters on our side of the St. Lawrence; but, if they do, apparently we would have some right to have the matter submitted to the Boundary Commission. But if it merely interferes with navigation, then, as I read the recent treaty, and as I understand the Minister of Justice to read it, we will have no right to say that this matter must be submitted to the Boundary Waters Commission, because the section is perfectly clear that the consent of the Boundary Waters Commission is required only in cases where obstruction in the boundary water affects the level on the other side. That, as I understand it, is the argument of the Minister

of Justice as to the effect of section 3, and it seems to be only an additional argument making it clear that now, before this thing is carried out, is the time for Canada to make her voice heard.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). As to the legal phase of this subject, I do not wish to say a word, simply because I do not consider myself competent to deal with it after it has been dealt with by the two able legal gentlemen who have just spoken. I would like to say a word or two on the practical side of the question. I am sure it is a matter of considerable satisfaction to everybody in Canada who is opposed to the damming of the St. Lawrence under any circumstances that the United States Congress has thrown out the Bill. I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) that this company will come forward again and endeavour to get authority both from the United States and from Canada to dam the St. Lawrence river. One reason why I am opposed to this damming of the St. Lawrence is that we could not now, or within the next five years, use our half of the power that would be generated. There is no question but that 500,000 horse-power could be generated there; in fact, some engineers put it as high as 800,000 horse-power. But, taking the smaller figure, if you had that power generated to-day you could not dispose of it in Canada at points near enough to the Long Sault for it to be used advantageously. A large amount of power is used in the city of Montreal. That power can be secured at points as close or closer than the Long Sault in streams not of an international character, and in places where it can be developed for far less money per horse-power than at the Long Sault.

Mr. HUGHES. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) is right—the St. Lawrence is not international below Cornwall.

Mr. TURRIFF. No, but it is at that particular point. As I have said, you could not use in Canada our share of the power when generated. How, then, could you prevent it being sent to New York? It could be sold in New York at a high price, and that is where it would go ; and once it went there, we would never get it back for use in Canada. We have had our experience at Niagara, we have had our experience at Fort Frances ; why should we take any chances? I venture the assertion that, if that power is left alone, and if, later, the people of Canada decide that it is valuable enough to justify the injury to navigation, in fifty years from this time, the power of the Long Sault would be worth the amount of Canada's national debt to-day. If that be the case, why should we part with our right to any company, whether Canadian or American?—but this company is practically altogether an American company.

Now, among the greatest objections raised to this scheme are those raised on behalf of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company. I have it on what I consider the most absolute authority that this Aluminum Company of New York, who have been hoping to get the right to dam the St. Lawrence, have been and are—if the action of Congress in throwing out the Bill has not put an end to it—buying up the stock of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company in order to silence the objections that have been raised on behalf of that company. But I consider that this should not have any effect. What I would like to see would be something even more definite than the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has given the House, although I think that what he has said must be fairly satisfactory—that is that nothing will be done in the way of approving of the plans for the damming of the St. Lawrence without fully consulting the House of Commons first. That is very satisfactory so far as it goes, but I would prefer that the government should take the position that, for the present at all events—I suppose no government can decide what should be done in the future—absolutely nothing shall be done, and no company, Canadian, American, or any other, shall be allowed to dam the St. Lawrence for the purpose of producing power. I am satisfied that the power is not needed, or, if it be needed, it can be got elsewhere, and got as cheaply, leaving the navigation of the St. Lawrence unaffected. I am glad to hear the discussion that has taken place, because I am satisfied that all we want to do is to have this matter aired in the House of Commons, and let the people of the Dominion understand the exact position ; for if they understand the exact position they will not allow the St. Lawrence to be dammed, and no government will dare allow it to be dammed.

Mr. FOSTER. Or they will be damned themselves.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, as my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says, they would be damned themselves. I am glad the American Congress has taken the sensible view and refused to pass the legislation asked for by the Aluminum Company ; and I trust the government of Canada will do no less in the matter when the question is put up to them.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I am sure the House and the country are under deep obligation to the leader of the opposition for having brought this matter to the attention of the House to have it thoroughly discussed as it has been to-day. My hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid)

brought up the question of transmitting the power—even if this Long Sault dam were constructed—to Prescott and other towns in eastern Ontario, and stated that power could be transmitted to Prescott just as easily from Ottawa as from Cornwall. He also spoke of other towns in eastern Ontario being supplied from powers developed on the Trent canal. The government, I understand, have disposed of the powers there, and the company that has taken them over is looking over the field to arrange for disposing of the power when it is developed. I wish the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) were in his place, but as he is not here, I would suggest to the Prime Minister to discuss with that hon. gentleman the question of this and other powers, and to have them examined by competent engineers. All the water that passes through the Long Sault passes down by the Thousand islands. On the Canadian side of the Thousand islands, at the Fiddler's elbow, owing to the islands there being so close together, we have a current of eight or ten miles an hour for some distance. My opinion is that, at far less expense, and without interfering with navigation, without raising the water at all, but merely by putting in a current wheel, an undershot wheel, as much power could be developed as at the Long Sault rapids. Such wheels could be put in some of the narrow channels which are not used for navigation. We have another power in eastern Ontario that could supply many points. The government own and control the Rideau canal. Between Newboro, at the north end of my constituency, and Kingston, there is a total fall of about 200 feet—at Kingston Mills about 50 feet ; at Upper and Lower Brewers, 20 feet ; Jones' Falls, 80 feet ; Fosters', 15 feet ; Chaffee's, 15 feet ; Bedford Mills, 20 feet. All these falls could be concentrated into one power. My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Harty) understands the situation, and I am satisfied will say a word in support of this suggestion. The effect of this improvement would be not merely to develop power but also to improve navigation. The navigation of the Rideau canal is practically spoiled because the waters are allowed to run away in the spring freshets. If the government will control the Bedford mills, owned by the Tett brothers, where the whole flow of water from Frontenac comes out, including the water from Bobb's lake and other lakes, a large power could be developed, and the water could be prevented from running away in the spring. This could be reserved for navigation purposes, it would give the Rideau canal a full supply of water, and there would be a surplus with which to develop electrical power. I do not know how many hundreds of horse-power could be developed, but it would be a very large quantity. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty) has gone into it more exhaustively than I have, but both of these powers could be developed, in the one case, without interfering with navigation and, in the other case, to the benefit of navigation. I would recommend to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that he would have both of these systems looked into and reserved for the benefit of the people of the eastern part of Ontario. We need not then go either to the Trent for a supply of power, or to the Ontario Electrical Power Commission, or to the Sault. We have powers in quantity to-day that are going to waste.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln). Before this motion is put, I wish to say a word about it. I am afraid, from the action of the government, as evidenced by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), that we are going to continue the same bad habit that we have had here for a good many years, of sitting complacently by waiting until the mischief is done, then regretting it and trying to regain some of the ground which we have lost. This dealing with the waters on the boundary between the United States and Canada has a history and a history which is not very creditable to the ingenuity of Canadians. In 1901 the United States woke up, or had awakened before that—at all events, they began to act with regard to the necessity of looking out for their own interests with regard to the water-powers to be derived from international streams. Away back in 1901, ten years ago, the Congress of the United States appointed a committee to get all the evidence ready so as to be prepared to chloroform and bunco Canada, and in that they have succeeded pretty well. There is no use of talking about the Waterways Treaty being a good deal for Canada; it does not give to us a half, or a quarter, of what we ought to have had without any treaty or arrangement. The United States were awake and active ten years, ago, and the result was the appointment of a committee by Congress to take hold of the matter in the interests of the United States in order to quietly get the evidence, or at all events, to ascertain their rights and to strike at Canada for a treaty when they were ready and when Canada would not be. They succeeded—there is no use in pretending that they did not—in getting the better of us as they always do when they deal with us. It is about time that the Minister of Justice or somebody else woke up to the necessity of acting ahead of time and not afterwards with regard to these encroachments by the United States upon our rights. When I heard of that committee being appointed in 1901 I had the temerity to put a question upon the Order Paper—the first ques-

tion that I ever asked in this House—as to whether this government had knowledge of the appointment of the committee by the Congress of the United States, and if so what they were going to do about getting their evidence ready to meet the arbitration that it was proposed to bring about. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) answered that he had heard nothing of it, that it was entirely unknown to him, that nothing to his knowledge had taken place in regard to it. Four or five years afterwards, and not until four or five years afterwards, the suggestion was made that these matters should be dealt with by what became known subsequently as the International Waterways Commission. I point this out because the officers of the United States had their evidence all ready when the inquiry came to be made. In the meantime they had had their surveyors through the county which I have the honour to represent and the adjoining county of Welland, making all sorts of surveys, ascertaining all the data they could, so that if they were confronted at the tribunal with any evidence from the Canadian standpoint that did not suit them they could contradict it, or, if it did suit them they could let it go. For four or five years their military surveyors were permitted to make surveys with regard to the Niagara river to ascertain how the power could be developed and where the boundary was, and they were ready to negotiate for the Waterways Treaty when the Waterways Commission was appointed and the treaty was made. I am not objecting to this having been done, but I am pointing out what was done. I say this because of what I think is the unfortunate carelessness, not to use the stronger word, of the Minister of Justice in talking about these matters. The other day he said that apparently there was no need of doing anything. To-day he practically says the same thing, but revises, not to say recants, the oponion he gave then as to the necessity the government are under of doing something. The Minister of Justice read us a lecture upon no proposition and no necessity. That is why I said what I did—no proposition and no necessity of doing anything just at present! There will always be a necessity in Canada of being ready to meet incursions from the United States in regard to these assets, rights and resources of this great country. The Minister of Justice does not seem to be quite clear as to what he ought to do in the interest of Canada, but he complacently says that because Congress has turned down the proposition as at present made, and since he made his speech last week—not before—there is no need of any alarm. Then the Minister of Justice took a great deal of time to say that he had not meant us to understand what he said, or meant to say, in his speech on February 2, as we did understand it. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his statement in justification of what he said he meant to say on February 2, read a paragraph from the middle of page 2969 of 'Hansard.' The middle paragraph that he read is on 'Hansard,' but perhaps, on reflection I should read it in order to get the connection with what I desire to say. He read:

> That is exactly the situation under the existing treaties. The right of navigation is paramount and that right is secured. That right exists in this United States channel which it is proposed to dam, just as it exists in the old Channel between Sheik island and the mainland of Ontario, which is to-day utilized as part of our Cornwall canal. The right of navigation is secured by treaty and is not proposed to be interfered with. On the contrary, it is proposed to be helped according to the plans of the promoters, and unless the right of navigation is interfered with, or the level altered on our own side, we have under existing treaties, no cause to object.

That is what the Minister of Justice read to-day as justifying his opinion that as long s navigation was not interfered with we in Canada could not object. But the hon. gentleman said something more immediately following that, and that is what I am going to read. He went on and said:

> I do not think much is to be gained by going back to the terms of the Ashburton Treaty because we have a new treaty on this very subject which goes further, which governs this very situation, and which has been ratified by both countries and is in force to-day. Under the provisions of that treaty while it prohibits the construction of any obstructions in boundary waters except under certain circumstances, it impliedly gives permission to obstruct boundary waters.

In view of that statement, how can any hon. gentlemen on this side of the House be blamed for believing that the Minister of Justice was justifying this obstruction? Why should the Minister of Justice mention and reiterate everything that it would be possible to reiterate and suggest on behalf of the United States in attempting to usurp or take away from us those privileges? It is exactly as if we on this side of the House were representing Canada and the other side of the House the United States, and as if the Minister of Justice were presenting the United States argument. No counsel for the United States could put it stronger if he were contending that Canada had no right to object. Why should our Minister of Justice seek for ways and means and arguments to sustain any claim the United States might make, that we could not assert our rights on the St. Lawrence. The Minister of Justice spoke about the absence of a treaty, but

what is the waterways agreement if it is not a treaty? He told us that under Article 3 of the Waterways Treaty we could not prevent the Americans doing this if it did not affect the natural level or flow of boundary waters on either side of the line. But Article 3 must be consistently read with Articles 4, 8, 9 and 10 of the same treaty, and Article 4 reads:

The high contracting parties agree that, except in cases provided for by special agreement between them, they will not permit the construction or maintenance on their respective sides of the boundary of any remedial or protective works or any dams or other obstructions in waters flowing from boundary waters or in waters at a lower level than the boundary in rivers flowing across the boundary, the effect of which is to raise the natural level of waters on the other side of the boundary unless the construction or maintenance thereof is approved by the aforesaid International Joint Commission.

It is further agreed that the waters herein defined as boundary waters and waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other side.

Mark you, that applies not to one country, but to both. Neither is to permit any remedial or protective works, or any dams or other constructions in waters flowing from boundary waters, or in waters flowing from a lower level. But the Minister of Justice undertakes to assume that article 3 is to be read as if article 4 was not there at all, and to construe it that it is only to apply if the level of the water is lowered. Then article 8 reads in part:

The high contracting parties shall have, each on its own side of the boundary, equal and similar rights in the use of the waters hereinbefore defined as boundary waters.

The following order of precedence shall be observed among the various uses enumerated hereinafter for these waters and no use shall be permitted which tends materially to conflict with or restrain any other use which is given preference over it in this order of precedence:

1. Uses for domestic and sanitary purposes.
2. Uses for navigation, including the service of canals for the purposes of navigation.
3. Uses for power and for irrigation purposes.

I pause there to interject that the Joint International Commission undertake to lay down principles which have been adopted in the treaty, and which are supposed to govern both countries in this matter. That is for the future; that is to apply to matters arising, such as this, after the treaty was signed. First, absolute precedence is given to the uses of these waters for domestic and sanitary purposes. Has the Minister of Justice inquired whether this work would have had a prejudicial effect in relation to sanitary or domestic purposes. He assumes it has not, but, if he is not counsel for the United States, then in the interests of Canada he should undertake such an inquiry. Then the second preference is given to uses for navigation, including the service of canals for the purpose of navigation, and, in the third place, to uses for power and irrigation purposes. The article goes on to say:

The foregoing provisions shall not apply to or disturb any existing uses of boundary waters on either side of the boundary.

The requirements for an equal division may in the discretion of the commission be suspended in cases of temporary diversions along boundary waters at points where such equal division cannot be made advantageously on account of local conditions, and where such diversion does not diminish elsewhere the amount available for use on the other side.

The commission in its discretion may make its approval in any case conditional upon the construction of remedial or protective works to compensate so far as possible for the particular use or diversion proposed, and in such cases may require that suitable and adequate provision, approved by the commission, be made for the protection and indemnity against injury of any interests on either side of the boundary.

Then comes article 9, which provides:

The high contracting parties further agree that any other question or matter of difference arising between them involving the rights, obligations or interests of either in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other, along the common frontier between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, shall be referred from time to time to the International Joint Commission for examination and report, whenever either the government of the United States or the government of the Dominion of Canada shall request that such questions or matters of difference be so referred.

Does not the Minister of Justice think this is one of the matters of difference that ought to be so referred. Look at the responsibility which the treaty throws upon both governments; look at the language of it for the protection of both parties. I ask, should not the Minister of Justice have done more than used his energy and ability to discuss the dictionary meaning of 'equally free and open?' Should he not use all his ingenuity to protect the rights of Canada, instead of endeavouring to point out that certain language in the Ashburton Treaty is not what it was supposed by the rest of us to be? In view of the fact that certain United States citizens have actually gone to Congress for power to interfere with the rights of the people of Canada, why did not the Minister of Justice submit to the International Waterways Commission that there was a difference such as is provided for in the treaty, and prepare a case for Canada, and submit it to this tribunal, which is supposed to be independent, and then we on this side of the House would not, from day to day, be compelled to apply to the

government to check these incursions by the United States upon the rights of our country. But what the Minister of Justice seemed to do was to throw out the hint to the United States that if they made the contention we were afraid they would make so far as he is concerned he would agree with them.

What greater invitation could there be to the United States to take everything they can get from us in this connection, than the knowledge that the first law officer of the Crown in the Dominion of Canada, ahead of time, has said that in his opinion they have these rights, and we cannot prevent them from exercising them if they choose to do so? The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), I think quite properly, complimented the United States Congress upon turning down this charter; but I could not help noticing that he did not say a word about the Minister of Justice. He evidently thought that the Minister of Justice belonged to the other side, and was entitled to be condemned, because, by his speech of last week, he practically invited Congress to take what they could. But Congress, perhaps out of sympathy for Canada, not wishing to take too much from her all at once, showed a good deal more desire to protect Canada than the Minister of Justice evidences. The hon. member for Assiniboia referred to our experience on the Niagara river, where we got the worst of it in all these matters. As I demonstrated years before this treaty was negotiated, they were entitled, according to the boundary line, to one-tenth of the power, while this commission gave them more than four-tenths. They woke up years before we did and began to help themselves, and when we woke up it was too late to get full justice. As the hon. member for Assiniboia said, it will be the same in this case: we shall get about one-half of what we should have, while the United States will get two or three times what it should have. There is a way provided by the treaty in which this matter can be dealt with, and in order to show what powers this government possess, if they like to use them, I want to read a few words of Article X.

Any question or matters of difference arising between the high contracting parties involving the rights, obligations, or interests of the United States or of the Dominion of Canada either in relation to each other or to their respective inhabitants, may be referred for decision to the International Joint Commission by the consent of the two parties.

This government could ask the United States government to consent to have this matter adjusted. Now, Sir, I would urge upon the Prime Minister that he ought to see that his Minister of Justice takes a different position to what he has done on these matters. The Minister of Justice ought all the time to hold a brief for Canada. He ought to be the keenest man in the whole country to suspect that these people are trying to make incursions upon us which they are not entitled to make. He does not seem to hold even a watching brief for Canada, but he stands up here and gives the United States to understand that we cannot stop them. The Prime Minister should direct his Minister of Justice to make his complaint, and see that the Waterways Commission takes hold of this matter and settles it properly, instead of trifling with the House, as he has done to-day, by taking the ground that equally free and open navigation does not mean that both parties are to have free and open navigation, but means that we are not to have it if the other party does not want it. I protest against the apathy of the government in these matters, and I hope they will turn over a new leaf and be more alert to protect us, and not wait again until the horse is stolen before they lock the stable door.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called, I see a reference in the papers to a telegram said to have been sent by the Minister of Finance to the High Commissioner in London with reference to the reciprocity arrangement made with the United States. I would like to ask the minister if he would be kind enough to lay a copy of that telegram on the table of the House before to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is given correctly in the evening paper; but if I find any inaccuracy in it, I will send a copy in correct form to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like also to suggest that the papers on the Farmers' Bank, No. 110B and 110C, which take in the curator's report and the correspondence brought down by the Minister of Finance, be printed, and that the rule of the House be suspended for that purpose.

Mr. FIELDING. They are largely such formalities that I hardly thought it necessary, but I have no objection to the hon. gentleman's motion.

Motion (Mr. Foster), agreed to.

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The following item appears in the Toronto 'Mail' of Tuesday, February 7:

MAY RENEW STEEL BOUNTIES.

Montreal, Que., Feb. 6.—Much curiosity was aroused on the 'street' to-day when it became known that an important conference had taken place at the Windsor Hotel on Saturday, in which Finance Minister Fielding; Premier Murray, of Nova Scotia; Hon.

A. K. Maclean, Attorney-General of Nova Scotia; Mr. E. M. Macdonald, M.P., for Pictou; and President J. H. Plummer, of the Dominion Steel Corporation participated. The subject of the conference, which was a protracted one, is understood to have been in connection with the representations that have been made to the Dominion government by the Canadian steel interests looking to a renewal of the bounties.

The general feeling is that the government will meet the wishes of the delegation and that a renewal of the bounties will be accorded.

I would ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) these questions: Have the government changed the position they announced to the House some time ago in reference to the renewal of these bounties? Have the government not received in the last four or five years many protests and largely signed petitions against the renewal of these bounties? Are the government not aware that there is very decided and strong opposition throughout the country in regard to the renewal of steel bounties to enable the company to pay dividends upon its watered stock?

Mr. FIELDING. When the government have any change of view to announce on that subject it will be announced in parliament and not elsewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. After the arrangement is made?

Mr. FIELDING. What arrangement?

Mr. FOSTER. Any arrangement?

Mr. FIELDING. No arrangement has been made. To the second question, I cannot remember if petitions have been received. If my hon. friend will move for them in the usual way and there are such petitions I will be happy to expedite the bringing down of a return. To the third question, we are aware that there is a divided opinion upon nearly all the fiscal questions which engage the attention of the government and the House.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Have any negotiations taken place between the gentlemen named here and the Minister of Finance?

Mr. FIELDING. There has been no such conference as that which formed the basis of the hon. gentleman's question. There have been applications from the Dominion Iron and Steel Company for a continuance of the bounty on steel rods.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Has there been a meeting between the Minister of Finance and the gentlemen named with a view to the continuing of the bounties?

Mr. FIELDING. There was an interview between the president of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and myself for the purpose of enabling him to present his views. That interview took place in my office in Ottawa some days ago.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. VERVILLE moved the third reading of Bill (No. 3) respecting the hours of labour on public works.

Mr. MARSHALL. This Bill was discussed last week in my absence. I was a member of the committee to which it was referred. Everything was done to secure evidence, I have no fault to find on that score, but I am opposed to the Bill for the simple reason that it is discriminating. I do not know why we should provide for an eight hour day for men working on public buildings when men working on other buildings have to work ten hours. I believe the Bill, if it is made law, will cause trouble. I have had a great deal of experience with help for years. My experience extends over thirty years, and the complaint with us has been that we do not give them sufficient work. For that reason I wish to put myself on record as being opposed to the Bill, believing as I do, after hearing the evidence, that it will cause trouble.

Mr. STANFIELD. As a member of the special committee who heard the evidence last year, I desire to say a word. My objection to the Bill is not very strong as I am in favour of helping on the eight-hour movement and the labouring people, but I wish to place on record a communication which I have received from Moncton. It is as follows:

Moncton, N.B., December 28, 1910.

John Stanfield, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—We, the undersigned, representing organized labour in the city of Moncton, hereby enter an emphatic protest against the proposed amendments to the Eight-Hour Bill (known as Bill No. 3), which amendments, if passed, will utterly eliminate from its benefits the thousands of employees of the government on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways. We particularly object to the striking out of section 5 of the Bill.

We believe that in the matter of hours and wages and in ideal working conditions generally the government of the country should be the leader, not the follower. To this end we would urgently request your support to the Bill as originally proposed.

Thanking you in advance for any support you can render us at this time.

We remain, yours very truly,
Trades and Labour Council.
CHAS. H. SMYTH,
President.
E. SMITH SCOTT,
Secretary.
Lodge 594 I. A. of Machinists.
W. R. CROWHURST,
President.

G. H. MANNING,
Secretary.
Brotherhood of Railway Carmen.
CHAS. H. SMYTH,
President.
L. McKINNON,
Secretary.
Int. Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers
CH. McQUARRIE,
President.
D. J. McGILLIVRAY,
Secretary.
Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Ship Builders.
JOHN O'NEIL,
President.
N. A. RAE,
Secretary.
Int. Boilermaker's Helpers.
R. D. DONNELLY,
President.
EDW. G. BRADY,
Secretary.
Electrical Workers.
A. R. SMITH,
Secretary.
Lodge 636 Typographical Union.
MRS. M. BARNABY,
President.
J. A. ROBINSON,
Secretary.

I wish to place this on record as the protest of these labour organizations against the passage of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say something on this Bill, but as it is almost six o'clock, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 9, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

CANADIAN CONTINGENT AT CORONATION.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. What rule or principle will the government adopt in selecting the officers and men of the Canadian contingent to the Coronation?
2. What will be the probable number of officers and men of said contingent?
3. What other persons will be selected to represent the Canadian government?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I would like to make an explanation with reference to what took place yesterday. I said to my hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) who put this question:

My deputy informs me that the answer was sent in last week in the regular way.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I inquired of the clerk, and he cannot find it.

That difficulty occurred in this way: My deputy supposed, and rightly, that the third part of the question did not refer to the Militia Department, and followed the rule of sending the answer of the two first parts to the Secretary of State so that the answer to the third might be got from the proper minister, and the whole answer sent in together. I found the answer, which was sent in on the 23rd January, in the Department of the Secretary of State today. The answer is as follows:

1. It is proposed to send representatives of every regiment or independent unit of the permanent force, and active militia, including departmental corps. The numbers to be furnished for the mounted and dismounted portions of the contingent have been arrived at, as far as possible, upon a percentage basis. Preference will be given to those who have not already partaken in former contingents on such great occasions, such as Jubilee of the late Queen Victoria, or the coronation of the late King. Preference will also be given to those who have served in the field. With regard to the selection of the more junior officers, it is proposed that their selection shall be made with due regard to efficiency. As regards the qualifications of non-commissioned officers and men, they will be required to fulfil the following conditions:

(a) To be at present included in the service roll of a corps of the active militia.

*(b) To have completed the full military training in 1908, 1909 and 1910.

(c) To be well set up, of suitable height and physique, thoroughly trained, and certified by their commanding officers to be of 'exemplary' character.

(d) To be examined and passed 'fit' by the medical officer, subject to confirmation by the principal medical officer before embarkation.

*This rule does not include corps organized since the above mentioned dates.

2. About 717.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. DONNELLY:

1. How much has the proposed bridge across the St. Lawrence river for the use of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway cost up to date?
2. What is the estimated additional cost to complete the bridge?
3. Did the government ever consider the advisability of tunnelling the river instead of constructing a bridge?
4. Did the government ever have engineers report upon the feasibility and cost of such a tunnel?

Mr. GRAHAM :

1. I presume my hon. friend refers to what is known as the Quebec bridge which has not been constructed for the sole use of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway.

2. As intimated to the leader of the opposition the other day this question cannot be answered at the present time as the tenders are under consideration.

3. The department does not consider the construction of a tunnel at that point in the realm of practicability.

4. No.

HOMESTEAD—R. F. RUDDOCK.

* Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster) :

1. Has the attention of the Interior Department been called to an application by R. F. Ruddock for a homestead in Chilliwack district, said to have been made on or about 11th May, 1908?

2. Has the applicant been residing on and improving the land applied for?

3. Is it the intention to grant this application before proclamation of the new regulations?

Mr. OLIVER :

1. The first intimation of record here that R. F. Ruddock claimed to be squatting on south-east ¼ 22, 2, 29 west 6th meridian, was by letter dated 13th October, 1910, from Mr. J. D. Taylor, M.P., to this department.

2. The agent of Dominion lands at New Westminster was asked to report on the case. His report has not yet been received and the department does not know whether or not R. F. Ruddock has been residing on and improving the said land. The agent has been requested to expedite the report.

3. Until the agent's report is received, and the nature of the claim is before the department, a decision cannot be reached in reference to the case.

IMPORTATION OF IMPURE CANNED PEAS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG :

1. Is the government aware that canned peas are being imported into Canada containing colouring matter, contrary to the Pure Food Act? If so, what action has been taken to stop the importation of same?

2. How many cases of canned peas have been inspected at the ports of entry, and how many have been condemned as not complying with our food regulations?

Mr. MURPHY :

1. The government is not aware that canned peas containing colouring matter are being imported into Canada, contrary to the Adulteration Act.

2. There is no information available respecting canned peas at the ports of entry nor concerning the number of cases that may have been condemned.

GAS METERS IN TORONTO.

Mr. MACDONELL :

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue been called to what appears to be the excessive reading of the gas meters in use in the city of Toronto?

2. Is the minister aware that it is alleged by the users of gas in Toronto that the meters register from ¼ to ⅓ more gas than they did at the same period in any previous year?

3. Is the minister aware that such complaints have arisen since the new gas main was recently laid across the city?

4. If the minister is not cognizant of the position of matters as above indicated, will he ask for a report from the proper government officer or officers at Toronto, with special reference to the gas pressure prior to and since the new gas main was recently laid across the city?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN :

1. No complaint has been received at the Inland Revenue Department, from Toronto, since May, 1908, relative to the excessive reading of gas meters.

2. No.

3. No.

4. The department will send an expert official to Toronto to ascertain the exact condition of affairs.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

* Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster) :

1. How many copies were printed of the proceedings of the special committee on the hours of labour on public works?

2. How many copies have been distributed, and, in general terms, to whom have they been distributed?

3. What disposition is intended to be made of the volumes remaining on hand?

4. What was the total cost of this committee, under each head of expenditure, including the volume of proceedings?

Mr. KING :

1. 2,275 copies for general distribution, as per list at Printing Bureau ; 800 copies for journals of the House of Commons, and 5,000 for extra distribution.

2. 2,275 copies distributed from the Printing Bureau to (1) the High Commissioner in London, (2) senators, (3) members of parliament (4) members of the provincial legislatures (5) judges (6) boards of trade (7) public libraries (8) mechanics' institutes, and (9) newspapers.

The following copies have also been distributed by the clerk of the Eight Hour Bill Committee : To Department of Labour, 30 ; to members and senators, 731 ; Builders' Exchange, 15 ; the press, 40 ; 'Hansard,' 14 ; officials of departments, 12 ; to various persons on request, 22.

3. It is intended to distribute the balance to trades and labour unions, to farmers' in-

stitutes, to the Dominion Grange, and to boards of trade, also to manufacturers from whom the committee have received communications, and to such other persons or organizations as may make application therefor.

4. $3,042.76 for printing report; $503.70 for witnesses; and $517.56 for stenographic assistance, in addition to the services of members of the staff of the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT LOANS.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

What was the total cost in dollars and cents of the loan of 1909 at 3¾ per cent, under the heads, respectively, of commission to financial agents, commission to underwriters, commission for arranging for underwriting, brokerage, advertising, printing, and other charges?

Mr. FIELDING:

Commission to financial agents..	$ 73,000 00
Commission to underwriters.. ..	292,000 00
Commission for arranging for underwriting	73,000 00
Brokerage	67,119 16
Advertising, printing, freight and other such charges	12,567 99
Other charges	93,762 35
	$611,449 50

REGINA AND MOOSEJAW TOWN SITES.

Mr. McCRANEY:

1. Was the government jointly interested with the Canadian Pacific railway in certain lots in the townsites of Regina and Moosejaw?

2. If so, was a division of interests made and when?

3. How many of such lots became the sole property of the government in Regina, what disposal was made of same and on what terms?

4. How many of such lots became the sole property of the government in Moosejaw, what disposal was made of same, and on what terms?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes, the disposal of such lots being administered by joint trustees.

2. Yes, on March 27, 1902.

3. 4,863; patented as a free grant to the city of Regina under the authority of an order in council dated April 6, 1903. In addition to these lots 285·55 acres of the unsubdivided portion of the townsite of Regina was revested in the Crown and subsequently patented to the city of Regina, as follows: 89·60 acres for cemetery purposes and 195·95 acres for public park and recreation ground purposes.

4. 2,152; patented as a free grant to the city of Moosejaw under the authority of an order in council dated the 6th April, 1903.

TIMBER BERTHS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster):

1. Has the Minister of the Interior received any requests lately for the removal of timber cases from lands at Hall's Prairie, B.C., or reports upon such applications not yet granted or dealt with?

2. In how many years have applications been pending for removal of these cases?

3. What is the situation at present?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. No requests have been received lately for the removal of timber leases from lands in timber berths B. L, Q, 176, 234, 293 and 450 near Hall's Prairie, B.C., but there are many illegal squatters in these berths who have from time to time communicated with the department for the purpose of getting the right to enter when the lands were made available.

2. The first request on file here from a squatter for the right of entry in these berths is dated March 5, 1902; one was received from another squatter, dated 23rd January, 1904; several were received in 1906 and others since then.

A petition signed by a number of residents in Surrey municipality was received dated at Hall's Prairie, April 18, 1908, asking withdrawal of lands in that municipality under timber lease to the British Columbia Mills Timber and Trading Company.

3. An inspection of these timber berths was made last summer by an officer of the department for the purpose of considering the question of possible withdrawals from timber license. Pursuant to the reports made, the licensees of timber berth B were notified to clear off part of the berth by the 1st May, 1911, and the balance by the 1st May, 1912. The licensees of timber berth Q were notified that part of that berth would be withdrawn 1st May, 1911, and the balance on the 1st May, 1912. In the case of the other timber berths above mentioned, the licensees were given till the 1st May, 1911, to clear off the remainder of the timber.

Protests have been received from the licensees in connection with these proposed withdrawals. The protest is now under consideration.

DAM ACROSS THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have to-day received word from Washington that the Bill to authorize the damming of the St. Lawrence is now before the United States Senate and they are changing it so as to give them power to dam the St. Lawrence south of the international boundary line which practically means damming the whole river. I am requested to ask the government that they should telegraph to Am-

bassador Bryce to protest against damming any part of the St. Lawrence without the consent of Canada, as asked for by the Bill. I wish the Prime Minister could see his way clear to inform Ambassador Bryce, if such legislation is being proceeded with in the United States Senate, that he should enter a protest on behalf of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Reid), without telling him the nature of the correspondence, that we are at this moment in correspondence with Ambassador Bryce.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to give the House information which was asked for by the member for Grenville yesterday. The hon gentleman stated that in a conversation which took place upon a train between him and Mr. Coté, the secretary of the International Waterways Commission, Mr. Coté had informed him that a plan for the construction of a canal from the Long Sault to Lake Champlain had been before the Waterways Commission, that the commission had made a report on it, and that that report was in the Department of Public Works. I stated then that I had received no notice of any such report and on inquiry from Mr. Coté, he tells me he did have a conversation with the hon. gentleman and that what he referred to in that conversation was the work of improving the navigable channel afforded by the Richelieu river and which connects the River St. Lawrence with Lake Champlain. Mr. Coté says he told the hon. gentleman that the report in regard to that had been made by the Waterways Commission, and if my hon. friend will turn to the report of the International Waterways Commission, page 239, he will find there the report which Mr. Coté referred to. Mr. Coté states he never heard of any report or any plan for the construction of a canal from the Long Sault to Lake Champlain, and he informs me that no such work was referred to in the conversation between him and the hon. gentleman.

THE DUTY ON FRUIT.

Mr. BURRELL. I wish to call the attention of the government to the following item which appears in this morning's 'Citizen':

South Haven, Mich., Feb. 8.—P. H. T. Carpenter, of Niagara, Ont., and H. H. Griffith, of Grimsby, Ont., representatives of the Agricultural Department of the Canadian government, here conferring with fruit growers concerning their stand on the fruit clause of the reciprocity treaty, both declared to-day that they favour the placing of fruit on the free list, and say that the prominent fruit growers of the Ontario district are in accord with the provision. Both men stated that the majority of the Canadian fruit growers with whom they have talked believe the treaty will be ratified by both governments provided the amendments are few.

In view of the fact that I regard that statement as absolutely unauthorized and unrepresentative I would ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) whether these are officials of his department.

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember these names as the names of any of my officials. I do not think they are, but I will look into it and see. If they are, they must be men who are just temporarily employed in some way as institute workers, but I do not think they belong to my department at all. I imagine they are officers of the Ontario government.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair I desire, on behalf of a large number of interests concerned with the object which we are about to discuss, to lodge an earnest protest against the undue and unseemly haste with which the House is asked to consider this very important agreement. I am aware that the rules of international courtesy oblige us to speak with caution even upon the subject of delay, but at the same time it is proper that I should point out that what we seek here is merely the necessary time to become fully acquainted with the details of this very important agreement, and to enable us, as in duty bound, to take counsel with those we represent here. There is no desire, as the House will see by the motion expressive of regret which I intend placing in your hands, to avoid that discussion, nor unduly to delay, nor to put any obstacle in the way of a proper discussion of that agreement. But since it has become apparent that the decision of the government is to rush this matter through without members having proper time to consider it, it seems entirely within our right, and no violation of that community of nations to which I have alluded, that we should put on record, those of us who are of that opinion, the fact that we have not had the proper time to consider all the details which it is the business of this committee to look into immediately.

Just one word to accentuate the fact, which has been pointed out by many people outside of this House, that this agreement is absolutely new. We had expected some thing less considerable, but it is of the most sweeping character. In the first place, the Minister of Finance has admitted, in making his recent announcement to the House, that it covers the whole field of

agriculture. That is at the present moment in this country a matter of supreme interest. It tends to invade our forest wealth and other natural resources. We have seen within a short time how backward we have been with respect to those resources. We have constituted a Commission of Conservation, we have spent a year in the study of those resources and of the means of conserving them, and we have just had a meeting at which it has been made apparent that we must change our course, and in the future bring to the conservation of those great natural resources all that care which has been found wanting in other countries and which is necessary, to prevent the waste of what constitutes the real strength of a nation.

Another motive for this demand for delay is the fact that the tendency of this agreement is admittedly to make our trade move north and south. I need not take up the time of the House in emphasizing, what everybody knows, that for years our efforts have been in an entirely different direction. Therefore, this question affects primarily the great question of transportation, and has to do with the immense sacrifices which we have made within the last 20 years to give to our trade that direction east and west which we deem absolutely necessary to the best interests of the country. This agreement, presented to us in this unexpected manner, which has not been discussed by us and our electors, comes to us with startling suddenness after 40 years of complete isolation from our great neighbour —40 years of separation, not surely attributable to us, since we all know that during those 40 years in the wilderness we, on our side, have time and again sought to obtain better relations with our neighbour. But, Sir, during that long period the circumstances have changed. That is a point which all people admit. We have federated our entire country—joined together all its parts from one end to the other, at the cost of many negotiations and at vast expense, an expense which would not, perhaps, have been so readily undergone had those obstacles for which I lay no blame upon our neighbour, but which they themselves maintained during that long period, not existed. We have, as a necessity, created new markets; we have had to find those markets. Our hon. friends on the other side of the House have time and again claimed the credit of having sought and found those markets for us. I do not wish to enter on that controversy. There is no doubt that we have been obliged to find new markets, and under a fiscal system established by us long ago, and maintained by this government, largely brought about by the isolation to which I have referred, we have created considerable industries, and upon the principles which lie at the basis of that fiscal policy those industries have grown, until large and practically vested interests have been created.

In support of this demand for delay, what do we find? It would be idle to take up the time of the House in indicating the circumstances under which this proposal has been brought about. We do not live on this continent without seeing and realizing what goes on around us, not only here, but all over the world. Members of this House know full well that there has been a very strong movement in the political life of our estimable neighbours for the lowering of their tariff. This has become their great party question, which they have discussed from each and every point of view during the last decade, and the upshot of that discussion, which has enabled them to familiarize themselves with the conditions of their own trade, is that those among them who are in favour of a reduction of the tariff have obtained the ascendency and will, in a few days, be in a position to deal effectively with the matter with which we are now concerned.

That is a condition which is far more favourable than our own. I speak in the judgment of the House when I say that the question of our tariff, the question of our fiscal policy, has not been a prominent one, and consequently has not been discussed in our country. In debating a proposal such as the one before the House, it is not for us to discuss the political situation in the United States, but we cannot help considering it. We cannot fail to realize that we do not stand here, with respect to the question of our trade relations, possessed of that information which our neighbours enjoy. When we see this strange and sudden change in the feelings of our neighbours towards us, which we welcome—for there is no man, I hope, in this country, who does not desire not only the most pleasant but the most favourable relations in business and otherwise with the neighbouring republic—in the face of that situation we may ask what position with respect to these negotiations has been taken by the imperial government? I think that is a fair question. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has assured us that during the negotiations he received the warmest support from His Majesty's ambassador at Washington. Did the British ambassador receive instructions in this regard from his government? Unquestionably he must have. There can be no doubt in the mind of any one who knows anything of diplomacy that in a matter of this importance, no ambassador would take up such a position unless under instructions. Well, if political considerations of paramount importance entered into the negotiations which have culminated in this agreement with our neighbours, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the

British government, which has just come out of the throes of the warmest political contest known in that country for a long time, sees some advantage in the carrying through of this agreement. Do the despatches which have come to us from the other side cast any doubt upon that very reasonable supposition? I submit not. From the manner in which this question has been discussed on the other side, we see that it assumes there, as elsewhere, a political aspect, and that those who are in power in England at present expect considerable political advantage to accrue from the carrying through of this agreement. I appeal to the government and this House whether, if there be no doubt on the facts which I have just given, there is not great uncertainty as to the value of the different elements of this agreement upon which we are called upon to enter immediately. I speak of the schedules. Open the newspapers and you find in them interviews with competent men on matters which concern them and which are referred to in these schedules and you find contradictory opinions among them, but you also find this careful reserve invariably expressed that we will require to look further into this proposed arrangement in order to be able to appreciate and measure its consequences. Under these circumstances, is it not advisable that we, who are but mandatories, should not now go into the discussion of the details of this arrangement when we have absolutely not had the time to confer with our constituencies not even those of us whose constituencies are closest to the Capital. It is a principle admitted in the law of every nation that a mandatory cannot conclude important matters or matters other than routine without consulting his principal. Well, what are we here after all but mandatories of the people? I myself live quite near Ottawa. With some of the industries in my constituency, which is not far distant, I am quite well acquainted, with others much less so, but there is not one of them affected by this proposed treaty, on behalf of which I would venture to speak with absolute certainty unless I had further information from them. I believe we should meet this proposal in a proper spirit, give it the attention due to its importance, but not greet it with those shrieks of approval with which my hon. friends on the other side hailed the announcement of the hon. Minister of Finance after his return. These things are quoted abroad. The next day throughout the newspapers in the neighbouring republic it was stated—and stated certainly with some grounds of truth—that this whole House, after this long period of forty years waiting for reciprocity, had greeted with acclamation the whole arrangement. I believe that we should be ready to conclude treaties with all nations where our interests are concerned; but under the circumstances it must be apparent to every member of this House that, whatever may be the circumstances under which these proposals for a trade arrangement are made, we must first consider Canadian interests. They should be first of all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. Is not that the true test, the proper criterion? Must we not view this proposed arrangement from the standpoint of what interests the future of Canada? Let me remark to my hon. friends that it is unusual in the highest degree for a nation to assent with such brief delay to an arrangement of this kind with its far-reaching consequences upon commercial treaties with other nations. They are concluded every day amongst European countries. You will find the usual clause that ratifications may be exchanged in six months, after the parliaments, the deliberative assemblies of those nations, have had an opportunity to look into them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. My right hon. friend says hear, hear. That is an approval, I suppose, of the statement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Quite the reverse.

Mr. MONK. My right hon. friend probably refers to the ratifications, to the ordinary sealing of the agreement, but will he show us a single case of an agreement of this kind, surrounded by the circumstances that surround this one, in which a parliament has been asked to approve with such a short delay. I do not think so. I defy my hon. friend to give us such an example.

Now, I conclude. The United States in making trade arrangements with other nations, consider only their own interests. I do not, in any sense, blame our neighbours for that. I approve of this course, but this trait has characterized their trade arrangements for all time. They awakened to the utility of this agreement at a moment when they realized that it was in their interest. That is right, that is proper. They have discussed those interests a long time, and they have come to the conclusion that while their rejection, time and again of our own approaches and proposals, was probably justified at the time, from their own point of view, the time has come to change their attitude and they come to us. We receive them in a proper spirit, and are considering their proposals but is there anything unfair in saying that we, the parliament which is going to lay

its seal on, and give its approval to this agreement, wish to consider it, to think it over, to weigh it, because it requires to be weighed and considered, and that we wish to consult those who have sent us here, to know what their opinions are, to understand fully how their interests are affected. I can see that it is probable that the demand I have made on the government will not be acceded to by my hon. friends, but I think it is important that we should put it on record. I know the feeling in my province is that this requires to be looked into, and we should put on record an expression of our regret that the government has not given us a further opportunity for consideration. I therefore, beg to move:

To add to the main motion the following words:—

But the House regrets that, before considering, on its merits and in its details, the arrangement concluded between the government of Canada and the President of the United States, it has not been given the necessary time and occasion to ascertain the opinion of the people of Canada in that regard and to study more carefully the effect the new fiscal regime may have upon the various interests thereby affected.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention at this stage of the proceedings to enter into any discussion of the merits of the reciprocity agreement. I have already had the opportunity of addressing the House at some length concerning it, and possibly before the matter is finally disposed of, some other opportunity may properly arise at which, if I so desire, I can again express my views. I confine myself at the moment entirely to the position taken by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), as to a delay of proceedings. I am not able to agree with my hon. friend that there is any good reason why this House should not now proceed to deal, not hastily, not rashly, but soberly and in the ordinary way of public business, with the important matter which the government have submitted. I cannot agree with my hon. friend that there has been anything rash or anything unseemly in asking the House to deal with the matter in the manner I have suggested. The question of reciprocity is not a new one. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk), himself, has said that in one form or another, we have had this matter before us for 40 years, and now he says he is very much surprised. But first he is surprised that this government have been able to obtain an agreement upon that question between the United States and Canada, an agreement which gives hope and faith and confidence to the people in nearly every industry in this country, and gives assurance that the great prosperity that Canada has enjoyed now for many years, will continue and increase. There is nothing new of importance in this agreement. It is, to a large extent, the old reciprocity treaty of 1854 over again. In some respects it is different, there are some things here that are not in the old treaty, but speaking generally, there is nothing in this reciprocity agreement that any intelligent and thoughtful man cannot comprehend with a very short study. It has been in our hands for a fortnight. We are not proceeding hastily; the proceedings of parliament are a protection against hasty legislation. We first give notice of resolutions, and we invite the attention of the House in Committee of the Whole to these resolutions. There may be a debate, as there is now, at the first stage. There is a further debate in Committee of the Whole. After the resolutions have passed, if they shall pass through the Committee of the Whole, and after they are reported to the House, they are crystallized into the form of a Bill, and at every stage of that Bill there may be further consideration and further debate. There will be a first reading of the Bill, and we can talk on it as long as we like, and so with the second and third readings; and then, if it shall have passed through these various stages, it goes to another place and the same procedure largely happens there, and if it is capable of being discussed, and in some respects a measure of that kind may be discussed in another place, although it is a Bill that principally belongs to this House, there is an opportunity, in a general way, for discussion even there. So, Sir, there will be abundant opportunity for the members of this House and the people of this country to carefully consider the arrangement to which the government asks them to give their approval.

In times past we have endeavoured to make reciprocity arrangements with our friends to the south, but in most cases we have been unsuccessful; for one reason or another nothing has been accomplished. We are to-day in the happy position that we are about, as we believe, to accomplish this great thing for which our people have been seeking for the last forty years. And, Sir, with the prospect of that great boon to the people of Canada so near, it would be a grave mistake and a great wrong for this House to refuse to take advantage of the opportunity which is presented. It is not plain sailing on either side of the boundary line. My hon. friend rather conveyed the impression that there is an intense desire on the other side of the line to achieve this arrangement. We who read the public press know that my hon. friend hardly put that matter fairly. He knows that on the other side of the line, as on this side of the line, there are interests which

will oppose this arrangement. He can turn to the Conservative press, and he will find their headlines announcing with triumph that this measure is to be defeated. Where? In the parliament of Canada? No, but in the Congress of the United States. It is to that body they are looking for hope and comfort. The effort that has been made on that side of the line to defeat this measure is exactly of the same nature as the efforts on this side. Perhaps the only thing in which we differ is that on the American side of the line they are fighting this thing bitterly because narrow and selfish interests, opposed to the good of the great multitude, feel that they may be affected. On this side of the line there has been no serious effort to discuss this question from an economic point of view. My hon. friend spoke of the shrieks that were made in support of this measure. I have heard of no shrieks in Canada in support of this measure; but I have heard and read the shrieks of the friends of the hon. gentleman in denouncing this measure, men in the press and men on the platform, who, unable to deal with this measure on its merits, are content to beat the big drum of imperialism. As the Ottawa 'Citizen' of this morning says, it is an insult to the intelligence of the people to claim that the acceptance of a trade arrangement with the United States interferes with the loyalty of the Canadian people.

Sir, we have come to an agreement with the United States government as to the manner in which this matter shall be dealt with. We are aware of the difficulties in the United States, we are aware that their Congress will cease on the 4th day of March, and we are aware that strenuous efforts are being made to defeat this measure on the other side of the line. If that shall happen, it is not our fault. We know it will give great joy to some hon. gentlemen opposite, who, in this matter, are looking to Washington, and not to Ottawa. We have agreed that the government of the United States and the government of Canada shall use their utmost efforts to recommend and carry this legislation through the Congress of the United States and the parliament of Canada. We believe there is a happy combination of events at Washington now which is likely to eventuate in success. We know the difficulties, we know there is a tremendous opposition there, as there is opposition here. I have strong hope that the president of the United States will be able to overcome that opposition in the United States, and that this measure will receive the approval of the United States Congress. But whether it shall receive the approval of Congress or not, one thing is clear, we will do our part; and if we pass this measure, and if the United States fail to pass corresponding legislation, then, in any future negotiations, our position will be stronger, we will be able to say: We have kept the faith, we did what we agreed to do, and if you did not do it, that is your fault.

Sir, I am not able to see any reason why we should delay. As I said a moment ago, there is a happy condition at Washington which has not prevailed in the past. We propose to proceed with this measure, not rashly, but in due order. Of course, we will have a suspending clause. Though we ask the parliament of Canada to assent to this measure, the Bill which will be founded on the resolutions now before the House, will contain a clause providing that this arrangement will not go into operation until we are assured that corresponding legislation has been passed by the United States. Therefore, there is no danger such as my hon. friend appears to apprehend. It would seem, from what we have heard in some quarters, that there is an idea abroad that we are going to pass this legislation, and put it into operation, and that our American friends will never do their part at all. That is not the situation. We shall ask parliament to pass the measure, and we shall ask parliament to adopt a suspending clause which will declare that this measure shall not go into operation until the government of Canada have obtained satisfactory information that the United States Congress have done their part as well. Believing that this is a good measure, good both for the Dominion of Canada and good for our neighbours to the south, believing that the conditions are particularly favourable for making this arrangement, I respectfully ask the House not to consent to delay, but to oppose the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

House divided on amendment of (Mr. Monk).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Ames,	Lortie,
Armstrong,	Macdonell,
Baker,	McCall,
Barnard,	McCarthy,
Beattie,	Maddin,
Best,	Magrath,
Blain,	Marshall,
Borden (Halifax),	Meighen,
Bradbury,	Middlebro,
Broder,	Monk,
Burrell,	Nantel,
Chisholm (Huron),	Northrup,
Cowan,	Owen,
Crosby,	Paquet,
Crocket,	Perley,
Crothers,	Porter,
Currie (Simcoe),	Reid (Grenville),
Daniel,	Rhodes,
Doherty,	Roche,
Donnelly,	Schaffner,

Edwards,
Elson,
Foster,
Fraser,
Gilbert,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Lanark),
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Henderson,
Herron,
Jameson,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thornton,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox (Essex),
Wilson (Lennox and Addington) and
Wright.—72.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allard,
Allen,
Aylesworth,
Béland,
Black,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chew,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Currie,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Delisle,
Demers,
Douglas,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
German,
Gordon (Kent),
Graham,
Guthrie,
Harris,
Harty,
Hodgins,
Hunt,
King,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lovell,
Low,
Macdonald,
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McColl,
McCraney,
McGiverin,
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Paterson,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Robb,
Ross (Middlesex),
Ross (Rimouski),
Roy (Montmagny),
Rutan,
Schell,
Sealey,
Sinclair,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Sperry,
Todd,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Warburton and
White (Victoria, Alta.)—97.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Lemieux,	Forget,
Templeman,	Thoburn,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Emmerson,	Worthington,
Bickerdike,	Osler,
Geoffrion,	Arthurs,
Conmee,	Boyce,
Ecrément,	Blondin,
McLean (Sunbury),	Campbell,
Martin (Regina),	Clare,
Smith (Stormont),	Hughes,
Tolmie,	Price,
Smith (Middlesex),	Russell,
Gervais,	Smyth,
Loggie.	Bristol.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING. I beg to move the adoption of the resolution of the 26th January, which is on the Order Paper.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is it the desire of the committee to take up the resolution as a whole, or item by item?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). We would like to have, first, a general discussion upon the resolution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The whole resolution is before the committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, the conditions under which I was called upon to speak on a previous occasion in this House, just two weeks ago, afforded little opportunity for grasping the full import of the proposals which have been submitted to parliament and to the country by the government. Those proposals are of too grave and serious a character to be considered from a purely partisan standpoint. I desire, therefore, to-day to make a reasonable and moderate presentation of the views which I entertain with regard to them without making any attack upon the government or upon any one else. In the first place, I shall direct your attention to the condition to which this country has attained after some forty or fifty years of effort and endeavour, and I shall undertake to demonstrate, in so far as it is within my humble ability, that these are not proposals that should be lightly entered into by the Dominion of Canada at the present time.

I do not agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when he suggests that there has been ample time for the country to make itself acquainted with the nature of these proposals, and with their probable result, whether that result be considered from the economic standpoint alone, or whether it be

considered from the distinct national standpoint which is involved in these proposals. The motion which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has moved to-day was presented to this parliament on the 26th January, just two weeks ago. On Tuesday last, twelve days afterwards, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance presented to parliament information which admittedly was necessary in order that parliament should have a real conception of what is involved in these proposals. That information was presented to this parliament about three or four o'clock in the afternoon, and it was proposed by the government to proceed with the discussion of these proposals on the following day at three o'clock in the afternoon. It is quite true that an arrangement was eventually made to postpone the discussion until to-day, but even so we have had in our possession for but forty-eight hours the information upon which these proposals must be considered by parliament and the country.

They are not proposals to be rushed through parliament. They are not proposals which ought to be forced upon the country without the most ample opportunity of consideration and of suggestion, whether to the government or to parliament. What do these proposals embody? They embody practically a new tariff for this country in so far as its tariff relations with the United States of America are concerned. They are of so sweeping an effect that probably no one man, inside or outside of parliament to-day, can accurately or properly estimate what their future result may be. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has referred to the reciprocity treaty of 1854. He has referred to that treaty as one which conferred great advantages upon this country. I do not propose this afternoon to enter into a consideration of the advantages which may have come to this country during some part of the operation of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, but I would like to point out that this is 1911, and not 1854, and that it is idle for us to attempt to discuss these proposals from the standpoint of 1854, or even from the standpoint of 1866. It is perfectly true that during the latter part of the reciprocity treaty, which lasted from 1854 to 1866, production was greatly stimulated in this country, and, I believe, we got very high prices for our products, but it is equally true that this resulted from causes which do not prevail to-day. During a portion of that period there was a great civil war raging in the United States, production was checked in the United States, production was stimulated in Canada, and the prices that we obtained for our produce during the last half dozen years of the existence of that treaty were very much higher than could reasonably be expected under other conditions.

I do not propose to waste your time by dealing with the reciprocity treaty of 1854, or with the conditions which prevailed at that time, except to contrast the condition of Canada as it is in 1911 with the condition which then confronted the scattered provinces, out of which this confederation was formed. What was the condition of this country in 1866? We had not yet formed confederation. There were simply four, or five, or six provinces in eastern Canada, four of which united to form this new, this great confederation. The task which they undertook at that time was, perhaps, as great a task as ever confronted any similar people under anything like the same conditions. What was the task? It was to convert these fringelike communities, scattered along the border land of the United States, into a great and powerful nation, which should maintain its place upon the northern half of this continent under the protecting ægis of the British flag.

The very first of our tasks was to add about 3,000,000 square miles to our territory; to take in the distant province of British Columbia, and all the great uninhabited territory between; to build lines of transportation, to develop and utilize our system of waterways; to bind together into one Dominion the scattered fragments of our country, and last but not least to conserve and to develop the natural resources of untold importance which had come as a priceless heritage to the two great races that had united for the development of this Dominion. Sir, there was something greater than even that: There was the task laid before the people of this country to allay jealousies and prejudices, to create a national spirit, and to bring about that harmony and mutual understanding among the people of these four provinces, and of the other provinces that should be added in the future, which would contribute to the building up of a united and powerful Canada as the greatest of the Dominions which own allegiance to the British Crown. The task before our people was to build up British institutions in this country, to develop them in the spirit in which they had been developed in the mother country, and to do all this under conditions that might well have daunted men of less stout heart, because, it was realized that these fringe-like communities were scattered for 4,000 miles along the territory of a great and powerful nation which must possess a far-reaching influence upon the commercial destiny of this country.

Well, what have we done in that interval of 40 years? Indeed, to mention what we have accomplished it is only necessary to re-echo the statements that have been made over and over again by the Minister of Finance in every budget speech for the

last 14 years, and to add to it the record of the advancement in material prosperity of Canada during the past 40 or 50 years, not confining it to 14 years alone. I trust I may be pardoned that remark, because I do not desire to sound any partisan note in the remarks I shall address to the House. Here are the statistics of Canada's trade comparing 1868 with 1910 :

TRADE STATISTICS.

—	1868.	1910.	Increase.	Per cent.
	$	$	$	
Total trade	116,000,000	649,000,000	533,000,000	459
Exports	49,000,000	279,000,000	230,000,000	470
Imports	67,000,000	370,000,000	303,000,000	450

Between 1868 and 1910 our exports increased as follows :

	1868.	1910.
Produce of mine increased from	$ 1,225,000	to $40,000,000
Produce of fisheries	3,000,000	15,000,000
Produce of forest	19,000,000	47,000,000
Animals and their products	7,000,000	54,000,000
Agricultural products	13,000,000	90,000,000
Manufactures	2,000,000	31,000,000
Value total field crops last year		533,000,000
Value total manufactures (estimated) last year		1,000,000,000

It is therefore abundantly evident, looking at trade statistics alone, that we have made not only great but marvellous progress in the last 40 years along the path which the people of Canada have been treading, and from which path I trust they will not see fit lightly to depart. Let us look at some other statistics. Let us look at what these scattered provinces in 1867 had in the way of transportation facilities —and transportation in a great country like Canada with enormous area, with abundant resources and with a small population, is after all, the key of the situation. Look at these figures:

	1867.	1910.
Miles of railway	2,240	24,731
Railway earnings	$12,000,000	$174,000,000
	1879.	
Tons of freight carried	8,000,000	74,000,000
Passengers carried	6,500,000	36,000,000

BANKS.

	1868.	1910.
Bank capital	$30,000,000	$184,000,000 Including reserve fund.
Bank deposits	33,000,000	925,000,000

POST OFFICE.

	1868.	1910.
Letters transmitted through the mails	41,000,000	414,000,000

AREA AND POPULATION.

	1868.	1910.
	Square miles.	
Area	337,524	3,315,647
Population	3,371,594	*7,250,000

*Estimated.

Look at these evidences of vast progress and prosperity ; look at the advancement we have made in founding universities and schools, look at our progress in education. And, last but not least, look at the standard of comfort in life which prevails in Canada to-day compared with that which prevailed in 1868. I know, Sir, that in my own home in the province of Nova Scotia, when I was a boy 40 years ago the comforts of life as they are enjoyed at the present day were unknown to the people then. Observe the growth of our cities. In 1868 Montreal had a population of 100,000 ; I believe that to-day it has a population of over 500,000. Toronto had a population at that time of 50,000; to-day it is a city of over 400,000. Hamilton had a population of 22,000 ; now I suppose it has over 80,000. Ottawa then was a town which had hardly escaped the name of Bytown ; it had a population of 18,000 ; now it has a population of 85,000 or 90,000. Take the splendid cities of the west—Winnipeg, Calgary, Regina, Edmonton, Vancouver, Victoria. Some of them were mere wilderness in 1868, and for a long time afterwards. Vancouver, which dates from 1885, is to-day a city of 125,000 or 150,000. Will you tell me that we have not a right to be absolutely satisfied with the material progress, splendid, worldwide in its reputation, which has come to the people of Canada in the last 30 or 40 years?

What has been the line of development which we have undertaken ? We have undertaken to bind the provinces of Canada together. We have undertaken to create a great interprovincial trade. We have undertaken to do that by assuming burdens and making sacrifices, which, I venture to say, are as great as were ever undertaken by any people in the history of the world. What burdens have the people of Canada themselves assumed, that lines of transportation and trade and commerce might flow from east to west, and might bind together these scattered communities into one great nation under the British

flag? I will tell you what we have done—and I did not realize the extent of the efforts of the people of Canada in that regard until I came to look over the record a little. The federal government has expended in actual cash on railways and canals up to 1910, according to the records of the Department of Railways and Canals, $427,000,000; the provincial governments, $36,000,000; the municipalities, $18,000,000; a total of actual cash expended out of the public treasury of this country upon railway development in Canada since 1868 of nearly $500,000,000. But, Sir, that is not all. The federal and provincial governments have guaranteed bonds for railway construction in Canada amounting to $127,000,000 more; and in addition to all that, the various governments of Canada have granted, in aid of railway construction, no less than 55,000,000 acres of the public domain. At the present time, to complete the Transcontinental railway, we are proposing a further expenditure of from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000. We are also proposing to build the Hudson Bay railway, at a cost of $30,000,000; and that is a work which ought immediately to be undertaken in the interest of our great western country. The Georgian Bay canal will cost probably in the vicinity of $100,000,000—a work intended for the further development of that splendid system of waterways which we possess in Canada, rivalling, if not exceeding in its importance and value, that which is possessed by any other country in the world. We are also proposing the enlargement of the Welland canal, at a cost, I suppose, of from $30,000,000 to $35,000,000. If, in the future, the trade of this country is to flow north and south, instead of east and west, what is the meaning of all these sacrifices that we have made, of all this treasure that we have poured out? What is the meaning of the Transcontinental railway, as it is being built to-day? What is the meaning of the Georgian Bay canal, as we propose it to-day? What is the meaning of the proposed enlargement of the Welland canal? Have these any real national meaning to the people of Canada if the lines of our trade and commerce are to be diverted so that in the future they will run north and south, instead of east and west as they have been doing?

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, has referred to the conditions as they were from 1854 to 1866. As I have said, the conditions are absolutely different to-day. Transportation and cold storage—and we want a better system of cold storage in this country—have brought the British market nearer to us to-day than the United States market was in 1854. In 1910, Great Britain took, of our animals and their products, $42,000,000 out of $54,000,000 which we exported, equal to 77 per cent. Of our agricultural products, she took $71,000,000 out of $90,000,000, equal to nearly 80 per cent. In the same year, the United States took of animals and their products only 20 per cent of our exports, and of agricultural products only 9 per cent. The United States last year took of our agricultural products only $70,000 more than she took 42 years ago. What does that mean? It means that, after the denunciation of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866, the people of Canada were confronted with conditions which sorely tried their spirit; that they met those conditions manfully, with a high spirit and a firm purpose; that they have gone into the markets of the world and built up their trade there, and built it up under stable and sure conditions; and that it would not be wise for us to-day to depart from the path upon which we entered some 50 years ago.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance referred to the fact that there was a standing offer of reciprocity in this country from 1866 for 25 or 30 years. It is perfectly true; but I would like to remind my hon. friend and all hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, of this one circumstance, which is of some importance in this connection, that it was the policy of this government, by their Tariff Act of 1897, as amended by the Tariff Act of 1898, to take off that standing offer of reciprocity, and it has not been on the statute-book since that time—why? Because the people of Canada had entered on a certain path; because they had built up other markets among the nations of the world; because they had been excluded by high tariffs from the United States market; because they had met those conditions as they ought to be met, and they believed the time had come when that standing offer of reciprocity should be taken from the statute-book of Canada, and it was removed from the statute-book by this parliament without any dissent.

Well, we did ask for reciprocity for many years before that, and we asked for it on many an occasion. It is perfectly true that Sir John Macdonald, in making his argument for the National Policy in 1878, before conditions had changed as they have in the past 30 years—it is perfectly true that he made the argument alluded to by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. It is perfectly true that there was an issue in this country upon that question in 1891; and it is also perfectly true that in 1891 the people of Canada declared that they would continue in the path upon which they had entered in 1866, and upon which they had made a distinct advance through the National Policy which was adopted in 1879. The United States, during all these years, refused our proposals for reciprocity. Un-

doubtedly the treaty of 1854 was denounced for more than one reason or rather there was more than one cause which led to its denunciation in 1866. There was no doubt some feeling engendered in the minds of the people of the United States by certain events which had taken place during the war; but I have always thought that the American people ought perhaps to have borne in mind the fact that some 40,000 or 50,000 Canadians had fought under the United States flag in the civil war from 1860 to 1863 for the maintenance of the union. There were, of course, some annoying incidents; there was perhaps some lack of good feeling, but there had also been a good deal of friction about duties upon articles which were not embraced in the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, and possibly that was one of the causes which led to the denunciation of that treaty in 1866. The United States did not have very much regard for the Canadian market in those days. They were a great and powerful and a rapidly growing nation, and it was said on the other side of the line in 1854, and repeated in 1866 and afterwards, that the ultimate destiny of this country was not only commercial but political union with the United States. There were no doubt many in the United States who thought that the denunciation of this treaty of 1854 would oblige Canada to seek for commercial and political union with that country.

Let us for one moment consider why it is that the great nation to the south, having refused our suggestions of reciprocity for 25 or 30 years, has at last come to the conclusion that at present reciprocal trade with Canada is desirable. Let us consider for a moment on what that present desire is based. In the first place let me say, lest I should be misunderstood, that no one realizes more than I the absolute importance of our having the best and most friendly relations with that great nation, whose boundary adjoins ours for nearly 4,000 miles. That is eminently desirable, and no one will work or co-operate for that purpose more thoroughly and sincerely than I; but the United States have framed their policy at all times in their own interests, and the people and the statesmen of that country are too broad-minded and generous to think for one moment of denying to this country the equal right of framing its fiscal policy as may seem best to its people. I would say this further. I would say that the United States, in many respects, give us a lesson which we would do well to consider and often to follow; as for example in their policy for the conservation of their natural resources, in the earnest attempts by their public men and men of great eminence, not in public life, to elevate the standard and ideals of public life in that country and to make the people more thoroughly cognizant of their responsibility as citizens of one of the greatest countries in the world. In these respects, as well as in others, I believe we might well take an example and a lesson from the people of the United States to-day. But on what is the present desire of the United States for reciprocal relations founded? We know that fiscal changes in that country are impending. They have had an enormously high tariff as compared with ours. Their tariff is almost double what ours has been during the past 25 or 30 years, and during that period the United States have afforded the most wonderful example the world has ever known both of protection and of free trade. They have a great tariff wall around their country and free trade among 90,000,000 of people within their own borders. They are thus a most remarkable example of protection on the one hand and of absolute unrestricted free trade on the other. And they have made marvellous progress in many respects. The United States to-day is the greatest manufacturing country in the world. It is probably the greatest agricultural country. I do not know what the figures are to-dav, but I remember that some eight years ago I examined the statistics of the United States with regard to their manufacturing industries, and I found that the total manufactured product in that country amounted to $13,000,000,000 annually, and that of that amount they exported only 3½ per cent, so that out of that enormous manufactured product of $13,000,000,000 they consumed nearly 97 per cent within their own territory. But there has been and there still is a powerful demand and persistent outcry for substantial reductions in their very high tariff. May we not, therefore find in the impending fiscal changes in that country one reason why its government is disposed to make a treaty of reciprocity with Canada?

The high cost of living in the United States is put forward by the President in his message to Congress. The exhaustion of the natural resources of the United States is also dwelt upon by the President over and over again in his message to Congress, and I shall trespass for a moment on the patience of the House to quote four or five very strong utterances in that regard which may be found in his message. At page 5, Mr. Taft said :

> If we can enlarge our supply of natural resources and especially of food products and the necessities of life without substantial injury to any of our producing and manufacturing classes, we should take steps to do so now.

On page 6 he says:

> Should we not, therefore, before their policy has become too crystallized and fixed for change, meet them in a spirit of real concession, facilitate commerce between the two

countries, and thus greatly increase the natural resources available to our people.

And further at page 7:

By giving our people access to Canadian forests we shall reduce the consumption of our own, which, in the hands of comparatively few owners, now have a value that requires the enlargement of our available timber resources.

And it is perfectly true that the timber resources of the United States at the present time are not only very considerably depleted, but have passed into the control of comparatively a very few men who are holding them not only for their value in the immediate present, but for that enormously increased value which will come in the early future as the price of timbe r rises and increases in the United States. I shall give some figures and statistics in regard to that a little later on. Then at page 8 :

The opening of the timber resources of the Dominion to our needs will be limited to no particular section.

I think then it is abundantly apparent to every hon. gentleman in this House that one of the impelling causes which have constrained the government of the United States to seek these reciprocal relations which they denied to us for so many years is the desire that they may have access to the abundant natural resources of Canada which ought to be kept and developed for the benefit of our own people.

Let us look for one moment at the condition of the United States to-day in respect of the natural resources which providence bestowed on them so freely. An authority in the United States, Mr. Gannett, says that the valuable and accessible coal in the United States will be exhausted in about 100 years. Mr. Van Hise, who has written a very exhaustive book upon the conservation of natural resources in the United States, thinks that estimate is perhaps too conservative and he believes that their coal will last for a longer period. The same gentleman whose work I cite because I believe him to be an author of repute and who seems to have examined the question very thoroughly, speaking of the wasteful use of coal in the United States, says :

In the last decade of the nineteenth century, more coal was mined in the United States than in all the previous decades of that century.

And further:

In the first decade of the 20th century more coal was mined in the United States than in all previous years in the history of that country.

They are already speaking in the United States of prohibiting the exportation of coal. The same authority says that the natural gas of the United States will be exhausted in twenty-five years.

Look at their iron supplies. In the first decade of the 20th century they mined 53 per cent of all the iron ore that has been extracted, they mined more in that decade than had been extracted from iron mines in the United States in all previous years. In thirty years more, according to this authority, the high grade ores of the United States, so far as they are known at present, will be exhausted.

Take their abundant supply of copper. In the first decade of the 20th century 57 per cent of all the ore extracted has been mined. The process of using up their natural resources is proceeding in that country at an enormous rate.

More than half of their timber is gone, they are using it according to this same authority, three times as fast as it is being reproduced.

Many hon. members in this House heard Mr. Gifford Pinchot address the Canadian Club of Ottawa upon the conservation of natural resources about a year or eighteen months ago. He has recently published a book from which I shall give an extract :

The five indispensably essential materials in our civilization are wood, water, coal, iron and agricultural products.

We have timber for less than thirty years at the present rate of cutting. The figures indicate that our demands upon the forest have increased twice as fast as our population.

We have anthracite coal for but fifty years, and bituminous coal for less than two hundred.

Our supplies of iron ore, mineral oil, and natural gas are being rapidly depleted, and many of the great fields are already exhausted. Mineral resources such as these when once gone are gone for ever.

Page 125:

The diversion of great areas of our public lands from the homemaker to the landlords and the speculator; the national neglect of great water-powers, which might well relieve, being perennially renewed, the drain upon our non-renewable coal; the fact that but half the coal has been taken from the mines which have already been abandoned as worked out and by caving-in have made the rest for ever inaccessible; the disuse of the cheaper transportation of our waterways, which involves comparatively slight demand upon our non-renewable supplies of iron ores, and the use of the rail instead—these are other items in the huge bill of particulars of national waste.

We undoubtedly have in Canada very great natural resources. The government of this country, with the hearty support of members on this side of the House, have taken steps along the line of the conservation of those resources. We know how immensely important forests are to

this country, important not only in respect of their value as material, but in their relation to the great waterways system of this country, and to the preservation of our water-powers, important to the people of this country in every sense. Thus when we observe that the President of the United States, over and over again, directs the attention of Congress to the importance of giving to the people of the United States direct access to the forests of Canada, in order that their own may be preserved, surely that suggestion and that argument afford ample room for thought to the people of this country as to whether or not they should accept these proposals.

Why did Canada want reciprocity in 1866 and for many years afterwards and why ought we to hesitate before embarking upon any proposal of that kind to-day? In the first place, we are not helpless to-day as we were in 1866. We have built up a great interprovincial trade, we have found stable and sure markets in Great Britain where the producers of the United States are our competitors. Transportation and cold storage have changed the whole situation from what it was in 1866, from what it was in 1878, from what it was even in 1891. The British markets are nearer to-day than the United States markets were fifty years ago. These proposals, in short, change the whole current of our industries and are likely to dislocate our national development. Further than that the now proposed markets will, according to the proposals of the government, be so entirely unstable and insecure that after having had the benefit of them for five years or even less, we may be obliged at the end of that period to go back just where we were, twenty-five years ago, to build up our industries again, to make a reputation for our bacon, our cheese, our butter in the markets of the old country, and surely no one of us believes that these markets which we may abandon for the moment will be left unoccupied by the people of Argentina, and other countries which have been competing with us in the past in those very markets.

We want to conserve our natural resources as I have said. We do not desire that they should remain undeveloped, but we want to develop them ourselves, not for the benefit of the few, but for the benefit of the whole people of Canada, and to develop them in such a way that not only the national wealth, but the individual wealth of the entire people of Canada will be increased by these resources.

Now in view of the statistics which I have given, are we not moving along the line of material progress and development about as fast as we could expect to go, and about as fast as it is desirable to go? Are we not at the present time following a perfectly sure and safe path? Have we not markets on the stability of which we can depend at all times in the future, as we have been able to depend upon them at all times during the past thirty or forty years? Is there not reason to believe, with increasing facilities of transportation, with the cheaper rates, which I hope will be secured, with better cold storage, is there not every reason to believe that the markets of the British islands will in the future be even more open to the people of Canada, than they have been in the past? Are not these very good reasons why we should be satisfied with the position we now hold. To use a well-known expression, 'What we have we will hold,' in that regard. But the proposals of this government, if they mean anything at all, seem to me to mean a complete, an unnecessary, an unwise departure from that path which we have pursued with so much success.

Then there is another consideration, and that is the delicate character of the agreement which has been entered into by this government. It is not a treaty, says my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. In the letters which constitute the result of the negotiations it is alleged that both parties expect and hope that this arrangement will continue for a considerable time. What is our position in regard to those items of the tariff which we may desire to change? If we desire to put a duty on any article, that is upon the free list under these proposals, are we at liberty to do so? Yes, says the Minister of Finance, you will be at absolute liberty to do so, and the proposals say so in distinct terms. What will be the result of that? He told us the other day that it was everything or nothing. Will not that condition bind us after we have once assented to these proposals, and will not our tariff have to remain fixed? Will it not still be our everything or nothing then? I see no reason why that condition, with which the Minister of Finance says we are confronted to-day, will not continue at all times in the future. If we alter one single item in that tariff the United States will have the right to say : The whole arrangement is off ; in the words of your own Finance Minister, it is everything or nothing. Is that a desirble condition for this country to enter into for the purpose of finding a new market? Is it for this that we are to abandon the stable and sure markets we have at the present time? A treaty stating a definite period during which a certain condition shall continue, is one thing ; it must be interpreted according to the usage of nations. But this arrangement which will leave it entirely open to either side to make any alteration, but which penalizes the slightest alteration by a complete

abrogation of the arrangement, creates a much more delicate and difficult situation, in my humble apprehension.

I do not propose this afternoon to deal at any length with the economic side of the situation. It is perfectly obvious that certain classes in the community may see in these proposals some immediate future advantage which will be of exceedingly doubtful permanence; it is perfectly obvious on the other side that very great disaster and ever ruin will be wrought to some industries in this country if these proposals are carried into effect. No one can doubt that they will produce a far-reaching effect on our trade as a whole. What their exact economic effect may be, I do not think any man in this House is wise enough to predict with accuracy. They do, however, seem to be a reversal of our policy as it has continued for more than forty years. Looking at them from a purely common sense standpoint, if the fruit men and the market gardeners of this country see their industry injured or ruined by the operation of these proposals, are they likely to assent to a policy which will give them absolutely no protection whatever in this country, while they pay duties and endure taxation for the benefit of other industries? It seems idle to imagine that any such result as that can obtain.

Then look at the effects on our trade with Great Britain. I take the past six years by way of illustration, and I find that we imported from the United States during that period $581,000,000 of dutiable goods, and $502,000,000 of free goods, or a total of $1,083,000,000. The rate of duty on dutiable goods was 24·26 per cent, and the rate on total importations was 13·4. We imported from Great Britain during the same period, of dutiable goods, $542,000,000, and of free goods, $113,000,000, or a total of $455,000,000. The rate on dutiable goods from Great Britain was 24·78 per cent, as compared with 24·26 per cent upon goods imported from the United States. The rate on the total imports from Great Britain was 18·64 per cent, as compared with 13·4 per cent upon total imports from the United States. Now we talk about a preference in our markets to the producers of Great Britain. As a matter of fact, taking the duitable goods alone, the British importer into Canada is paying higher duties to the revenues of this country than the United States importer. I remember well that the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, in years gone by, declared when he was in opposition that a condition of that kind amounted virtually to a discrimination against Great Britain. What are the figures respecting exports? Our exports to the United States during the six years to which I have alluded, amounted to $506,000,000, and our exports to Great Britain during the same period amounted to $726,000,000. If you look through the returns of the Department of Trade and Commerce you will find staring you in the face the fact that dutiable goods from Great Britain are paying a higher rate of duty to the revenues of Canada than goods from the United States. What then becomes of the argument for a British preference? Can it be reasonably said that there is any real British preference? Then add to the conditions which have brought about that result, this free list which it is proposed to create between Canada and the United States, and the reduced list which is also provided for in these proposals, and what kind of trade conditions will you have in the future as between Canada and the United States on the one hand, and Canada and Great Britain on the other hand?

During the past six years Great Britain has bought from us nearly $300,000,000 worth more than we have bought from her. We have bought from the United States between $500,000,000 and $600,000,000 worth more than the United States have bought from us. Well, if you alter these proposals along the lines suggested by the government to-day, what condition as between Canada and the United States on the one hand and as between Canada and Great Britain on the other are you to apprehend in the near future?

The Minister of Finance has spoken of the influence of the United States upon the destinies of this country. No one realizes that more fully than I do. A nation of 100,000,000, the greatest manufacturing nation in the world, the greatest agricultural nation in the world, with its boundaries extending along ours for 4,000 miles —why, of course, it must exercise a most profound influence upon the future commercial destiny of this country. I might characterize it even more strongly than I have done. It has been said that they can lower their tariff and change our trade routes. Perhaps they can accomplish something of that kind, but I want to ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether or not it is wise for us to combine with them for that purpose? Are we wise to make concessions to them for that purpose? Wider markets is the cry of the Minister of Finance. If the national issue is to be absolutely disregarded and you are to push the argument of wider markets to its logical, and, I believe, its inevitable conclusion, what will it lead you to? It will lead you to complete free trade and absolute commercial union with the United States. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) smiles at that suggestion. I do not know whether he smiles at the argument or in approval of the suggest-

ed ultimate destiny. But I would like to say to him that if it is good to seek wider markets, from which the rest of the empire is excluded, in the United States of America, why not have still wider and wider markets in the United States of America from which the rest of the empire will be excluded? That path has only one termination, and that is absolute commercial union with the United States of America. There cannot be much doubt, I think, about what that would mean. The President of the United States, in his message, on page 6, used very significant words. Speaking of the people of the Dominion, he said: 'They are at the parting of the ways.' They are at the parting of the ways! I think the people of Canada have indeed, come to the parting of the ways, and that the issue of infinite gravity which is presented to them at the present time is whether they will continue in the work of nation building, in which they have been engaged during the past forty years, whether they will maintain their own markets as they have maintained them during the past forty years, whether they will preserve the autonomy of this country as they have preserved it during the past forty years, or whether they will undo the work which the fathers of confederation began, and which their sons have been carrying out. Whether our provinces will continue to trade with each other and with the mother country as in the past; or whether we will impel British Columbia to trade with the state of Washington, the prairie provinces to trade with the middle west, Ontario to trade with Ohio, New York and Pennsylvania, and Quebec and the maritime provinces to trade with the New England states. If that issue is not presented to the parliament of Canada by these proposals then I certainly have utterly mistaken their purport and meaning. A book came into my hands only a few years ago. It is written by a gentleman who visited Canada about seven years ago—Mr. Geoffrey Drage. I quote the opinion of a German authority and publicist from page 68 of this book. Mr. Drage refers to the opinion of Professor von Schulze-Gaevernitz, contained in a work which he has written on British imperialism and English free trade, and the quotation from this German professor is in these words:

As Professor von Schulze-Gaevernitz has pointed out, a zollverein between the United States and Canada would be both commercially and politically the death of British dominion in North America. Political union must follow commercial union.

Then Mr. Drage goes on to speak of commercial union in these words:

Such a union would also be the political suicide of Canada, who would lose the political identity which she has developed and of which she is so jealously proud.

I could give very many extracts, indeed, from the opinions of men in the United States. Mr. Beveridge, a very notable public man in the west, has given utterance to ideas, which, I am sure, have come to the attention of every hon. member of this House. Perhaps it might be well that I should quote one or two words from his opinion in this connection:

There must be reciprocity with Canada. Our tariff with the rest of the world does not apply to our northern neighbour. That policy already has driven American manufacturers across the Candian borders, built vast plants with American capital on Canadian soil, employing Canadian workmen to supply trade. That capital should be kept at home to employ American workingmen to supply Canadian demand. We should admit Canadian wood pulp and Canadian paper free in return for Canada's admitting our agricultural implements, our engines, pumps and other machinery free. We should freely admit Canadian lumber to American planing mills in return for Canada freely admitting other American manufacturing products to Canadian markets.

And so on. The argument there is, and indeed, the scope of many of the schedules brought down to this parliament is, to hand Canadian natural products over to the United States producers with a minimum of labour employed upon them in Canada. Mr. Henry M. Whitney, of Boston, has written a notable article upon reciprocity with Canada, which was published in the Atlantic Monthly of October last. He says:

If we were to admit Canadian grain free of tariff charges, much of it would stay with us for home consumption; a portion would go through our ports to foreign lands.

Then, a little farther on:

New York and Boston and Portland are the natural outlets for the foreign trade of eastern Canada. St. John and Halifax are twice as far from Montreal as New York, or Boston or Portland. The Canadian Atlantic ports are not to be mentioned in competition with the American Atlantic ports for passenger business.

Further on:

The elevators for storing and handling Canadian grain should be located on this side of the line, and the steamers of the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk Pacific should, in the winter time at least, find their home port in New York, or Boston, or Portland. And if under a reciprocity arrangement or otherwise, the farm products of Canada were admitted free of duty, the Canadian government would be friendly, instead of hostile, to the use of American ports for Canadian business.

Then, in a previous part of the article he says:

What might ultimately be the political effect of the establishment of friendly trade and social relations between the United States and Canada, is a problem that had best be left to work itself out in the years to come. It is quite possible, indeed I think it quite likely, considering the number of questions of domestic and foreign policy which might arise under such a condition, that the two nations would in the end become politically one.

And he adds:

But that would be a long way in the future, if it ever came to pass at all.

Mr. FOSTER. He thought he was too strong.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Now, what about the fiscal policy which we are to pursue in this country? We should have regard to Canadian interests in the framing of the tariff. If our tariff needs any revision to-day, let us sit down and get at it and revise it for ourselves, and let us do it without the assistance of the United States of America, much as we respect that great nation, and much as we desire to be on the most friendly and intimate terms with her. When we desired reciprocity, the United States did not spring into our arms, and there can be no offence surely in the assertion of Canada that she proposes to keep her commercial and fiscal freedom absolutely intact, and to proceed along the path on which she entered so many years ago. Sir, we should have a fiscal policy that aims at the development of our own country, at the employment of our own labour, at the increase of our own population, at the utilization of our resources. We ought to aim at giving the producers in Canada a reasonable opportunity of carrying on their business by equalizing the cost of production where they might suffer from competition under unfair conditions. We have natural resources in Canada which afford a foundation for many splendid industries. We have carried out such a policy as I have referred to for the last thirty years at least, and why should we abandon it now? Upon what should our policy be based? Should it be based upon an attempt to create millionaires in this country or to impose unfair conditions upon any portion of the community? Not by any means. I believe that we in Canada, in the future still more than in the past, should attempt to shape our tariff upon scientific consideration of known facts. I believe it would be well that we should have exact information as to these matters laid before parliament. I believe it would be well if we established a permanent tariff commission in Canada so that our tariff should not be made by rule of thumb. An agitation arises in some part of the country against a duty of 25 per cent, and it is said it should be reduced to 15 per cent. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs get together and conclude that it ought to be reduced to 15 per cent. Then the industries affected declare in strident tones that a reduction of 15 per cent would absolutely wipe them out and throw thousands of men out of employment. Thereupon the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance say: We will compromise, and we will make it 20 per cent. I do not think that is the manner in which our tariff should be framed; I think it should aim at equalization of cost of production so far as that can reasonably be accomplished. We ought to give the people of this country a fair opportunity to create industries and to give employment, but we ought not to give it under conditions which would impose unjust burdens upon a portion of our people. My idea of a tariff is one which would give the industries of this country a fair chance, and more than a fair chance perhaps, to stand up against competition of countries where, it may be, the standard of living among the labouring people is lower than in Canada, and lower than it ought to be any where. That I think is a reasonable proposition. A permanent tariff commission if established would be the most fitting authority to decide as to these points. I understand, of course, that there are complexities. I understand that the problem of transportation must come in; I understand that the problem of great combinations of capital in other countries must be considered; I understand that a great factory which has an annual output of $20,000,000 can sell its products at a much lower price than a factory the annual output of which is only $1,000,000, but I would insist that we should have reasonable and accurate information as to all this. We can guard against our own trusts and combines by appropriate legislation passed by the parliament of Canada, but we have no means, except our tariff, to guard against the trusts and combines of other countries. I would like to tell hon. gentlemen that there are some curious positions which we do not all appreciate, connected with tariff questions. I remember that some years ago I was talking to a big manufacturer and I said to him: There is an outcry from men in your industry for an increase in the tariff, and he said: I am not joining in it, I am opposed to it. I told him I was surprised at that, and he said: You will not be surprised when you learn the reason, and I will tell it to you: A great many factories in this industry have gone out of business during the past few years, there are only a few left now beside myself, I am strong enough to keep on under this tariff although I will not make any money at present, but my com-

petitors in Canada are not as strong as I, and they are bound to go to the wall, and I want them to go to the wall. It is for that reason I am opposing any change in the tariff upon my line of industry at the present time. Remember that after all there is something in competition, under a reasonable tariff, which makes for reduction in the price of products. The hon. gentleman from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), presented a very forceful argument to this House with respect to the duties on agricultural implements, and I say that the government of Canada ought to be in a position now to lay before the House information which would either corroborate or displace the facts presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen). So far as agricultural implements are concerned the proposals submitted by the government are not along the line of the facts which my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) presented. They deal in exactly the same way with some articles upon which he admitted he could not base a very strong argument and with other articles upon which he made a very strong argument indeed. Before the end of the session the government should bring down, with regard to that particular industry, information absolutely accurate and definite with respect to the cost of production, and having that information it would be in order for parliament to deal with the question according to the light which would be shed by that information upon the very important subject which that hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) brought before this House. The statements of my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) have not up to the present date been controverted by any member of the government, and if not controverted I think all must admit that they call for some action by the government and by parliament.

Earlier in the session my hon. friend the Prime Minister has spoken, and I have spoken, of a certain feeling among the people in the western part of Canada that fiscal conditions in this country at the present time are not perfectly fair to them. I feel that after all the question of transportation is the question which, coupled with that of terminal elevators, most intimately affects the west. Some years ago when I was in western Canada a great many farmers spoke to me on matters directly affecting the people of that part of the country. One big farmer who sought an interview with me dwelt most vigorously upon the needs of the west in respect to transportation, and I was very much impressed by his observations. He said:

'There is a good deal of outcry in this part of the country about the duties on agricultural implements and the duties on other articles, but I am not very much disposed to join in that outcry. We deep-thinking men are more concerned with the question of cheap transportation of our products than we are with the question of paying $25 or $30 a year on our agricultural implements.' And, so I believe that the question of transportation is the most vital question with the people of the west. The government should deal promptly and effectively with that question, and with the grievances which have arisen in the west in that connection, and they would find the people of the west disposed to treat the fiscal question in a broad-minded and generous spirit; after all, the day will come when the people of western Canada will see tall smoke stacks, and great and important manufacturing industries in all our western cities.

The west is very much concerned at the present time about the building of the Hudson Bay railway. There is not absolute unanimity of opinion in this country as to the relief that will be brought to the people of the west by the construction of that road. I hope it may bring to them all the relief they expect, but beyond question, in justice to the west it ought to be pushed to completion without any delay. Further than that, I think the government ought to have regard to the wishes of the west as to the operation of that road. It should not be placed under the absolute and sole control of any one transportation line, but it ought to be operated by means of a commission so as to give to every one of the great railways of the west equal rights over it, and to give to the people of this country complete control of rates. If the government are prepared to deal with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway along these lines, they will find the members on this side of the House prepared to give their proposals a warm support.

Then, there was the question of terminal elevators which the right hon. gentleman found confronting him when he went west last year. I have spoken of that already during this session. I believe the government ought to take steps to operate these terminal elevators, and I see no reason why that could not be done by a commission. It may be said that is a great undertaking ; but is it a greater or more important undertaking than the establishment of the Railway Commission of Canada, with all the enormous powers devolving upon that body? Suppose we had a commission to take charge of these elevators, to lease them, and to operate them, so that there would be absolutely no question of the grading of the wheat that went through them, and no injustice done to western producers of grain, I venture to say that the people of eastern Canada

would support the government in a proposal of that kind. I advocated in this House in 1903 the equipment of every one of our great ports in Canada as a national port. I believe that was a wise policy, and I believe it would be one step along that line for the government to take charge of these terminal elevators and operate them under such conditions as would satisfy the farmers of the west.

Then, Sir, as to cold storage and refrigeration and the establishment of abattoirs in the west, we on this side of the House have already stated our position. Considering that we have this great gap of 800 miles of uninhabited country between the east and west of Canada, I think it is worth while for the east to make every reasonable concession to the west in order that there may be no apparent divergence of interest between the east and the west, but that east and west, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, may join together in the upbuilding of our great federation.

I trust that the Prime Minister will not proceed hastily with these reciprocity proposals. The country has had very little time to consider them. As far as I am concerned, my opinion with respect to them has, I trust, been made fairly clear to this House this afternoon. I think the Prime Minister would do well to withdraw them from the consideration of the House at the present time, and to await some further developments. We have begun a great work in this country. Two great races whose mother tongues are spoken in this parliament came into the inheritance of this great country under the providence of God. Our fathers endured many hardships and made wonderful sacrifices in planting their homes in this then western wilderness. In times of peril both races have poured out their blood without stint in defence of their common country. In the work of upbuilding a strong nation and a great civilization under the British flag, on the northern half of this continent, they have laboured side by side with mutual sympathy and with high purpose. The heaviest burdens have been lifted, the greatest obstacles have been overcome, the most difficult part of the task has been accomplished. I trust that the Canadian people will not lightly relinquish the task to which their energies and the energies of their fathers have been consecrated for so many years. I trust that the standard will not be thrown aside and the retreat sounded when the battle is more than half won. The self-denials, the sacrifices, the patriotism, demanded of us today in order that this nation may maintain and carry out the ideals and the purposes for which it was called into existence are as nothing to those which were required of our fathers who founded this confederation. Loyalty to their memory and to the ideals which they consecrated demands that we should continue with firm heart and unabated hope upon the path on which we entered nearly fifty years ago.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). In rising to address you, Mr. Speaker, in reply to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I must say that I fail to quite understand the position he has taken on this question. That may be due wholly to my fault or partly, perhaps, to his. True, he said he did not wish to discuss the economical aspects of the question, and therefore postponed any remarks he might have to make on the several items in the agreement before us. My hon. friend contented himself with a review of the past history of this country and its progress. He did not intend, he said, to go back and discuss the old Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, because that would be ancient history; but he did go back to 1866 and spent a large portion of his time in depicting the progress which Canada has made from that day to this. That progress was, of course, very gratifying to every member of this House; but my hon. friend failed to observe—perhaps it was by mistake—that the most notable progress which this country has made, has been made during the last 15 years during which the Liberal party has administered its affairs. Any one who will look at the records of our trade cannot fail to be struck by that fact very forcibly. And no doubt the greatest factor in this progress, has been the carrying out by this government of a platform laid down by the Liberal convention in 1893.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. I repeat that the change of element in that progress, has been the policy of this government, in carrying out that convention and making trade freer with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. The Liberal party, in convention, assembled in this city in 1893, promised that should the people elect it to office, it would carry out the platform then laid down. Shortly after assuming office, steps were taken in the direction of making trade freer between Canada and Great Britain. The British preference was granted which gave a strong impetus to the trade of this country. At one bound our trade exceeded what it had ever reach-

ed before, under previous administrations. Our exports to Britain were, of course, admitted free into the English market, but we made trade between the two countries freer still, by reducing the duties on British goods, thus inducing a greater flow of British goods into this country and augmenting very materially the total trade between the two. We also made an honest effort to promote freer trade with our friends to the south. My hon. colleague and leader, the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and another member of the cabinet early took action to see if anything could be done in that direction. In this they were not successful. The minds of our friends to the south were not then inclined to freer commercial intercourse, and from that day until a very short time ago, although we were ready at any time to listen to any proposal that might be for the benefit of both countries, we were unable to accomplish anything. However, to-day our friends to the south, are viewing things in a somewhat different light and are showing a disposition to have freer trade relations with us, and did make overtures to us to that effect. We met their approaches in the spirit in which they were made, with the result that my colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and myself have been able to effect an arrangement which we consider mutually advantageous, with reference to a large list of articles, under which these articles may enter each country absolutely free of duties, and with reference to another list of articles, on which the duties between the two countries have been made uniform. That arrangement was made, subject of course, to endorsation by this parliament. My colleague, the Minister of Finance, is now affording this House an opportunity of pronouncing upon this arrangement, and that is the question we are at present discussing.

The agreement arrived at is a mutual one, subject entirely to the approval of parliament, both as to its acceptance to-day and as to its continuance. The fiscal independence of Canada remains to-day with this parliament and will continue to remain with it, under this arrangement precisely as it has done during past years. The same condition obtains with our friends in the United States. Their fiscal independence remains unaltered as well, but an understanding has been arrived at, which will take effect upon concurrent legislation being adopted by the people's representatives in both countries. Steps are now being taken in the Congress of the United States to ratify that agreement, and that agreement is now before the Canadian parliament for its ratification.

We were told this afternoon that this thing should not be rushed. Well, there is no disposition on the part of the government at all to rush the matter. This parliament will have all the time to consider it that it deems necessary. But it is necessary that we should consider it. It is in the interests of that country that we should do so, and I propose now to give my views of the benefit that will accrue to Canada from this arrangement, and likewise to the United States. But in doing so, I propose to refer to the objections, in the first place, which have appeared throughout the press of the country that is hostile to this understanding. One of these objections made in the press, but which has not been made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, is that this House should not go into the matter at all until the people have been given an opportunity of pronouncing upon it. But how could you ever initiate any arrangement in such a manner as that?

The arrangement was made in the only way in which it was possible to make it, and made on the responsibility of the ministry. They are responsible to parliament who are free to reject this arrangement if they choose to do so. The arrangement was made with the full knowledge on the part of the government, as there should be on the part of every member of this House, that the people themselves will have an opportunity of pronouncing upon it, and that at a not very distant date; and I venture to say that when an election is held this will be a live question with the people of Canada, that they will pronounce their judgment upon it—and I expect that that judgment will be favourable. If it is not, and if the feeling should prevail that they want our friends on the opposition side who may be opposed to this to take the reins of government, these hon. gentlemen will have perfect freedom to submit a measure to this House to repeal this arrangement. I do not look for any such result as that.

We are said to be engaged in an entangling alliance. Nothing of the kind, there is no entanglement about it at all. It has been said that it will tend to do away with the British preference. There is nothing in these resolutions that points in that direction. The British preference remains; as my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) told the people of this country, whatever changes might be effected or negotiations entered into there is one cardinal principle that will be maintained, the British preference, and it is maintained. The argument is made that by what we have done we will weaken the tie that binds us to the empire as one of its members. What force, I will not say what sense, is there in that statement? The British preference remains, goods will go to Great Britain as they have

gone before, goods will come from Great Britain as they have come before, and they will come with a preference over the goods that come from the United States in so far as there are duties upon these goods coming into this country under the general tariff. Therefore, I dismiss it at once, without offence I would say the statement is not worthy of intelligent men.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Under the present arrangement, typesetting machines come in from the United States free. How does the minister propose to give Great Britain a preference in that respect?

Mr. PATERSON. There are a great many things that come in free, agricultural products, for instance, all come in free. I do not know that we can do any more in the way of a preference for our British friends than to give them a bounty if they want to send us some of these things, but certainly if they come in free from the United States they will come in free from Great Britain too, and that is about as low as we can go for any country. Not only does it seem to me to be a remark not freighted heavily with common sense, but rather freighted with an imputation that is an insult in its nature, that is that because we have entered into an arrangement of this kind with our American friends, the tie of loyalty between this people and the British people will be in any way weakened. The loyalty of the Canadian people lies not in that direction, at least it does not on this side of the House.

Another objection that has been argued, and it was argued at length by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), this afternoon, is that this change of mind on the part of our American brethren is due in a large measure to their desire to reach and secure some of the natural resources of Canada. I do not know that I am concerned to deny that if anybody wishes to affirm it, but what did he specify as the natural resources of Canada? In one of the passages which he read, food products was said to be one of the most vital. If the people of the United States want to get some of our food products, that is not an unnatural thing on their part, nor do I think it is a very great disaster to the people of this country. If we have wheat and other grains more than we consume ourselves we will have to sell them to some one else, and the man who produces them, I think, will not be very careful or anxious as to the nationality of the man who buys them, he will be more concerned about the man who will give him the highest price. But they say: You should conserve your natural resources, and keep them for the people of this country. All right, do not let us ship away any more of these breadstuffs, do not let us sell ourselves out so we will be in danger of want. But I can see no force in the argument that we should keep the whole of the crops of this Canada of ours stored up because, perchance, by and by, we will have great, great grandchildren enough to consume them all. They say the Americans want our natural resources that are buried in the hills, our ores. Well they do, I believe, in a measure, but we want to sell these ores. Do the men of Frontenac and Hastings want the iron ore that for centuries has lain in their hills undeveloped, giving no profit to the people of this country, to remain there because perhaps sometime in the future our great, great grandchildren may establish a smelting furnace? If they do there will be enough of those ores left there to establish all the furnaces they want. Meanwhile are you to keep them locked up there? The men of Frontenac will not tell you so. The Kingston Board of Trade asked my colleague and myself, instead of placing impediments in the way of the export of these ores, to endeavour to have the Americans take the duty off them, and we tried our best to get them to do it. They met us partially, but they could not, in their own interests as they saw it, place these ores absolutely on the free list. But iron ore is reduced from 15 cents as it was, to 10 cents. From conversation I have had with parties interested. I believe that as a result there will be a fine industry created in the county of Frontenac, giving employment to hundreds of men, and yet hon. members opposite say: Lock it up, lock it up, do not have these men employed.

Representations were made to us by the proprietors of talc mines in the county of Hastings. They said there was a duty of 25 per cent upon that article. They said to us: There is a duty of 35 per cent on that article, we have immense stores of it, there is no market for it here, there will be no market for it here for years and years to come. By a ruling they made it more than 25 per cent, they made it equal to from 50 to 60 per cent, and they have shut us out of their market. And that would suit my hon. friends opposite, the Americans shutting themselves out from getting this article. But it did not answer our purpose, at least we thought not, and what is the result? We prevailed upon the United States, not only to reduce it to the old rate of 20 or 25 per cent to which it had been raised by a ruling of a treasury board, but we got them to put it on the free list.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the article?

Mr. PATERSON. Talc.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that something used in place of soft soap?

Mr. PATERSON. No, it is not used for that, I think that in its finer preparation

it is not used in particularly large quantities. It goes finally, I think, into the adornment of the person. Well, then, they say: You do not preserve our forests, you are going to allow them to be depleted. I have great sympathy with the preservation of our forests, I think reforestration and efforts in that direction are highly important. I am much pleased to know that a lively interest is being taken in that subject, and that steps will be taken towards reproducing the timber as it may be used. But let me point out to the leader of the opposition that these forests are not the possession of the Dominion government, they are the possession of the local legislature.

Mr. LENNOX. Not all of them.

Mr. PATERSON. Mainly that, and it is within the power as it is within the rights of the local legislatures—a right and a power that we have no desire to interfere with in the slightest degree— to make such regulations as they see fit with reference to cutting this timber, to withdrawing the limits, to raising the scale of duties, to do anything they like with their own property. But when that timber has been manufactured into a commercial article, it being then in the power of this government to get an added price to the article that is being produced, and that is seeking a market, we thought if we could get for the lumberman a dollar a thousand more in price than they were getting by the reduced American duty, we would secure something valuable for our lumbermen, and add to the wealth of this country; and that we did. Fish—they wanted our fish, and we wanted to sell our fish, they are not all gone. But we did want to sell our fish at a better price if we could, and we secured that better price by having fish put upon the free list by that nation that has always hitherto objected to it. Our friends opposite talk a good deal about our natural resources, about the necessity of conserving them. But what you cannot consume, what you cannot hope to make use of for years and years, to say that we shall not bring these latent resources into a position to contribute to the welfare of this country, seems to me an argument without foundation. Well, it has engaged the attention of both countries. We are favoured with the possession of large quantities of pulp wood. That pulp wood is controlled largely, not wholly, by the provincial governments; and as I said before, we do not want to interfere in the slightest degree with the rights and powers of the provinces, they are sovereign in that matter. But we did make this stipulation, that when conditions are such that the United States will feel willing to admit our pulp and our paper free—and we believe when that is accomplished our mills on this side of the line would be able to compete with the mills on the other side of the line if they had an open market—we said to them: When you have made pulp and paper free from all parts of Canada, not from particular portions of it, then we will admit your pulp and paper free into our country, but not before. That is the position we took on the pulp question.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I would like the hon. gentleman to explain to the House that one clause about pulp. Is pulp going to be admitted into the United States generally, or is it going to be admitted only from such provinces as do not put an export or stumpage duty upon it? That question is now engaging the attention of the people of the United States, and they do not seem to understand it. The hon. gentleman has not explained the question to the House at all. He says it is free or it is not free.

Mr. PATERSON. I explained it as it is in the resolutions. The hon. gentleman can read them for himself.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). There seems to be a difference of opinion in the United States, even in Congress, over the meaning of that clause. It is construed by some to mean that pulp and paper are to be admitted free forthwith; by others it is understood they will only be admitted from such provinces as do not put an export duty upon those articles in some form. Will the hon. gentleman explain that clause clearly to the House, and tell us what it means?

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I will leave the United States to settle their own matters.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I do not think that is right.

Mr. PATERSON. As far as we are concerned, that is the position we are in.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Evidently the hon. gentleman does not understand his own clause.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes, the hon. gentleman understands it himself, but it may be impossible for me to make the hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie, Simcoe) understand it.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I confess I do not.

Mr. FIELDING. The leader of the opposition was not once interrupted.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, well, that does not bother me at all. I was saying that the point which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) laboured most, and where you could judge, perhaps, better from his utterances than from any other that he was opposed to this agreement, for I frankly confess that I was not quite sure, when he got through, whether he would vote for this

proposition, or whether he would not, but the argument that he seemed to lay most stress upon was that we had spent millions and millions of money in developing our transportation system, and that it was largely in a line from west to east. He wanted to know why we should disturb this and expressed a fear that has been expressed in stronger terms than he did it in the newspapers opposed to this agreement, that our transcontinental roads would be interfered with, that the money that we had spent would have been, in a measure, wasted, that we were going to divert the traffic and have our grain carried through the United States, and that, therefore, it would be a very serious matter for us. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the United States roads south of Canada carry a large quantity of Canada's wheat to Great Britain and Europe now, with a duty on?

Mr. FOSTER. Carried in bond.

Mr. PATERSON. Carried in bond, without any cost as far as the bond is concerned. The hon. gentleman knows that. Well, if that be the case when the duty is on, as it is on now, and if that has been going on for years and years, what harm has resulted from it in Canada? I read some remarks in a paper—I forget the gentleman's name, but I think he was the local member for Fort William, or Port Arthur, or something like that, and here is the wail that came from him. It was sad. He said: If you make wheat free it will go through American channels. Well, I had the curiosity to look up the figures in reference to that matter. He said: Our elevators that we have at Fort William and Port Arthur can be thrown into the bay if there is to be free wheat, because it will all go south. He seemed to be in blissful ignorance of the fact that out of that very Fort William elevator 12,292,771 bushels of grain went this year through the United States to England and Europe, and that out of the elevator at Port Arthur there went 7,186,142 bushels. This was wheat carried by our transcontinental railways, placed in the elevators there, carried from thence through American channels to Great Britain and Europe. That has been going on for years, and yet you talk nonsense about diverting the traffic and ruining the railways when wheat can go as freely through American channels with 20 cents a bushel against it in the United States for home consumption, as it will go under this arrangement. These are samples of the arguments that we hear from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). If he has the figures—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. An hon. member has the right to ask a question and to interrupt with the permission of the hon. gentleman who has the floor, and until there is some intimation from the hon. gentleman who has the floor that he objects to the interruption I must allow the question to be asked.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, take it this time.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Will the hon. gentleman state what amount of western Canadian grain during the past year has passed through the Duluth and Superior elevators? He has the figures and he ought to know.

Mr. PATERSON. No, I have not got them. But I have my own figures here, which show that there was a total export of wheat through the United States of 25,950,728 bushels. Twenty-five million bushels have gone in that direction, 19,000,000 or 20,000,000 of it right through Fort William and Port Arthur, and yet, because wheat is free—and it goes just as free to-day in bond—these elevators are to be taken down and thrown into the bay, if you would listen to the jeremiad of the local member, who spoke in that way. What will prevent wheat moving over our transcontinental roads in the future? If Mr. Hill, as they claim, should try to hold up and frighten the people, if he is going to project roads into the northwest here and there and extend those which he has there, do hon. gentlemen propose to prohibit him from bringing in those roads? Is that their policy? If he brings his roads in there or creates new roads, if he carries western grain down over his roads and over to England, shipping it by American channels, he will have to do it as cheaply, if not cheaper, than our own roads, and if he does it cheaper, who gets the benefit but the men who grow the wheat? Sir, I say nothing against our great transportation roads, but I do hope that they will not take up a position antagonistic to this arrangement, which is vital in the interest of the country out of any selfish motive. We have aided these roads to the extent of millions and tens of millions. They have reached a sound financial position, and if they cannot get the grain at the present prices their self-interest will make them lower their rates rather than give up the carrying of the grain. It was said—I am sorry to say—by a member of the British Columbia government that Mr. Hill was so anxious for this free wheat that he financed the deputation of farmers which came here. I am not disposed at all to deny that Mr. Hill may have ideas in his mind of reaching the

northwest by his present lines, or by more lines that he may propose. Mr. Hill is in the transportation business. The very papers that state that he finds himself cut off from his trade by other railways in the United States, and that he is casting longing eyes at our northwest in order to get our wheat. It would not be an unnatural thing for a railway man, a transportation man, to look for a source of supply, and Mr. Hill has no doubt come to the conclusion that I have come to, that you have come to, that every man has come to in this House, that there is going to be an enormous production of grain in our northwest, and if he does meditate coming in there to get a share of the carrying trade, and if he comes in there and gives rates to the people as good, if not better, than those that any other transportation road gives them, he will get that grain whether it goes through in bond or whether it be free, as it will be if this agreement passes.

Look at the report of the Department of the Interior and see the homestead entries for just one year, and then you may figure out what would be the effect upon transportation as regard railroads now in existence or which may hereafter be built. In the year 1910 there were 41,568 homestead entries made in the northwest, and of these, 13,566 were taken up by settlers from the United States representing 47 states and territories. From the older provinces of Canada there went 11,470 homesteaders and from the United Kingdom 7,331. These 41,568 homesteaders taken in one year comprise 6,650,880 acres, in addition to the 1,184,790 acres of land sold by the railway companies, the Hudson's Bay Company and other land owners. Just fancy that addition in one year to the land development of the west. The total area under crop, including wheat in 1909 was 11,960,000 acres and in wheat alone 6,778,000 acres and the total yield of wheat that year was 147,000,000 bushels and the average yield to the acre over 21 bushels. Have you figured out what this means ; have you considered what facilities will be required to transport that enormous quantity of grain from the wheat fields in the west. Put it at only 100,000,000 bushels and to transport it would require 17 trains daily for 300 days, each train having 20 cars with 1,000 bushels of wheat in each car. And, Sir, it is counted upon as a certainty by those who know that within the next five years that production of wheat will be doubled and there will be all the wheat that James J. Hill, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern, and the Grand Trunk Pacific will be able to haul. Mr. Hill, may look forward better than some of you gentlemen opposite ; Mr. Hill may be more farseeing than most of you. To-night we have had the keynote of the Conservative attitude on this question, and it is : Don't rush, go slow, we are well enough now, let things alone.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. Hear, hear said my hon. friend but my motto is : When you are doing well let things alone unless you can do better. And we can do better. And, men like J. J. Hill can see in the future what hon. gentlemen opposite are blind to, namely, that there will be as great a change in this country and perhaps as great advancement in the next five years as there has been in the past ten. And so we will go on advancing and advancing, and yet, we have the leader of the opposition rising to frighten the people of this country from a trade agreement that will redound to the wealth and prosperity of our people, because perchance, as he says, it may interfere with the business of our freight transportation lines. Well, Sir, cheaper rates there may be for the man who grows the grain, and he will not be found grumbling very much at that, but more grain there will be for the railways to haul. I think I can say without egotism that I know a little about trade, and in my judgment the agreement now before you for ratification, if carried into effect, will give a stimulus to the prosperity of this country equal to if not greater than that which followed our inauguration of the British preference, against the protest of hon. gentlemen opposite. I should have liked had we unanimity on this question : I should have liked to see hon. members rise above partisan feeling and consider with unbiassed minds what it means to get an open market for our agriculturists, our fishermen, our lumbermen, and our mining interests. Perhaps it may not give us a greater market for our manufactured goods, but will not our manufacturers be in as good a position as they are now, plus the fact that the population of the wheat fields being increased and prosperity being abroad in the land, they will have to produce more manufactured goods to supply the demand within our own border. I regret, Sir, that there is opposition to this proposal ; I regret it for the sake of hon. gentlemen opposite. I should have liked to see them rise to the occasion but if they fail to do so I can tell them this : That in spite of their opposition, in spite of their cynicism and jeerings at measures which have been propounded by this government, they have had to admit that these measures were fruitful for the advancement of the happiness and prosperity of our country. Their whole argument is : Canada is more prosperous now than any country under the sun, and why meddle with things as they are, and, Sir, in arguing that way they are forced to confess that our measures for the promotion of immigration, the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, the

British preference, and all these policies which the Liberal party carries into effect in spite of the opposition of gentlemen opposite, have made Canada to-day a prosperous and progressive country. Well, I am sorry to say they appear unwilling to join us in this last patriotic movement for the benefit of the people of the country. All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is this, that the Liberal party, having taken these other steps that produced this prosperity, are strong enough and willing enough, if it is left to them alone to have the glory of it, to see that this, like the other measures, is carried to a successful issue.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Chairman, I hope that my hon. friend, who has dispensed so much wisdom in the short time that he has spoken, and has done it with such extreme clearness and distinctness of voice, will pardon me if I do not follow the points one by one, which he has been endeavouring to make. I am not to-night concerned at all in an endeavour to get the best of a man in argument. I am looking rather to getting at the rights of a question, which I think is important enough to engage the attention of Canada, and will be thought by the people of this country important enough to call for calm, sound and deep thinking and reasoning rather than declamation. In the course of my remarks I shall probably touch the points which my hon. friend has made to-night; but what impresses me at the present time, is the situation in which we find ourselves—a position which, in the first place, is unique. Neither in Canada, nor do I think in any other country, has such important fiscal legislation been undertaken in quite the manner in which this has been undertaken by the present government. In the next place, the situation is one of extreme gravity. I may be wrong, but I have given a great deal of thought to trade matters in the course of my political life, and my conviction is that we have never had in Canada any question quite so important as this present one—any issue upon which hung more far-reaching consequences. The only one that, in my mind, approached it, was the struggle in 1891, when commercial union with the United States and discrimination against Great Britain was the slogan of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the cry around which centred one of the greatest political battles ever fought in Canada. I think it is a situation which involves in a large degree the fiscal freedom and political independence of Canada. In the fourth place, I think it is a question which is fraught with consequences greater than any of us can now see, but a sense of which comes to me and I believe to every thoughtful man in this country—fraught with grave consequences to the future of that empire, of which, up to the present time, Canada has been a shining and a noble part. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance appealed to history, going into a rather long disquisition upon the record of reciprocity negotiations. Whether he did that by way of apology or as a defence for the proposal which he has made to us, I do not know. If it was the first, it was as good as any other old thing; if it was intended for the second, it is a defence, which I think, is inadequate, and which will not stand examination. History is very valuable, Mr. Chairman. It is valuable for what it teaches us to imitate; it is equally valuable for what it teaches us to avoid; and, if my reading of the history of reciprocity negotiations with the United States of America is correct, it is one which may well teach us what to avoid in the present and for the future. But, Sir, there is history and history, and you, Mr. Chairman, were no doubt quick to perceive that my hon. friend traced the history of reciprocity negotiations up to the year 1891, and then and there dropped it. Then occurred a long hiatus of twenty years in which he could appeal to no history with relation to negotiations for reciprocity with the United States of America. What did that mean, Sir? It meant that the old volume was then completed, sealed, and laid away, and that at that time a new volume was begun and a new record and a new history was initiated in this country. Am I right or wrong in that? In 1891 the Liberal-Conservative party made its last endeavour for reciprocity with the United States of America, and after the negotiations were ended and we returned home to Canada, the Liberal-Conservative party declared itself as done with reciprocity from the United States, of America, and that henceforth its duty was to develop Canada on the lines of its own self-dependence, and to look to the British market as the great, steady, stable market for our products. The old heresy had not yet been quite purged from the Liberal party, which pursued the quest until 1897. They went to Washington; they tried their efforts; they failed. They came back, and they made declaration in this House of Commons and elsewhere, that as far as they, as a party, were concerned, they were done with reciprocity negotiations with the United States of America. Let us invoke the record. In 1898, the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, according to 'Hansard,' spoke as follows in this House of Commons, respecting the negotiations and their failure to result in anything:

Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with myself, would have given many things to obtain the American market, but, thank Heaven, these days are passed and over.

That is strong language; and it expresses what I suppose it was meant to say. But after ten years more during which neither Liberal nor Conservative party raised the issue of reciprocity with the United States, my right hon. friend stood in the Imperial Conference in London, and before the assembled delegates of the empire made this statement:

> There was a time when we were wanting reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside and negatived. We have said good bye to that trade and we now put all our hopes upon the British trade.

Could anything be more explicit as a repudiation, before the assembled delegates of the empire, of any desire for reciprocity, and a declaration that Canada had given up the quest and had put all her hopes in the British market? Later yet, in 1899, in this House of Commons, the same right hon. gentleman said:

> Canada has opened her doors to Great Britain in the hope that she would ultimately receive similar preferential treatment from the mother country.

This is my warrant for saying that from 1891 the Liberal-Conservative party and from 1897 the Liberal party—that is both parties in this country—had closed the door on reciprocal negotiations with the United States and had opened up a newer, broader and more promising highway for our commerce. But there is corroborative evidence. In a general election, if there be any live issue, it comes out on the hustings. After 1897 had passed and the right hon. gentleman had made his repudiations, we went through the elections of 1900, 1904 and 1908, and I challenge him to show that in any one of those three electoral contests, anywhere in this Dominion, he or any of his party advocated reciprocity with the United States as a policy. On the contrary, the ideas which he enunciated in the extracts I have read, were promulgated from platform to platform, and it is not too much to say that we came to the conclusion, and rightfully, that Canada, as a whole, endorsed the action of the two parties and took no stock in reciprocity. I need not elaborate that point any further.

It was significant that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance closed his history at 1891, since which time Canada has made great progress, signal progress, despite the burdensome load it has had to carry in the shape of a rather poor administration. We heard this afternoon what was done, what was begun, and what is contemplated by this government. Again I want to ask my right hon. friend, after this exposition of the situation, why this sudden change, and this renewed quest for reciprocity? Is not that a pertinent question? Why the change? You had buried reciprocity. You declared that you had buried it. The country attended its obsequies and did not mourn nor weep; and after it had been buried for 11 years, by yourselves and for a longer time by the Liberal-Conservative party, what has brought it to life again? Will some one answer that question. Where was the mandate of this government to take that question up, to go to these conferences, to make this agreement and to bring it to this parliament and demand that this parliament shall pass it as being the best policy for this country? That you did not get a mandate from the people is plain enough. You had a mandate from the people to let it alone, if ever a mandate was given, after the repudiations of hon. gentlemen opposite and the acquiescence in those repudiations by the people of this country at large. There were no compelling condition to force you on this question. Production was good. Never in the history of Canada has its production, in all its varied interests, been larger or richer. No blight had fallen on the productive powers of Canada, in any respect, owing to conditions which the government might remove. There was no lack of market for everything that Canada produced. There was quick sale, easy sale, no glut in the markets, no molding in our bins and cellars, no rotting in our fields. Everything that Canada produced, and she produced richly, found a market and a ready market. There was no lack of transport, everything ready for market had means of transport. The prices too were good, they were never better in Canada. I have just gone through a very important and useful volume which has been issued by the government itself, giving the round of prices for a series of years in this country, and the government themselves being the authority prices in the Dominion of Canada were never so high as they have been during this last five or six years. Where then were the compelling conditions in this country which cried for relief and for which relief could be got only by going to Washington and negotiating for a reciprocity treaty? There were some few causes of dissatisfaction; we may reduce them to three. There was the demand of the grain growers in the west for free agricultural implements, or a reduced duty upon them. There was the fitful cry of the ardent and conscientious free trader, who with all the power that was in him, cried for free trade, but supported the protectionist government of my right hon. friend, which rose here and there throughout the length and breadth of the country, and there was, in the third place, the wide spread dissatisfaction with the condition of things imposed upon us by the

United States of America in accepting a $104,000,000 free list from us and giving us but a $33,000,000 one in return, in buying from us but $100,000,000 worth, while selling to us $223,000,000 worth; of meeting a Canadian tariff of 26 per cent by a United States tariff of 41½ per cent. There was a feeling in the country that that was not a neighbourly thing for them to do, not fair business treatment, not what we would expect from a great and rich and powerful neighbour. These were the three things that were mooted as grievances in the country.

I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, as a man of common sense, if the grain growers and farmers in Canada believed that agricultural implements were rated too high and that the government should either reduce the rate or make them free, I ask you, Sir, as a man of common sense what was the scientific, the common sense, the business thing to do? It was for them to lay their plaint before their own government and if they made good their case to get the grievance removed by tariff legislation in this House of parliament. That was the straightforward, the common sense, the business method of procedure. If their case was good, the government should have granted them relief; if their case was not good, the government, with equal strength and justice should have said to them: You are treated as well as others and we think you have no cause for complaint. The second one could have been met, was in process of being met, had this government simply remained at home and minded what the people had told them to do and avoided what the people had not given them any mandate for doing. In the United States of America what was the condition of things? A high tariff from time immemorial, growing higher through the Dingley Bill, the McKinley Bill and at last coming to a height of 42 per cent on an average on dutiable goods; against that a revolt broke out, a campaign was waged, and the slogan of the campaign in the Republican party was a downward revision of the tariff of the United States. The Republican party promised it; they were elected, they came into power, they brought down their measure and the Payne-Aldrich Bill ended not in any revision downward that was worth mentioning, but, in some things in a revision upwards. What happened? The people of the United States have a pretty sterling sense of what is due from them to men who make pledges and then break them and they rose in insurrection. When the Payne-Aldrich Bill was going through Congress some Republicans raised the banner of insurrection in the Congress and in the Senate. They fought the Bill there, they were defeated there, they carried the fight out into the constituencies and in the late elections they gained the support of the people and the punishment which ought always to come upon men who make pledges and then cynically break them came to the Republican party. They were defeated in the country and their day is just about over in the Congress of the United States and will soon be over in the Senate of the United States. What was the position? That insurgent force that swept the Republicans out of power was pledged to a diminution of the tariff especially on food stuffs. The Republican party in that position, the Democratic party were pledged to a revision downward of the tariff especially on food stuffs. It was known by all men that the new Congress soon to go into power would deal with that matter and it was known that it would deal with it in the line of taking off and diminishing duties especially upon natural resources and food stuffs. That was the moment when this government should have avoided any meddling in tariff negotiations with the United States of America, but that was the psychological moment, as my hon. friend said, when he took it into his head to butt in and pay the Republican party for what was due and acknowledged to be due to the people of the United States, and what that party would have to give at the coming session of Congress. That is the way that matter would have been settled and settled with better effect than by the present arrangement and without our having to foot the bills in any way.

That being the case what happened? Just at that psychological moment—I think that is a good word—two men started out of Ottawa, two very estimable men, but not in any way extraordinary. Apart from their being ministers of a government, members of a cabinet, just lay aside their titles, and their positions, and their power of dispensing patronage, and turn them out in the streets of Montreal or Toronto, and you would not find all the captains of industry, and the men of finance, and the great business men of the country, rushing out and falling down before them, sitting at their feet, and worshipping them ; not at all. They are estimable men. But does the Minister of Customs mean to tell us to-night in sober earnest that he knows more about the business of this country than the trained business men who have been in it, in one branch or another, from boyhood up, and are to-day the great captains of industry and men famous in their several spheres? Not at all. Neither would my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, though a very good newspaper man in his time, and though a very good man in business in a limited way—I do not know that he has had any specially large experience, himself sav here in the House to-night that he knows more about these things than the

trained men of business who direct affairs in this Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, what happened? These two estimable men, without any mandate from the people, without any call from any interest in this country—that is literally true—without any consultation with any interest from British Columbia to Cape Breton, these two men journeyed to Washington, consulting with nobody, except thirteen not more extraordinary men, with whom it is just possible they consulted, though I do not know—men of such eminence in business affairs as the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), men so versed in financial and high matters of banking and commerce as the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden), men so famous in business circles as the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy), men of such fine financial mind and business acumen as the right hon. gentleman himself who leads the government and the party (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Now, giving all credit to those men for all that they know—and they know a lot, a lot that they ought never to have known—but giving them credit for all they know, it was true that in the whole Dominion of Canada no one was consulted but these fifteen men, if even they were all consulted. What did the right hon. gentleman say himself? He passed through the west this year, he was asked for tariff reductions and tariff adjustments. What did he promise to the deputations? That he would take it into consideration, but there would be no adjustment of the tariff until a tariff comission had examined into the matter, and had heard from the various interests. Did my right hon. friend make that promise in the west? If he did not, will he deny it now? The right hon. gentleman did make that promise, he will not deny it now. Has he carried out his promise?

There is another thing the right hon. gentleman said: To one cardinal principle we adhere, that is that the British preference would not be interfered with. Did the right hon. gentleman make that promise? Did he mean it when he made it? Has he implemented that promise any more than the other? A solemn promise made by a leader of a government to men who came to him with a tariff grievance that he would not make any adjustment of the tariff until —common sense idea—a tariff commission had been issued, and had found out the facts of the case, and got information upon which to make an adjustment. And yet he has made the most important tariff revision that ever was made in this country. In the face of a promise that whatever was done the British preference would not be impaired, he comes back with an instrument which, in almost every line of it, impairs, diminishes or completely obliterates the preference which Great Britain has to-day in the markets of Canada.

These two men sit down with three or four other men in a secret chamber in Washington. The receiver is taken off the hook, the telegraph line is cut, and for two weeks those gentlemen are closeted in camera with gentlemen of the United States, and no interest in this Dominion can get a word to them or a word from them. There are rumours, there are grave stories of what is being done, there are fears everywhere, and dislocation and disturbance in every part of this country. The receiver is still off the hook, the line does not run into the room. No interest in Canada can get the ear of that conclave of four or five men who are dealing with the affairs of this nation. How do they deal with them? On the line of justice and fair play? No, Sir. It is a strong word, but I am going to use it, they dealt with these interests as gamblers deal. Now that I have used it, I will show you that I am not far out of the way. If an interest comes to a government which is independent, which rules in Canada, responsible only to parliament, and that interest says : We want more protection; or want less protection upon such and such a line of goods, there is only one way in which the grievance may be removed and justice may be done, that is, to look into each case, try it on its merits, giving to the one or taking from the other because of the intrinsic merits of that interest which has to be taken from or added to. Is there any man in this House, Grit or Tory, who can deny that this is the proper way to do it? Is that the way that these gentlemen in camera in Washington acted? Not at all, Sir. The United States player shoved up his pawn, free fish ; the Canadian player advanced his, free fruit. Before the Canadian player shoved up the pawn of free fruit, did he call before him the representatives of that great and growing industry in this country, and by a single word ask them what would be the effect of this change upon their great industry? He had to go one better, or one equal to the American player, but he did not do it on any ground of reason or of justice or examination. The American player put up free dairy products to the United States. The Canadian player shoved up his free dairy products to the Dominion of Canada. Did he say free dairy products because he had consulted the interests—the wide interests—of the dairymen of this country, and had advised that those interests would not be hurt, and might be advantaged by it? Not at all ; he was asked to play up in the game, he played and so it went from one interest to another until every pawn was moved and the game ended. All that time the interests that you were playing with were in dense ignorance of what you were doing, and you were in

dense ignorance of how their interests would be affected by your play. That is absolutely the wrong way to deal with the interests of this or any other country in the matter of tariff legislation. Did I use too strong a word? I do not think so. I was not vicious in using the word ; I just meant it, that is all.

And now, Sir, after having played the game they take the receiver off the hook, they connect the telephone with the chamber, and they let this parliament know that they have signed a pact. What kind of a pact? Did you, in Winnipeg, know what it was? Did you in Wentworth, did you in Brantford, did you in Kent, did any of you members of parliament who represent mightly big interests many of you, large interests all of you, know one single thing of what had been done behind your back and behind the back of this country? No, Sir, you did not. Now, Sir, the crime —for it is not much less than that—might have been mitigated if one course had been taken. Having no mandate, having consulted nobody, taking it up off your own bat—the crime would have been mitigated or I could not have called it such if you had brought that pact back to Canada and stood up in parliament and said: This is what we have done; true, we had no mandate; true, we held no consultations, but this is what we have done, and, having done what we thought best for Canada, we present that pact to the electorate of this Dominion and invite them to consider it and to pass their opinion upon it. If they had done that they would have followed the constitutional practice, they would have honoured responsible government, they would have been true to the democracy about which they talk so much, they would have approved themselves as business men and as statesmen, who have confidence in the people and do things above board. But that pact is signed, is brought back to parliament when we are half through this session and parliament is told that it must be passed without the dotting of an 'i' or the crossing of a 't.' Take the whole of it or take none of it! The Minister of Finance has the colossal boldness to stand up in this parliament and fling before it that pact gotten up by two men without mandate, consultation, or authority from anybody, or any great interest, and then cooly says that parliament is absolutely free to take it or not, as parliament pleases. No wonder some of my friends opposite smile. The Minister of Finance knows that he was stating what theoretically may be true, but is practically absolutely false. This parliament is free! I invite my right hon. friend now to carry out the words, implemented the statement of the Minister of Finance and to-morrow take the free voice of your party in this parliament, let every man vote as he chooses and pleases, and so prove say that this parliament is free. Will he do it? Will he do it? Not for his life will he do it. This parliament is free, but the government has pledged itself as a government to use its utmost efforts to pass that measure through parliament. If the government does not pass it through the government dies. If the government dies the party dies, and, therefore, the party is bound to support the government if it fears and flies from death and dissolution. Death is repulsive in every form, none the less so in its political forms, and the amount of freedom we have in this parliament and in this country is measured by the fact that the government has pledged its existence to the passage of this measure, and that if it fails not the government alone, but the party in the House and in the country in all its ramifications goes out of power and another party comes in. When I was listening to the Finance Minister going so glibly over his story, and as the extent and gravity of the measure forced itself to my mind I wondered whether the Finance Minister himself knew in any adequate degree or measured the full import of the agreement. Giving him all credit for farseeing capability just as freely as I can give it to him, I have no hesitation in saying that he did not then know, he does not know now and I have not yet found a man in Canada who does know just where all this may end.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman had better sit down then.

Mr. FOSTER. I had better sit down?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If you do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. If the people ever perish it will be because of their lack of knowledge, and I have not the least doubt that if the situation in its entirety can be put before the people of this country my right hon. friend will find that he is in the great minority. My right hon. friend, in that contingency would have to sit down and with emphasis. Now, what does this measure do? In the first place it alters the fiscal conditions of interchange, not for a few unimportant articles, but a long list of most important products. It alters the fiscal conditions of interchange for all our dairy products, all our animals, all our grains, a large proportion of our lumber, all our natural food products, all our fish products except sardines, all our fresh vegetable products, our mineral products, our wood pulp and paper, by transferring them in one block from the dutiable to the free list. Do we know just what that means and can we sense just exactly how far that reaches? But it goes further than that: Our meat products, our grain pro-

ducts, our prepared vegetables and food products, a large slice of manufactures, are transferred to a lower reciprocal list, and another fairly large number of important products are transferred to a non-reciprocal but specified list in which the duties are lower. In gross, it takes $95,000,000 of products and at a stroke of the pen transfers them from dutiable to free or from a higher dutiable to a lower dutiable list. Every man knows that if you change the fiscal conditions of interchange of $95,000,000 worth of products in this country you affect in some degree every other of our products or nearly so. As I have shown $47,800,000 of our imports, and $47,300,000 of our exports are affected. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to labour these different points beyond what is necessary to get them under advisement and thought. Every man in this House must realize the importance of a measure which at one stroke of the pen lifts $95,000,000 of interchangeable products out from old established conditions and makes a different fiscal system for interchanging them. Such a measure must be of a far reaching and wide importance. How far it goes requires business men of the best calibre to figure out adequately. But, this arrangement does something even more important: It shifts the base and conditions of production. It is true that production is of greater importance than interchange or trade, because trade is founded upon production and without products you cannot have trade. You must have at least two different productions in order to have a trade; one man raises one thing, another man raises another thing and there you have the basis of interchange and that interchange you measure by your trade figures of the value of each. Therefore, though trade is important, the conditions and the base of production is more important still to be considered. And, this agreement if it goes into operation, shifts the base of production and not to the advantage of Canada in my opinion. For example, British Columbia is particularly adapted to the raising of fruits, and British Columbians have invested their capital and risked their future in the business and they have done well and aim to do better. They have accomplished their success so far through being fairly protected from the southern fruit growers who compete in their market. There you have the production of fruit that employs labour and capital and is of great importance to that province. East of the Rockies they produce grain and cattle; British Columbia has to get grain and the prairies have to get fruit, and there you have the basis of interchange between these two parts of our Dominion, and the products are both raised in Canada. Now, what does this measure do? It changes the base of production; it says to the prairie buyers: Men in the United States will raise fruits and will supply them to you and you need not deal any more with British Columbia: it says to the prairie provinces: You may still raise grain and cattle, but you will send them down to the United States. You have the same grain and cattle raised, you have the same fruit raised, but one of your products has been shifted from its base in Canada and transferred to the United States. That, Sir, is the defect of this instrument which is before us to-night. These gentlemen opposite say: We are in favour of reciprocity? Are you? What would be the best reciprocity?—Reciprocity between the different sections in Canada itself that raise different productions and have different capabilities. Why, if you favour reciprocity should you kill, or deteriorate, or diminish the reciprocity between British Columbia and the prairies? That is but a sample, but there are other instances. Take fish which is a great natural industry and a great business industry as well. Within the last 20 years a fish trade of large dimensions has been built up between the lower provinces and the rest of Canada running as far as the Rockies.

There is a production in Canada. The eastern Canadians want cattle, want grain, or want flour, which is raised in the western provinces. There are the elements of a reciprocity which builds up this country—both productions made in Canada and an interchange between the different sections of Canada. Now, what are you going to do? You are going to say to the fish industry in the eastern provinces: Go, seek your markets somewhere else. The fishermen of the lakes and the fishermen of the Atlantic shore, because they have shorter routes and cheaper routes, maybe, to the heart of the great west, will get and give the fish that are required in the west. It will no longer be reciprocity between two sections of our own country. It will be reciprocity between the United States in one production and the west in another production. Now, Sir, that runs through the whole of this reciprocity arrangement. You talk about your foreign trade, and you bellow about it as though it were the greatest thing in Canada. I was going to say that it was almost the least thing in Canada. What is the greatest thing in Canada? The interprovincial trade, which is founded upon the many productions in the east, and the wheat, grain and cattle productions in the west—the two complementing each other. What has made Canada so strong, and so great in her progress is this, that you have filled her veins with the rich blood of interprovincial trade, stimulating productions in various parts, and then interchanging these productions one part with the other part.

This instrument has for its object, can have no other, the shifting of the base of production, and giving as far as possible at least one-half to the United States of America, and taking it from Canada, with this proviso, which is important, that the kind of production you leave to Canada is the production so dearly loved by the Minister of Customs. To Canada, he says, dig out your ore; the United States will manufacture it up through a thousand processes until you get it at great value, and then send it back to us to buy. Frontenac, dig your talc, and employ a few hundreds of men; send over the product of your pick-men and your shovellers to the United States, and let them do the perfecting processes upon it, and get the employment, get the accrued wealth, and get the national development. That is what it means. The part you call for Canada to keep is that which employs the least labour; what you give to the United States as the result of that employment of the least labour in raw material—is what employs the greatest labour and runs up into the great figures of value which labour adds to the raw material in perfecting the product. The real reciprocity for Canada is the reciprocity between these different provinces. I put it to you, Sir, that if it were now 1867 and the provinces were asked to federate, with the alternative of free reciprocal trade with the United States of America, would we have any federation of these provinces? It would have been absolutely impossible, and if this measure is to have the effect that its promoters and sponsors in the United States hope for it, it will turn us backward, and lead us towards the pre-confederation days when our maritime provinces traded with New England, and our large central provinces with the states on the border—there was no prairie then—and when British Columbia traded with the border states on the Pacific. My count against this measure, stronger and deeper than any, is that it threatens the best and highest production in this country, that it threatens thereby the stream of interprovincial trade which is absolutely the life and essence of this country as a whole. It also vitally affects and changes the direction of the channels of trade and the great transport routes. Now, that does not need to be argued at all. Everybody admits that. The only thing that is said with reference to it is this: Granted that what we have gone to such expense for, what we have been for forty years building up, what we have now in the great trunk lines of communication east and west—granted that they will be affected—and if your reciprocity amounts to anything, they will be largely affected—there will be enough grown to keep them going and to keep the southern lines going too. Is that the sum and substance of our national aspirations to-day? Twenty years ago you could have said of one straggling line of railway in there, it can carry more than is produced, but in a little while production will overtake it, and surpass it, and the southern lines will have what they want, and that line will have all it can do. That was not the ambition of Canada. The ambition of Canada was to keep her transportation routes even and adequate for the increased production of the country. If this year it is thirty million bushels to be carried out, let the Canadian routes carry them out; if next year it is forty million bushels let the Canadian routes multiply themselves, and carry them; if afterwards it is a hundred million bushels, there is freight enough for all the railroads that can be built, and under stable conditions there is capital enough to build all that are needed. It is my ambition that, however, much the expansion and development of the productions of the western country may be, our seaport towns, our steamship lines, our canal routes, and our railway transportation systems shall keep pace with it, and do the work—why not? Did you ever take your pencil and sit down and calculate just what is meant by a great line of railway running from Vancouver to Sydney? It is not simply two rails, some engines and some cars. From the time it thinks of starting it gives employment to labour and subsidiary operations before it can get a locomotive or a car or anything of that kind; and from the time it starts to build its running road and its working gear, through every branch and hour of its operations, Canadians and Canadian work and Canadian machinery and Canadian employment are called upon, until it becomes a great invigorating stream of development and wealth-production from one end of the country to the other.

If you have one, there is so much, if you have two, that is double. If you have dozens, or scores, as you will have, in course of time, then it will be our ambition to have them Canadian and manned by Canadians. I think that is a far higher ideal than we can achieve by inviting Mr. Hill to enter that country on the ground that there will be plenty for both.

This agreement restricts freedom of legislation. I have a quarrel with the government because, without giving ear to the market gardeners or fruit men or any other interests, they have made a pact and rushed it through, and while they are rushing it through, these men come and complain that it cannot fail to do them damage. But the Minister of Customs, with loud voice, says to these people: You do not know anything about it; it will be the best gift God has ever given you. These people have to submit, because this government

has contracted to push the thing through, they must get it through, and they are pledged to the United States administration to keep it there, after it is through. Two years pass and the market gardeners and other men come again to the government and say: our industry is absolutely gone; we can not subsist another year; you told us it would be all right, but it has not turned out all right; on the contrary, we shall be ruined unless you come to our relief. What does the government say to that ? All they can say is: We cannot help it. Why ? Because if we do, that will break up the whole compact, and that we cannot do. What then is this parliament asked to do ? It is asked to absolutely give away its independent power of redressing grievances. They come to the administrators of their own country, these men who pay taxes and build up homes in this country, and add to its accumulated wealth, they come to the government and they say: Here are our grievances, remedy them. But in reply the Prime Minister folds his arms and says: There is a different forum now; before this trade arrangement passed we could have given you a remedy, Canada could control her own, but to-day the forum in which you must plead is not Canada, with its eight millions, but the United States with its ninety-three millions, there is the judge to whom you must appeal and if that predominant partner does not agree to what you ask, we can do nothing. I say that is rank injustice. The men on the other side pay no taxes to this country, they build up no part of this country, they pay no Canadian labour, and yet, for the sake of the southern fruit labourers, you do this and your own people are ruined, and when they ask you for redress, you have to confess that you have bartered away your authority and can provide no remedy.

But, Sir, that this arrangement will virtually affect our transport system east and west, does not require any argument. We know that it will, and the only thing said in explanation is: Oh, well, we know it will, but we trust there will be enough for all, and if our people do not get their share, it will be their own fault. But do we also take this into consideration ? When I listened this afternoon to the presentation made of Canada's growth during the last 40 years, and of the mighty interests that have been built up, the question came to my mind: Why have we built those works ? Why have we spent that money ? Why have we made this great march of development ? For what purpose have we done all these things ? Was it in order that we might afterwards turn them over as joint assets in a partnership with a great, rich and dominant people ? No, we did those things to make Canada great and not to make the United States great. We did them to develop the resources of Canada, to work up our own raw material with our own capital and our own labour. Suppose that the iron ore does lie in the ground, some of it unused, for 20 or for 50 years, will the generations to come, find fault with us for having conserved that much of our raw materials, for their benefit ? Is Canada limited in its horizon to 30, 100 or 500 years ? All that we have the right to do to-day, is to take what is fair and reasonable for the user of the present generation and preserve the rest, as trustees, for the generations to come. Some time or other, and not very distant, this rank spirit of commercialism which would take the last salmon from our streams, the last stick from our forests, the last pound of ore from our mines, the last available ounce of fertility from our soil and turn it all into money for the present user—the time is not far distant when that commercialism will have to give way to a more healthy sentiment, in favour of the preservation of not only the nationality of to-day, but the nationality of the future.

I was surprised at the heretical doctrines of the Minister of Customs. In this hour when the conservation of our natural resources is engaging the best thoughts of the best men in the best countries of the world, what place can there be for such a doctrine as this, that because there is plenty of iron ore in our country now, exceeding what our small 7,000,000 of population can use, we must get rid of it as soon as possible, and lose sight altogether of the 50,000,000 or 100,000,000 of people who will be living in this country in the future, whose interests we are in conscience bound to protect, and who will be grateful to us for having preserved for them these essential natural resources.

I have one other point to make and it is this—that this measure vitally affects the labour interests of this country. I have made my argument in reality on that, all I have to do is to state the proposition. If the effect of this measure is to shift producing centres from this country to the United States, to give us half and the United States half, it means that half of the labour possibilities for the future are taken from this country, and shifted to the other side or kept upon the other side. If it is true, as I have stated, and I believe it is, that we are keeping the more raw processes for our country and leaving the more finished processes for the other country, and that the raw processes employ the least labour and at the smallest wage and the finishing processes the greatest amount of labour at the highest wage, we are cutting again into the great future of the labour men of this country. I do not need to carry that out a single step further.

I do not feel like finishing my speech to-night, and with the consent of the House, I would move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this go on to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, my hon. friend would have a slim audience to-morrow. We will resume the debate on Tuesday.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Supply. The Minister of Labour will take up his estimates to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 10, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY RATES.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, if I might be allowed, I would like to refer to a question asked me the other day by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), in reference to a complaint of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) in reference to an error made in the Intercolonial railway office at Moncton concerning cheap rates for a Conservative picnic that was held in Nova Scotia. The hon. leader of the opposition asked me to ascertain what happened to the junior clerk who had made the mistake—was he promoted for making it or was he reprimanded? As a matter of fact, the young man was fined and placed in a less responsible position, for the time at least, for the error he had made.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. C. L. OWEN (East Northumberland). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I notice in the Montreal 'Gazette,' in the account of the proceedings of this House yesterday, that I am put down as having voted with the government on the amendment. That is a mistake. I voted for the amendment, but I did not notice that my pair was absent. When that fact was brought to my notice I asked to have my name erased. At the same time, I said that had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment, because I was of the same opinion as the mover of the amendment, that we should have a little more time to talk this matter over with our constituents before being asked to vote upon it.

SUPPLY—INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to direct the attention of the government to an incomplete return laid on the table the other day. The return ordered by the House was as follows:

> How many appointments have been made by the government from the constituency of South Grey since 1904, what are the names, to what positions appointed, and the salary or remuneration in each case?

The government have brought down a return showing something like 26 appointments. It is fair to say that the most of them are very minor appointments, chiefly from the Post Office Department to country post offices worth a few dollars a year. The larger departments have not responded at all. There is no reply from the Public Works Department, none from the Interior Department, none from the Department of Railways and Canals, and none from the Marine and Fisheries Department, the four important spending departments of the government. I cannot understand how this could have been overlooked. One department says it keeps no record of that; another says something of the same kind. It seems to me that it would not be a very difficult task on the part of any department, by consultation with the sitting member for the county, to learn how many appointments had been made from the constituency from all departments of the government since 1904. That is a very reasonable request. I am not going to criticise particularly my hon. friend who represents the county, as he is not in his seat; but I am informed on very good authority that he makes it a pretty common plank of his platform for re-election that he has been so successful in representing the county having been able to get so many appointments for his county made in the different departments of the government. As these offices are in the gift of the government, and the salaries come out of the public treasury, the government should be able to say who have been appointed, and where they come from. I did not include the hon. Minister of Finance with the departments that have not been heard from. It may be that my hon. friend from South Grey has been influential with the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING. He would be.

Mr. BLAIN. I would think so. My hon. friend is always ready to respond without much persuasion, particularly to requests coming from that side of the House. I would ask the government to obey their own order and to lay on the table of the House a list of these appointments from every department. I suppose my hon. friends will answer that this is an impossible proposition. Everybody in this House knows that it is not. If any department has not a record of the constituency from which each person appointed comes, surely that could be ascertained by consultation with the sitting member who in the main would recommend the persons for the different positions. Then they could lay a complete return on the table of the House, from which the public could understand whether or not my hon. friend was using the proper election method in stating that his constituency was honoured because he was so influential with the government being able to get so many of his electors on the Civil Service pay-roll of the country.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I should think that the Secretary of State would be able to collect from all the different departments the necessary matter for a complete return such as is asked for by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). Another matter which I wish to bring up is this. The other day, when the Prime Minister was absent, I appealed to the government, instead of taking the estimates of the Public Works Department day after day, to vary them with those of some of the other departments. Probably two-thirds of the session have now gone by, and the only department whose estimates we have yet considered in Supply is the Department of Public Works. There are a great many items for that department, and if we discussed each item fully it would probably take the whole session to deal with that department alone. There are important matters to be considered in the Marine and Fisheries Department, and in the Department of Agriculture which is one of the most important of the government as the Prime Minister will admit, judging by the deputation which was here to-day. In the past we have had different departments under consideration from time to time, but this rule is now violated, and I think when we appeal in person to the Prime Minister he will give our appeal attention.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand there have been no appointments made in the Department of Public Works from the constituency of South Grey since 1904?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend send me over the return?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The motion to adjourn was for the purpose of obtaining what information is actually on record in the department, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has received that I do not know that he can complain.

Mr. BLAIN. I assume that no man is appointed to office by this government unless the government have a record of that appointment?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The record of the appointment might not necessarily give the locality the appointee came from.

Mr. BLAIN. These appointments are not usually made at the request of the appointee, but at the request of the sitting member and the government can easily inquire from the sitting member where the man came from. The ministers or their officials can find out from the member for South Grey what persons from his constituency have been appointed since 1904.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think it is the duty of the officers of my department to go round to the different members and find out where in former years was the place of residence of certain officials. There is no record kept, as I understand, of the place whence an appointee originally came, and I take it for granted that the return gives all the information in the department.

Mr. BLAIN. If the minister states there have been no appointments to his department from the constituency of South Grey since 1904, I will accept his statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There may be dozens of officials in my department who originally came from South Grey, but we do not keep a record of where they came from.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not think this a fair answer. The order of the House asks that the government shall lay on the table all the appointments that have been made from the important constituency of South Grey, and the minister answers saying there is nothing in the department to show whence the appointees came. Surely that answer will not be accepted by the House. If the information is not given we must assume that it is not given because they wish to keep this secret. If the Minister of Railways, or the Minister of Marine, or the Minister of Finance will stand up and say there has been no appointment made since 1904, I will accept the statement at once. I regret that my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) is not in his place, but I am informed on very good authority, that when the hon. gentleman goes back to South Grey from the House, each and every time he congratulates himself and his people upon the fact that he has been

so powerful with this government that he has had so many men appointed to the different departments. That is using an unfair weapon in party politics by a supporter of the government. I am not suggesting that there is anything wrong, but it is quite easy for the government to clear the matter up.

Mr. LENNOX. I believe there is a duty upon the government to inform the House as to the matters which my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has moved for. All that the Minister of Public Works or any other minister has to do, is to go to the member for South Grey and get a list—and I understand it would be a long list—of the gentlemen who were appointed at his instance. I venture to say that the public will think it necessary that the government should know from what district an appointee comes, so that they may be able to ascertain something of the character of the person they are appointing. It is altogether too much a habit of the ministers of the Crown to keep back information which the people of the country have a right to get. Does the leader of the government forget that it was brought to the attention of the House the other day that the hon. member for South Grey is trading upon the influence he has with the government, that he is indeavouring to influence his constituency by the statement that he is able to control the government in the matter of appointments to the public service. In view of that, it comes with very bad grace from the Minister of Public Works and from the government to refuse to make a simple inquiry, which would result in a full disclosure of the names of these parties, so that we may know whether or not the hon. member for South Grey is justified in the boasts he is said to be making.

Mr. BLAIN. May I be permitted to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) whether there have been any appointments made in the Finance Department since 1904 from the constituency of South Grey?

Mr. FIELDING. If I had the information I would be very happy to give it, but I do not think there is a record kept in the department of the places from which the appointees come, but even of that I would not be quite positive. It may be possible that some of the parties appointed did come from South Grey, but I could not say from memory.

Mr. CROTHERS. It is a rather large draft on our credulity to ask us to believe that there is no record kept in any of the departments of the localities from which the appointees come. One would naturally suppose that whenever a person is appointed to an important position in any department, there would be, in the order of council appointing him, some addition to his name. I do not suppose that a motion is made and carried that John Brown, for instance, be appointed to a certain position in any department, without giving his residence and profession, as for instance John Brown of the city of St. Thomas or Toronto, merchant.

Mr. MILLER. I have just come into the House, and do not know exactly what has been said, but I understand that there has been a discussion as to the appointments made from the constituency of South Grey, and that the statement has been made that I have boasted of the number of these appointments. To this I give the most emphatic denial. I challenge any one to name any place or occasion in which I made such boast. No such boast has been made by me for three reasons. First, because I am not in the habit of boasting about such things at all ; second, because I have had no occasion to make any such boast, as the number of appointments from my constituency has been very small ; and third, I have no need to make any such boast to carry South Grey, and I expect to be able to carry it again without resorting to any such method. If my hon. friends opposite desire any information from me, as to appointments made from my constituency, I shall be glad to give them all the details.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask another question? Might I ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) if there have been any appointments made from the constituency of South Grey since, 1904 in his department?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is evident that my hon. friend is not really very keen to get the information because my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) has just offered to give it to him and he did not accept that offer. Why, if it is the information he is after, there is the source from which he can get it, and from which he intimated a few minutes ago the government might get it. My hon. friend has as much right to ask the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) as he has to ask a member of the government.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that when an order of the House has been passed unanimously, that order would be complied with by the hon. member for South Grey giving the information?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend himself suggested that the information could be got from the hon. member for South Grey and got very easily, and the hon. member for South Grey is ready to give it, but my hon. friend refuses to take that information when it is offered to him. As far as the Railway Department is concerned, I

have no recollection of any one having been appointed in my time from South Grey or of the hon. member for South Grey having importuned me for any appointment. But if I wanted to get a good official, there is no man in this House whose advice I would take more quickly than that of my hon. friend from South Grey.

Mr. BARKER. I think we are getting entirely away from the question. This House has ordered that certain information shall be given, and I would like to know why we have not got that information. It is no answer to say that we can get it from the hon. member for South Grey, or that the appointments were very few or that the minister has not the names or the residences. The minister can get these. When the government allow an order of this House to pass, they ought to have some regard for the decency of procedure, and see that it is complied with.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Railways has directed my attention from the government to the hon. member for South Grey.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman made that suggestion himself.

Mr. BLAIN. He said that if I wanted the information, I could get it from the hon. member for South Grey.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend himself said it could be got from that hon. gentleman, and that hon. gentleman offered to give it.

Mr. BLAIN. Does this document contain the full number of appointments from the constituency of South Grey since 1904?

Mr. MILLER. I do not think it does. I do not think any appointment was made in the Railway Department on my recommendation or that any appointment has been made in the Department of Agriculture. I think that there are two in the Department of the Interior, not mentioned in this list.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the hon. gentleman give the names and salaries?

Mr. MILLER. I can give the names but not the salaries. One is Frank Wenger and the other is Daniel MacDougall. These are the only ones principally that do not appear in the return. The hon. member for Peel made the statement that I have been boasting of these appointments. I ask him to produce the evidence. It has been suggested that I should ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw, but I shall not do that. He may make, so far as I am concerned, any statement he chooses.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not make the statement myself. I said it was currently reported in the hon. gentleman's constituency—and I repeated that a number of times—and at another time I shall be very glad to give the information my hon. friend asks for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did my hon. friend not hear the member immediately in front of him follow up his remarks by the statement that the hon. member for South Grey had been boasting?

Mr. LENNOX. No, nor did the hon. Minister of Public Works hear me make any such statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We all heard it.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister prides himself upon his memory. I would as soon trust his memory as his statements on many occasions, but I would not want to be forced to trust either very much. I did not make the statement that the hon. member for South Grey boasted, but I said that it had been stated in this House that he had been in the habit of boasting of the appointments he had made. I referred simply to what had been said on a former occasion, and it does seem rather peculiar that it took so long for the hon. member for South Grey to summon up his courage to contradict that statement. Personally, I know nothing about it. I accept the statement of the hon. member for South Grey with regard to the matter. It took some time for him to tell us. But he does revise his statements occasionally, as I have some reason to recollect. I think he revised the statement he made to the returning officer of his election expenses if I remember rightly——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) is speaking on a point of personal explanation, I understand.

Mr. LENNOX. I will not follow that up, Mr. Speaker, but I was only going to say, as the matter has become personal to some extent, that I am glad that the hon. member for South Grey has, after mature consideration, after thinking over it for some time, been able to come to the House and say that he has not boasted, and to tell us that he is not in the habit of boasting. I wish to pay my compliments more particularly to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). If, as a young member of this House—young in years as well as in my time in this House—I might presume to give that hon. gentleman advice it would be this: To be a little more particular about contradicting hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and to be a little more sure of his facts before he makes statements concerning hon. members on this side. It is not many weeks since I had occasion to call attention to a very significant—

Mr. SPEAKER. I would not like the debate to open up on that line. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) is speaking of a matter concerning which he was misunderstood. Having already spoken, he is limited to that. Of course, if he proceeds on the line he is now taking the minister (Mr. Pugsley) will have to be allowed to answer.

Mr. LENNOX. I would very much like to hear him.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) has been misunderstood or misquoted he has the right to explain.

Mr. LENNOX. I was only going to say in reference to it—of course, I bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker—that this is not the first time that the hon. gentleman has given us occasion to call attention to the fact that his memory is short and likely to be at fault.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will not ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) to do more than look at 'Hansard' to-morrow, and he will see what he stated, and I am sure he will then be satisfied that the remark I made is absolutely correct.

Mr. LENNOX. Well, it will be the first time.

Mr. MILLER. I would like, also, to make an explanation. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) I regard as a personal friend, with whom I have no quarrel, and do not expect to have any quarrel. The hon. gentleman says it has taken me a long time to get up my courage to deny the statement made in this House some time ago. I do not want the hon. gentleman, or any other hon. member on that side, to think that it is lack of courage that makes me ignore a good deal of what they have to say; it is rather lack of interest. It was also said a few days ago that I was, day after day, asking favours of certain ministers. I might have denied that and might have briefly stated that I have never, since I came to this House, made a request of any minister of the Crown for any personal favour to myself. The hon. gentleman has made reference to a supposed revision of my statement of election expenses. That is a matter I have never thought it worth while to meet before, but I can say without hesitation that I have never revised my statement of election expenses, and never made a statement of election expenses that was not absolutely correct. And I would remind the hon. gentleman that it would be better if he did revise his statements, particularly as to the amount the 'Globe' gets from this government year by year—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) cannot cover these points—

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. MILLER. I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I have reminded the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) of his duty in this matter.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. HUGHES.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, now that this episode has been cleared up, and we find that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) has not been getting so many appointments in his riding, I shall take up a matter, which, possibly, may be of very little concern to the House, but of considerable concern to myself and to others immediately affected. As I have pointed out before, for many long years I have been specially interested in the closer union of Great Britain and her colonies, and it has been my endeavour not only to encourage the closer union of Great Britain and her colonies, but also to place obstacles in the way of any movement that might tend in the direction of disintegrating the empire. Therefore, I looked with a great deal of suspicion on the movement made a year ago, initiated by Rev. Mr. Macdonald, then editor, now part editor, of the 'Globe,' in his peregrinations to Washington to bring about reciprocal arrangements in regard to the maximum tariff of the United States of America and some changes that we made in our tariff to prevent the imposition of that maximum tariff against the Dominion of Canada. So far as I am concerned, I would have welcomed the imposition of the maximum tariff on the part of the United States of America against Canada, and I condemned then, as I condemn to-day, the action of this government in bringing about the reciprocal changes which were then made. That was followed up by the agitation which has brought about the proposition, which I am not at liberty, under the rules of the House, to discuss to-day, in regard to the reciprocal trade relations which are now proposed between the two countries.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But later.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Yes, with the help of goodness, I purpose having my say, or, at all events, my vote, later on. And I hope, knowing the open mind of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to be able to give him, on that occasion, good and sufficient reasons why he should change his mind and seek some means of having the proposition thrown overboard. However, Sir, while I was making my researches in connection with this movement of a year ago, I ascertained beyond peradventure, from the city of Boston, that Rev. Mr. Macdonald, then editor, now part editor, of the 'Globe,' was in receipt of moneys from the American Peace Society from a

fund headed by Mr. Ginn, of the well-known firm of Ginn, Heath & Co., of Boston, to advocate the claims of this peace society. I was asked to make that statement in the House. I declined to do so, because, as I said a week or so ago, I knew that some petty friend of Rev. Mr. Macdonald, some gentleman of small calibre occupying a pulpit, or having access to the public platform in some part of the country, would charge me with taking advantage of the privilege of parliament and refusing, or failing, to stand out openly before the public and make these statements. I went to St. Catharines and made the statement frankly and squarely on the public platform, that the Rev. Mr. Macdonald had, a year ago, undertaken to conduct these reciprocal negotiations between Canada and the United States regarding the maximum tariff and some changes to be made here. I pointed out that this had been carried out, and was being followed up by the present reciprocal negotiations. I pointed out, also, that it was a strange position of affairs, in a country like Canada, to have a man carrying on this agitation, receiving money from an American concern, and at the same time receiving part of his pay from the Toronto 'Globe.'

These statements have never been contradicted by the 'Globe' or by Mr. Macdonald. Never, they cannot contradict them truthfully, they are the facts. Then I went on to say that it struck me that this Peace Society movement, in practice at all events, was merely a movement to bring about closer union between Canada and the United States. That was the ground I took then. Sir, I have no reason to change my position, it is the ground I take to-day. We had an illustration of it here. We were told that this gentleman was in association with President Starr-Jordan—with a hyphen between the Starr and the Jordan—president of Leland Stanford University of California, and Mr. John R. Mott and others for the propagation of peace. We had an opportunity of hearing President Starr-Jordan in the city of Ottawa and he was also heard in Montreal and Toronto. He spoke under the auspices of the Peace Society, the subject being this Peace Propaganda, and the keynote of Professor Starr-Jordan's sermon or lecture was an insidious argument in favour of the union of Canada and the United States. He came out openly in favour of removing the customs officers between Canada and the United States, after approaching it most beautifully. If that is not preaching reciprocity, if that is not moving towards annexation then I would like to know what it is. Does any man mean to tell me that if the custom officers were removed, along the borders between Canada and the United States and kept on the outer borders of those countries against the rest of the world, that would not be annexation pure and simple? On the following Sunday Professor Starr-Jordan went into the pulpit of one of the churches of this city, and as I pointed out in my former address on this subject, as reported in the 'Free Press' of this city, he enunciated the identical views, that we wanted the removal of customs officers between the two countries. Was I or was I not justified in taking the stand I did upon this question? And when I was slandered by the 'Globe'—let me say I appreciate the slander from that source, I value it very highly—when I was slandered by the 'Globe' in this matter I replied to them in the House of Commons. On the following Sunday evening a parson in the city of Ottawa in his pulpit delivered an oration. This parson is an intimate friend of this Rev. Macdonald of the 'Globe'—with a capital 'R'—and this gentleman made use of words which I shall read to the House. Members of his congregation on that evening thought, and said that the words applied to me. I was told by a gentleman in the city of Ottawa that night that I had got slated by one of these great divines in the city of Ottawa, and he told me of this sermon. When I opened the 'Citizen' the next morning, I saw a report of the sermon in which he spoke of the rights of members of parliament. I read it. As I came up the street every other man I met drew my attention to the fact that I had been slated by this parson. Well, Sir, it is a free country. So far as I am concerned I have not the slightest objection to every parson in the country being free to use his pulpit for the propagation of any idea, politics or any other subject—I never hear them preaching the Gospel very much, some of them—that they choose to discuss. I believe in the utmost freedom in that regard, but I also believe in this aspect of the case also : Let those for whom they are lecturing pay the piper, and in the county I have the honour to represent I have taught the gentry of the Liberal faith that if they choose to use the pulpit and sermons in disseminating Grit principles, if we cannot convert them by prayer we will do it by fasting, or, as the poet Whittier says beautifully: 'By dint of fasting if we fail by prayer.' I now come to the article, and it is strange that it is in quotation marks. How did this article so suddenly get into the Ottawa 'Citizen' on the morning immediately after it was delivered? Was there a shorthand reporter there who took it down? I understand not. I will not charge the reverend gentleman with any more offences than possibly he is guilty of, but I understand that this was furnished to the Ottawa 'Citizen' from some source, possibly the reverend gentleman did not compose it but

it was furnished to the Ottawa 'Citizen' in order that members of parliament might be taught where they belonged, and if they dared transgress the dictum of this gentleman and others like him, they might know what the future held in store for them. Here is the article :

RIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT.

Rev. J. W. H. Milne, in his sermon Sunday in Glebe Presbyterian church, in referring to men being able to differ and yet remain friends, said:

'Some men in politics can agree to differ. Some men can contend openly and honourably, yet withal retain no unkindly feeling. But every now and then there are men, even members of parliament, who are so venomous in their opposition to those who differ from them that they are ready to suggest or say anything that will leave a stain on the character of an opponent. There is something essentially villainous in the make up of a man who, in order to gain his ends politically, will accept any story floating about and then ask a question, because privileged, with the object of destroying another who may be opposed to him.

I may say, Sir, in passing that this is the twenty-first session I have had the honour of being a member of the parliament of Canada, and I have not known one solitary member of parliament to whom those remarks would apply in all that 21 years.

But worse still is it for any member of parliament, because shielded by four walls, to bring before the public the name of any man——

He might as well have printed Rev. James Macdonald, D.D., of the Toronto 'Globe.'

—any man against whom he may have a grudge, on mere pretext of suspicion. Any man may have his name brought before the House by any member. He may be maligned by inuendos. He may, although innocent, have suspicion cast on his character, yet have no means of redress.

This may be called the right of parliament, but it is not in harmony with the spirit of Christian civilization.

This is the same gentleman who a week ago assisted in passing one of the most disgraceful, unchristian and bedeviled motions that has ever disgraced any body of public men in the Dominion of Canada. Yet he uses the words 'Christian civilization.'

No civilized community would tolerate the highwayman who would jump from an ambush and steal the purse of a respectable citizen, and yet we permit political highwaymen to stand up in the House and rob sincere, earnest citizens of their character. There must eventually be some means provided which will prevent such public outrages.

I leave it to the First Minister, I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, if in your experience you have ever seen in this parliament any conduct which will justify such words as these from a minister of the Gospel. I have never seen it, Sir. I stand here today the best of friends with every man in the House of Commons on both sides. When I hit, the First Minister and every other man knows that I hit above the belt, fairly and squarely and manfully.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES. I am told that our good friend who uttered these words now says that he did not refer to me.

He referred to me. I am not perhaps taking his own words because he says that he referred to all the members. But. if he did not refer to me. personally he must have referred to me as one of the members of parliament and in that instance I have a perfect right to defend my honour against this slander that this gentleman uttered from his pulpit in the city of Ottawa. But what do we now hear that his excuse is?—that 'I did not mean to refer to Hughes but to the member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce).' But he did not speak until two days afterwards, showing the very weak subterfuges of these gentlemen and the extremes to which they will resort when they want to cover up their tracks. It was to defend the honour of the Minister of Finance that this was done! No, Sir, he might as well come out in the open and frankly admit that he referred to me. There is no equivocation on my part; I referred to him; make no mistake about that. I did not try to hide myself behind any subterfuge and I am satisfied the public would respect him much more if he would come out manfully and say—he might resort to a little white fib, but I am not going to quibble as to that—I made a mistake ; I did refer to Hughes and I am now ready to take my medicine.' But, he does not do that, he squirms around and says: 'No, I meant the members altogether;' and in that he is endorsed by some hon. gentlemen occupying seats in this House who should be ashamed of themselves. He has gotten back at me in the Ministerial Association and I will deal with that organization in due time.

Now, Sir, valuing my good name as I do, valuing the honour of this House and valuing more than that the liberties of the people of this country and desiring to preserve them from ecclesiastical encroachment or tyranny whether coming from the Roman church or from any Protestant church, I shall have a word to say with regard to the action of these gentlemen. Ecclesiastical tyranny has in all ages, in all lands and at all periods of the world's history coerced humanity. I hesitate not to say so, I have said it before and I am endorsed in that by the best men in all

churches. I know that most people hesitate when they are attacked by these gentlemen wearing—I said five cent white neckties—but, I must apologize to the House; I find that an ordinary batch can be got for 25 cents a dozen, but the style that most of them wear now comes a little higher. They are adopting what is called the Roman stole, a descendant of paganism, and this comes a little higher, or costs a little more money. But I know that the people dread running up against these gentlemen. Mark you, in any thing that I utter here to-day I am not saying one word with reference to those godly and good men that are found in all churches. I excepted them in my utterances upon another occasion and I will again except them from what I say here—men who are a credit to the churches with which they are connected, who are found among the ranks of the ministers of the gospel and there are no men who despise these weaklings more than those splendid fellows who are found in the ranks of Christian ministry up and down the country, but who cannot very well get rid of these others. They have to put up with them. The tendency is for humanity to bow before these gentlemen who pose as representing the church, and as being ministers of the gospel. Well, it is not my intention, at all events, to be so suppressed. I have had the privilege of meeting these gentlemen on other occasions. In my own county we had a very godly, Christian soul who, on the eve of an election, found it to be his duty to go from house to house—Tory house to house—and have a prayer for the success of the G. W. Ross government. A number of the gentlemen there were very much annoyed and I wanted to know why they were annoyed. They said: We are going to leave the Methodist church, but I said: Not at all, this fellow is only an excrescence on the church; what you should do, if you cannot reform him by prayer is to reform him by fasting; that will bring him around. So, when the next pay day came around, there was a very small stipend put up, the result being that he got out at the end of the year and balanced up by using some of the missionary funds.

On another occasion another gentleman, who did not belong to the Methodist church, thank fortune, but unfortunately belonged to the Presbyterian church, went from door to door. We found his trail, we saw that his buggy only turned into the Tory doors and he went from house to house, and although he was not a voter, he told them how disgusted he was with politics and that he would under no consideration think of voting for either candidate. The Tory party seemed to be a good deal the worst, but he would not vote for either. In that way he endeavoured to keep a great many of the honest Conservative voters from voting. But the boys in the country are instructed. They listened to this gentleman when he preached the gospel, even then taking only what suited them, but in politics they used their own judgment. I got wind of this and I brought it up in this gentleman's presence, as I usually do in dealing with such things, on the public platform in the village of Minden. I gave him an opportunity of stepping up on the platform and making good his position. Well, Sir, strange to say, the boys applied the fasting game there also, and that gentleman sought fields and pastures new. That is the way we treat political parsons in our country.

Now, Sir, I shall come to the resolution which these gentlemen have seen fit to pass. Let me say before I deal with it that the Ministerial Association in Ottawa should be and, as a rule is, a respectable body of men when they are all there. It is made up of a number of very good men, but I want to point out that on this occasion the big men in the church, possibly with one exception, and he is an innocent, dear old soul, they say—I do not know him at all—who could easily be misled, were absent. However, the gentleman who engineered the show was named Ramsay; I do not know that his name has ever got far through the length and breadth of the land; I never heard of him, but I notice that he is the gentleman who. on a certain occasion came to the assistance of Hon. G. W. Ross in the city of Ottawa, and that he attended his meeting here in order to impress the people with the idea that this man Ross after all was not as bad a fellow as he had been painted. This motion was moved by Rev. Dr. Ramsay. This is the gentleman who is reported by the Ottawa 'Citizen' of January 21, 1905, page 12, as being at the G. W. Ross meeting in the Russell Theatre. It says that on the platform at that meeting were Rev. Dr. Ramsay, Rev. Mr. Reynolds, Rev. Wm. McIntosh and Rev. Mr. Milne. These gentlemen were on the platform at that meeting and one of these is the gentleman who got back at me the other day The resolution was moved by Rev. Dr. Ramsay, and seconded by Rev. Mr. Deeprose. I understand that Mr. Deeprose is a very respectable gentleman, but quite unsophisticated and not up to the arts of these gentlemen who were engineering this affair to suit their little purpose. The resolution was passed unanimously. But at this point I may interject the remark that the leading ministers of the city were not present.

Dr. Herridge, a gentleman whose name is held in high respect, was not there. If Dr. Herridge had joined in condemning me, or if the Rev. Dr. Henderson had joined in passing a resolution condemning me, I would have sat up and hesitated to

ask if I had not done something wrong. These are gentlemen whose names carry weight; they are gentlemen of Christian standing, they are gentlemen whose actions as well as utterances are never voiced along the line of politics in the pulpit. I do not know what their political inclinations may be, but these are gentlemen whose names stand high in the Christian world throughout the length and breadth of the land. Neither was Archbishop Hamilton present, or the Rev. Canon Kittson, nor Rev. Mr. Peever, and I submit that not one of these present but Rev. Mr. Deeprose, has any standing. That is the statement furnished me, I am not vouching for it, by authorities in the city. The resolution goes on:

The Ministerial Association of Ottawa, made up of members of various religious denominations, takes this first opportunity to express the surprise and pain——

I will endeavour to give them some balm for their pain:

—with which it has learned of the attack recently made by a member of parliament upon one of our own number.

Now, I don't mind any crowd standing altogether. You all heard the story of the lawyer—I do not know whether it was the member for Pictou in his first case or not—who, when he was addressing the jury passed up and down amongst their ranks and muttered something to them, and the jury, without leaving the box, stood up and said: 'Not guilty.' After it was all over the judge said to him: How did you manage to hypnotize that jury, and he replied: I just muttered to each man as I went along that now is the time for a crowd of fellows like us to stand together.

Mr. CARVELL. Tell the rest of it.

Mr. HUGHES. There may be a little of that spirit abroad among these gentlemen. I do not know whether there was or not, but if so, I do not blame them much:

—upon one of our own number, Rev. J. W. H. Milne. Some years ago Mr. Milne served as our secretary with great efficiency.

He has evidently been always on the job:

He also filled at one time the office of president with tact and dignity. After these many years he is honoured by us all for his geniality and integrity——

In this case it may be something like the darky who was brought before a magistrate, and the magistrate said: This is the first time you were ever up before me, and the darky replied: Yes, Massa, please the Lawd, in his infinite goodness and mercy, this is the first time this here darky has ever been cotched:

—his faithfulness as a pastor and power as a preacher, his breadth of mind and fervor of zeal in the advancement of Christ's Kingdom——

Well, so far as I can find out he has been doing all this chiefly along Grit political lines in the city of Ottawa, and I never knew there was a department of Christ's kingdom for that organization. There may be, but we will inquire into it.

—and we esteemed it a privilege to possess his personal friendship.

I do not blame them in the slightest degree for that. Here it refers to the 'Hansard' report,' and while I do not wish to reflect on the gentlemen who report for 'Hansard,' that report of my address on that occasion by some mischance, contained two of the most outrageous misprints or mistakes that has ever fallen to the lot of any man to have credited to him. However, you would naturally suppose that these gentlemen would have got a corrected copy of 'Hansard' and that they would have done me or done themselves the honour of asking for a corrected copy. Oh, no, they were going it blind:

We have listened to the 'Hansard' report of the speech of which Mr. Milne was assailed.

I stand here to say that Mr. Milne was not assailed, Mr. Milne was exposed, as I am going to expose him a little more to-day:

Together with the 'Citizen's' summary of that part of the sermon which gave an excuse for the hon. gentleman's denunciations.

Now, I ask the Ministerial Association how they knew I referred to Mr. Milne? They take his word that he did not refer to me. How do they know? Surely, if my description of this gentleman is so terrible it cannot apply to any one of them. How do they know it referred to him? They might as well come out in the open. I referred to Mr. Milne, and I admit it, and Mr. Milne referred to me and he won't admit it. There is the difference between us.

It seems to us remarkable that a single member of parliament should apply to himself alone remarks of quite a general nature.

If the remarks were not applied to an individual then it is doubly cowardly on the part of this man to stand in the pulpit and slander 220 odd innocent men for the sake of getting at one man. If he refers to me let him have the manhood to say so. The excuse is now given, I am told, that he referred to the member for Algoma. That is a subterfuge, the member for

Algoma did not speak for two days afterwards.

We feel humiliated—

It would take a good deal to humiliate the gentlemen who drew up this resolution:

—that any man should pollute the atmosphere of our national parliament with language so abusive.

Pollute the atmosphere—why, 'eau de Cologne' compared with a polecat would not be in it with my remarks compared to theirs.

—so abusive as seems to have been used on this occasion.

They seem to think that my statement and the narrative of facts I gave have been a little hard, but what I did give was a narrative of facts, plain straight facts, not one of which can be successfully contradicted. Before I am through I will show whether they can be proven or not, if the Ministerial Association is anxious to follow it up:

Not less deplorable do we think it that the representative of a Canadian constituency should unrebuked have publicly repeated to the detriment of a fellow citizen assertions of some irresponsible tale bearer which he does not pretend to have verified.

I verified every statement that was made to me. Members of Mr. Milne's congregation and gentlemen in the city of Ottawa will verify every statement I made. The only one upon which there can be any possible doubt is whether he referred to me or not. If he referred to me individually, then I have accepted it, and if he referred to me as one of the 200 odd members of parliament, I have accepted it as one of these. In the first instance, if he referred to me specifically he would be more manly, but if he referred generically then his statement is utterly cowardly from any point of view you like to take it. Then, the resolution goes on:

We accept without reserve Mr. Milne's assurance, corroborated by the members of his congregation that these assertions are absolutely false.

We will see about that. They go on:

With him, moreover, we regret that there are members of parliament so venomous as to be ready to suggest or say anything that will leave a stain on the character of an opponent, and affirm that such conduct is not in harmony with the spirit of Christian civilization.

Well, Sir, if anything more slanderous and cowardly than that can be produced I want to see it. Now, what are the facts? They have no evidence to back them, not a tittle of evidence for one assertion they made. They didn't even get a correct copy of the 'Hansard'; they did not even ask me to go before them and justify the statement I made concerning one of their members. They showed no Christian spirit in the matter from start to finish. Why, a set of desperadoes, the commonest political hacks I ever saw, could not formulate a resolution under conditions more degrading than these gentlemen who have formulated that. They followed no rules of evidence whatever, they simply took Mr. Milne's statement. And, Sir, the report was prepared, I understand, before they ever went to the meeting. Now, I stated that Mr. Milne, previous to the elections some years ago—the time the Ross government was beaten—had expressed himself as antagonistic to, or at least regretted the actions of the Ross government and condemned them in general terms. There was nothing wrong in that. Lots of Liberals did that and lots of them afterwards fell back into the ranks, and that is not a serious offence. I rather appreciate his manhood if he did condemn them. Then the next statement I made was (and I want to point out this is one of the statements the Ministerial Association says is absolutely untrue), the next statement I made was that he appeared on the Ross platform. The Ministerial Association declares that is untrue. In the Otttwa 'Citizen,' January 21, 1905, page 12, will be found the report of a meeting in the city of Ottawa, and the four clergymen, Dr. Ramsay, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. McIntosh and Mr. Milne are reported as being present. And, when some of the congregation objected to the active part Mr. Milne was taking in that election—I have this from the particular gentleman who was spoken to in the matter, and I will be glad to give the evidence to the Ministerial Association if they choose to act as gentlemen and Christian judges, but if they are going to act as Grit heelers I will have nothing to do with them. One of these gentlemen remonstrated with Mr. Milne for the active part he was taking in the matter, and Mr. Milne said to him: 'Why, you are as bad as Russia in the city of Ottawa, if a man cannot take part in these matters.'

The next statement I made was, that he had arranged with the Rev. Mr. Macdonald (with a capital R), of the Toronto 'Globe' to come down and address the electors in his church on either the Sunday immediately before the election or the Sunday before that; and I stated that this was opposed by certain members of the Session. I will now go further, and say that the Session took the matter up, and that two gentlemen were deputed to wait on Mr. Milne and arrange with him that Mr. Macdonald should not come here. This

is one of the statements which the Ministerial Association declare is absolutely without foundation. I repeat that statement to-day, and I will go further and say that Mr. Milne afterwards stated that Mr. Macdonald could not come. That was the reason he did not come. I can give the names of the members of the church Session who were deputed to see Mr. Milne, and have Mr. Macdonald called off from preaching. And yet, I am branded before the Dominion of Canada by this outfit in the city of Ottawa as having stated what was false and untrue.

The only other statement which I made, which it is necessary to refer to, was this, that the Rev. Mr. Milne had furnished, in one way or another, to the Grit leaders a list of the members of his congregation, marked as to how they would vote and how they could be influenced. I stand here ready to produce an affidavit of a gentleman in the city of Ottawa, who will swear that that is true. A gentleman who subsequently tackled Mr. Milne about the matter, arranged to go with him and meet the gentlemen referred to, but when the time came, Mr. Milne did not appear. But the gentleman found out that in the meantime, Mr. Milne had gone to this man privately, and arranged that the difficulty should be smoothed over; and when he denied this, he was told a word of four letters, which I will not repeat here, by the member of his congregation, but a word which comes with very bad grace to one who poses as a minister of the Gospel. It is an old and well recognized principle that:

> Of all the ills with which mankind is curst,
> Ecclesiastical tyranny is the worst.

I wish to point out that not one word that I have uttered has reference to the splendid ministers of the gospel, who are found in all parts of Canada and in all lands. These are men of the highest Christian character and godliness, in word and act, and they are men that one is proud to meet. But these men do not endorse such actions as those I have referred to. I go further and say that the disreputable men in the Christian ministry are responsible for the fact that Christianity, in 1900 years, with all the energy and money expended upon it, has made such little progress. It is owing to the fact that there are these objectionable men to be found in the Christian ministry more than to any other single cause. One of these men will neutralize the good work of 50 good men. One of them will cause more suspicion in the public mind than the actions of a hundred splendid, noble men of the church. I know it personally from this better class of men, that the great drawback they feel to the Christian church in the land, is the fact that there are mountebank clergymen, who are always seeking their own advancement, as this gentleman sought his own advancement.

Let it be clearly understood that in my action towards the Rev. Mr. Macdonald of the Toronto 'Globe' I acted from the highest viewpoint of the British Empire and humanity. I had nothing personal in view. Who dragged the matter into the Glebe church! The gentleman who occupies the pulpit of that church. He made the attack on members of parliament, whether he meant the members generally or me personally; and if there is anything coming before the Ministerial Association, I am not the man who brought it. They passed the resolution; I had no part in it; and let them take their medicine in any way I choose to give it to them.

Mr. Milne lobbied some years ago for his father. I am not saying a word against the old gentleman. I am sorry to bring this in, but I do it just to show you the class of man he is. His father is now in the Post Office Department in the city of Ottawa, as a third-class clerk. He was appointed in 1901. He was born in the year 1835. He is thus 76 years of age, considerably over the retiring age. This is a motive for the gentleman's loyalty. Others of these gentlemen are seen frequenting the halls and corridors of parliament, dancing attendance on ministers, and may possibly have a similar interest in doing so. The famous historian and divine, Rev. Dr. Robertson of Scotland, stated that there were three classes of men to whom no quarter should be given—the hypocrite, the pharisee and the tyrant. There is no use, he said, of reasoning with these three classes of men; there is only one way to reach them—expose them with the strong whip and lash of public censure and public condemnation.

Now, Sir, if any of these gentlemen of the Protestant Ministerial Association approach me on the morrow, I shall be glad to assume full responsibility for everything I have uttered here to-day, by giving them a revised copy of 'Hansard' with my endorsement upon it, and with my certificate that I accept full responsibility for everything I say to-day. Then they will not be able to bring the charge that I am shielding myself behind the privileges of parliament. I have given the evidence to prove every charge that I have made with regard to Mr. Milne. The only point about which there is any possibility of equivocation on his part, is his statement that he referred to all the members of this House and not to me specifically. The more manly thing would be, to say, that he referred to me specifically, and that he did not slander the other 200 members or more of this House. 'An equivocation

is half a falsehood, and a falsehood is all of Hades,' and I charge the minister who passed that resolution with being guilty of deception, with being guilty of falsehood, and with being guilty of slander; and I will sign that statement any day that the Protestant Ministerial Association comes to me and asks me to do so. Sir, I rather enjoy the old story told in New England years ago. Whittier put it very well:

> So this is all, the utmost reach,
> Of priestly power the mind to fetter,
> Now shame upon ye, parish popes,
> Was it thus with those your predecessors
> Who sealed with racks, and fire and ropes,
> Their loving kindness to transgressors.

I can imagine this outfit, in the old palmy days, when the strong arm of temporal power was at their beck and call, trailing your humble servant before them and saying to him: Now, dance, you terrier, dance; and then following some of the good old Christian devices, such as bore his tongue with a red hot iron, chopping off his ears, or cutting off his nose. These things have been done by Protestants as well as by the others. We have had women thrashed naked through the streets of Boston, and hanged to the nearest gibbet. But the other fellows did it in even a more drastic manner. These are all part and parcel of the old days of intolerance, and that spirit still exists in the hearts of men to-day, not only in the church, but out of it.

As an instance of this, just let me point to the Ministerial Association. I wonder what the Master, whom these people pretend to follow, would have done under similar circumstances and conditions. Even supposing that I am all that they say—and I am not anything of the kind, for I claim to be just as righteous as any of them, which is not saying much—but, what would the great Master have done ! I am satisfied that He would have followed an entirely different line of action, and it would have been more becoming on the part of these gentlemen if they had shown a little more Christian spirit and had not been so anxious to whitewash one of their own kind. I do not propose to allow myself to be placarded in the way these gentlemen have placarded me all over the country, without showing them up in their true light. In my own county, the exponents of religion, mind their own business, except in the case of one of them, who meddled in the last election, and he had to leave the county. He was deserted by his congregation, and we did not take long to get rid of him. Fasting is the surest way to cure a gentleman of that kind, of this disease. Close up the purse strings, and he will immediately see the errors of his ways, and conclude that if he is going to be in religion, he had better stick to it, and leave politics alone, and if he is going to be in politics, he had better give up his whole time to them. I find that some members of Ministerial Association,—not the big, noble minded men of the organization at all, but the smaller fellows, the men who have not that breadth of heart which they would have, if they really loved one another—have passed resolutions on many an occasion about other people in higher positions than myself. I find that even His Excellency the Governor General, the representative of the King, the Supreme Head of the British Empire, has fallen under their censure, for they passed resolutions condemning him for having gone to a horse race. Well, I have never found any fault with a man of the gospel for going to see the circus. These gentlemen take the children to the menagerie, but they always wait to see the girls dance and ride fast horses. I approve of their going to see the circus, but why make the excuse that they are taking the children to the menagerie ? Why not frankly admit that they are going to see the circus, and are taking the children with them ? We have also had examples of these extreme members of clerical organizations seeking to invade the private homes of people in the country in order to find out if they indulge in a game of bridge on a Sunday afternoon or in a glass of wine. Some years ago a number of respectable gentlemen in the city of Toronto heard that there were living pictures in the exhibition being held in that city. They were informed that a lot of girls had been brought from the slums of yankee cities and were dressed up in tights and were posing as living pictures, and the question was mooted whether it was proper or not. Well, these gentlemen appointed a delegation to inspect, and the delegation after viewing the show for a week or so, came to the conclusion that they were satisfied with it. Why, some of these worthies had the hardihood to condemn even the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), for some official act, and also some of the judges in Ontario. It is nothing but condemnation all over, but I fail to find where the Master followed the same line. He did not go about always condemning. The only time I find condemnation from His lips, is when he was dealing with just such subjects as this hypocritical crowd, and then he was severe, and rightly severe. These people show the same spirit as was shown by the early pagan priests and which was displayed afterwards by the clerical tyrants of Christendom. The earliest annals we have in history recount the tyranny, the villanny, the vindictive spirit displayed by the early pagan priests against those who dif-

fered from them, and when democratic Christianity vanished from the face of the earth and autocratic Christianity took its place, we find our friends of the Roman Catholic church beheading, butchering and massacreing whenever persecution suited their purpose. Later on we find our Protestant friends of the various denominations, pursuing the same unchristian mode in order to get rid of those who did not agree with them. In all days and lands, there has been an unwritten law, giving immunity to the clergy of all denominations which, I say, is not in the best interests of any nation. The only immunity to which any man is entitled, is that which comes to him from gaining the respect of his fellow men, by the rectitude of his conduct, and his broadmindedness, tolerance and charity. All the immunity the ministers of the Gospel need, is that which comes from the respect to which every decent man is entitled.

Let me give you an instance from the good, old days, and mark you, there are many who claim that the world was as far advanced centuries ago, as it is now. There are many who claim that the old Phoenican Empire was as great and progressive as those which take the lead to-day. In many lines we know that it was just as far ahead as we are. It had large colonies and made advances in manufactures and in science, such as we have not yet attained. Yet the old Phoenician Empire vanished and humanity fell for centuries, under the heel of the tyrant; and if to-day we occupy the position we do, it is due to the diffusion of education throughout the length and breadth of the British Empire and the carrying of that education into other lands. There is the reason why I am so persistent in endeavouring to bring about the union of Britain and her colonies. I foresee the danger to humanity should the British Empire become dismembered, and that old, grand institution, the British constitution, fall into desuetude. It would then be a very easy matter to have the world back to where it was when the Albigenses and the Waldenses strove for liberty.

The spirit that brought about the butchery of these splendid people is still dominant in the hearts of some men, though they have not the power, thank Heaven, to carry their ideas into effect. The same spirit that sent Cranmer and Ridley and Latimer to the stake is abroad in the world to-day. The same spirit that brought about the persecutions under John Calvin—a man admirable in many ways—that brought about the persecutions in the New England states of people for seeking to worship Almighty God each according to the dictates of his own conscience, is abroad in the world to-day. And the only safeguard that any nation can have is to make an absolute separation between church and state. Let the clergymen, if they wish to preach politics, get out of the pulpit—for the people will not tolerate politics there, and take their places as ordinary citizens, and not seek to give their political utterances the authority of their priestly office.

What prove these but that time was ne'er so black
As ghostly cheer and pious thanks to lack.

How can one describe the days of the persecutions in New England? The men who had fought for freedom in England, the followers of Cromwell, left Great Britain for the right to worship Almighty God each according to the dictates of his own conscience. But soon each primitive community fell under the sway of a tyrant ecclesiastic. Whittier expresses it all, and I will take the liberty of quoting his words:

O glorious days when church and state
Were wedded by your spiritual fathers
And on submissive shoulders sat
Your Wilsons and your Cotton Mathers
No vile 'itinerant' then could mar
The beauty of your tranquil Zion,
But at his peril of the scar
Of hangman's whip and branding iron.

Then wholesome laws relieved the church
Of heretic and mischief maker;
And priest and bailiff joined in search,
By turns, of Papist, witch and Quaker.
The stocks were at each church's door,
The gallows stood on Boston Common;
A Papist's ears the pillory bore,
The gallows' rope a Quaker woman.

Your fathers dealt not as ye deal,
With 'non-professing' frantic teachers;
They bored the tongue with red hot steel
And flayed the backs of 'female preachers.'
Old Newbury, had her fields a tongue,
And Salem's streets, could tell their story
Of fainting women dragged along,
Gashed by the whip, accursed and gory.

Why, Sir, it is not many generations since women were tied to the tail of the cart and flogged naked in the city of Boston because they chose to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and in a way different from that approved by their persecutors.

There is one famous instance of a man named Macy—the story is told by Whittier—who had harboured a Quaker for the brief space of one hour, and given the poor fellow a meal. Along came the sheriff and one of these bewigged parsons and demanded his surrender. Macy was going to defend his position with his musket, when the Quaker, declaring 'No blood shall be shed on my account,' walked out and surrendered himself. And a week or so later, after a mock trial, he was hanged for the offence of being a Quaker. And Macy was to be prosecuted, but he and his wife made their escape to the shores of a little lake,

and, taking a boat there, struck out and left the community. The parson ordered them to come back, and when they refused cried, 'Beware the church's curse,' and received Macy's answer, 'Curse an thou wilt, but thy blessing, prithee, spare.' In leaving this subject of the New England persecution, let me quote again the words of Whittier:

> No, for yourselves alone, I turn
> The pages of intolerance over
> That, in their spirit, dark and stern,
> Ye haply may your own discover.

People say: There is no good in going back into these dark days of history; these things are gone, and the world can never come to such a stage again. Why, Sir, within twelve months, in Barcelona, in Spain, another ministerial association was instrumental in having one of the finest men and greatest advocates of freedom shot to death. I refer to Franceso Ferrer. Instances of this kind are found in almost every country, where, if it is not open persecution, it is persecution in office, persecution in society, that is sought to be carried out by dragging the ecclesiastical affairs of the country into the life of the nation.

Now, I come to another ecclesiastical matter. Only last year, we had an exhibition in the city of Montreal, of this ecclesiastical spirit. The Eucharistic Congress met in Montreal a year ago. Standing here, I say that if I had been managing the affairs of the city of Montreal at that time, I would not have objected to the procession that took place. I believe in the utmost freedom in these matters. I fought with the tongue—but we were prepared to take action if necessity arose—that the Salvation Army might be free to parade the streets of the town in which I live. But when it comes to dragging the whole country into a matter of this kind when we find the Public Works Department decorating the public buildings in that city—the Post Office Department, I believe it was—decorating these public buildings with flags other than the flags of Britain; for I am told that there was but one British flag on that whole building, the others being flags representing his Holiness at Rome, I have no hesitation in saying that that should not be allowed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am sure my hon. friend does not wish the House to misunderstand the case. I may inform him that any decoration of these buildings is under the direction of the Public Works Department.

Mr. HUGHES. The Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) is quite right. I have the correspondence with the Minister of Public Works concerning the protests that were made. But the decorations were there all the same. And I repeat that there is only one way for this country in matters of this kind, and that is to keep ecclesiasticism, whatever its source, out of the public life of the nation. If this thing is to be allowed to go on in the city of Montreal on the occasion of a Eucharistic congress, then, on the 12th of July, if we demand it—but we could never be insane enough to do so—the post office in Lindsay ought to be decorated with Orange colours. If it is conceded in one case it must be conceded in the other. Let these institutions keep to their own business; let them keep out of public affairs. And men there were, officers of the Dominion of Canada, who took part in that Eucharistic procession in their garb of office. I am surprised that these men had not more self-respect than to parade the streets in official costumes as part of a procession under the auspices of an ecclesiastical institution. I am amazed at the want of personal self-respect on the part of such men—to be so carried away by this spirit as to be found in such a procession in their garb of office. I would say, 'God bless them,' if they walked in such a procession in their individual capacity; that is none of my affair; they can decorate themselves in any way they choose, they can garb themselves as grotesquely as they please, they can go with rings on their fingers and bells on their toes if they choose, and that is their own affair. But it becomes my affair when they don the garb of an officer of the Dominion of Canada, I care not what position that garb may indicate, to march in such a procession. And I say it is time for the nation to declare that this must stop, and that these ecclesiastical matters must be kept out of our public life.

I am sorry I have had to occupy the attention of the House at such length, but I want to point out that every statement I have made from start to finish in connection either with the reciprocity arrangement, with Mr. Macdonald of the 'Globe', or with the 'Globe' itself, or Dr. Starr-Jordan, or Mr. Milne, is borne out by absolute facts. The only statement about which there is the slightest possible chance of difference is that Mr. Milne says he did not refer to me personally. If he did not he referred to me as one of the 220 members of this House, and I have a right to defend myself as one of them. In order to get at one man he slandered the whole batch. I stand here to say that my motive in introducing this subject of reciprocity long ago and bringing in Mr. Macdonald was in order as far as possible to defeat the attempt to bring about commercial union between Canada and the United States because I believe that is the ultimate ambition of the gentlemen who are engineering that to-day. I am not wor-

ried by being attacked from the pulpit, although every one knows what the effect of an attack from the pulpit is if the man has anything behind them. Years ago in my own riding I have had these attacks, but I do not think I will have any more; as I said there is only one way to bring about the proper conduct of these matters and that is if we cannot bring it about by prayer, then let us bring it about by fasting.

Mr. MACDONELL (South Toronto). As an ordinary member of this House, I cannot retain my place without making one word at least of comment upon the remarks just dropped by the hon. member (Mr. Hughes). With that hon. gentleman's quarrel with the clergyman in question I have no concern whatever. I have no concern and no comment to make upon his difference with this particular clergyman or this or that particular church or any other particular matter regarding which he has a desire to speak to a question of privilege in this House, but in a word, I do not desire to sit here and hear an attack, a slander upon religion and the various clergymen of religion without discrimination, of their order. I wish to put myself on record as not concurring in the remarks which have gone down on 'Hansard.' The hon. gentleman has gone out of his way to attack clergymen who do not belong to the church to which the Rev. Mr. Milne or the Dr. Starr-Jordan belong. He has referred to clergymen, priests and ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic church, both of the present and past generation. His reference to these gentlemen is entirely unnecessary and quite gratuitous and in no way concerns the dispute the hon. gentleman had with the particular clergymen in question at the present time. I cannot permit the hon. gentleman to state that humanity has been cursed by ecclesiastics of the order and the faith to which I have alluded, nor can I sit patiently and hear his remarks directed to what he calls ecclesiastical tyranny when directed in the most indiscriminate and general way without any reference whatever to the question of privilege to which he has risen.

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to no question of privilege whatever.

Mr. MACDONELL (South Toronto). You spoke to a question of privilege.

Mr. HUGHES. There was no question of privilege.

Mr. MACDONELL (South Toronto). I think he spoke to a question of privilege and exceeded the privilege. I simply rise to say I will not permit his remarks to go on 'Hansard' without my name being associated as entirely dissenting from them, strongly disapproving of them; and speaking as far as I am concerned, and with reference to the church to which he alluded, I make a protest against the language he has used.

Mr. HENDERSON. Fearing that silence on my part might cause people outside to think that I had sympathy with a great deal the hon. gentleman has said in his lengthy speech, I rise to make the declaration that I am not at all in sympathy with the discussion of a question of this kind in the House of Commons. I would not like to be identified with it, nor would I like people outside whom I know and whom I respect to think that I sympathized with the statements made this afternoon.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, not to speak of the clergymen who belong to my own faith, but speaking for the clergymen of the country in general I wish to disassociate myself and I believe all the members on this side of the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX—from the very serious and violent remarks made by the hon. gentleman. I do not think that any well-thinking Canadian can approve of these remarks. I have no mandate to defend the clergy against the aspersions of the hon. gentleman. I have no brief to speak for my clergy, nor for the Protestant clergy, but I think that this Canada of ours can boast of having in both the Protestant and Roman Catholic clergy, high, elevated minds of which any country could well be proud.

Mr. MILLER. I have no part in this matter at all. I did not listen to the address the hon. gentleman delivered in the House a few days ago, but since that time a member of Mr. Milne's church in Ottawa, I refer to Mr. Reid, of the Sun Life Assurance Company, a very estimable and prominent citizen of Ottawa, came to me and said that the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton were quite incorrect as to that church having refused church and pulpit to the Rev. Dr. Macdonald of Toronto. Mr. Reid said that Mr. Macdonald had been invited by their congregation to take their pulpit on the Sunday in question, but had declined the invitation, it not having been possible for him to be present. I do not think that if the hon. member was as brave in this matter as he has often proclaimed he was in South Africa, he would have made an attack upon gentlemen who have not the same opportunity that he has of defending themselves, and speaking in this House. It is not so bad, perhaps, to attack the Rev. Mr. Macdonald, because Mr. Macdonald can reply through the medium of his newspaper, but Mr. Milne has no such opportunity and I do not think it

was any example of bravery or chivalry for the hon. member to attack Mr. Milne in the way he has done.

Mr. HUGHES. Before you leave the chair I wish to correct a statement made by the hon. member for South Grey, the only member of the House who was base enough to make out that I had boasted of my bravery in South Africa. It is the privilege of every coward to sneer at those who went to South Africa. I never directly or indirectly in this House made any reference to my bravery in South Africa. The hon. gentleman and one other hon. gentleman have been found base and degraded enough to charge me with having boasted of my actions in South Africa. I take back the word and apologize to the House for having used it, but language could hardly be found harsh enough to describe the spirit of the gentleman making such a remark as he did.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. Far be it from me to question the bravery of any man who, with the aid of one other, rounded up 300 Boers. Nothing was farther from my mind.

Mr. HUGHES. Coward.

DUTY ON FRUIT.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, if this exposition is finished I would like to call the attention of the House, without entering upon any discussion, to a message I have received which I think should go upon record as soon as possible. To this message I would ask the special attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) who especially represents the province affected. The message reads:

Mission Junction, British Columbia,
February 9, 1911.

J. D. Taylor, M.P.,
Ottawa.

That in the opinion of the Hatzic Fruit Growers' Association any alteration in the tariff now existing on fruit and vegetables imported from the United States as proposed by the reciprocity agreement would cause widespread ruin amongst the many small growers, depreciation of land values and disaster to numerous towns now solely dependent upon the industry. We rely upon you to oppose the measure strenuously.

J. McCHIE.
Secretary.

I may add that messages to this effect have been before the government since last session, when a project of interfering with the fruit duties was first mooted.

FISHING VESSELS AND CUSTOMS REGULATIONS.

Mr. JAMESON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) if he would take over Bill (No. 27), respecting licenses to fishing vessels, and Bill (No. 28) to amend the Customs Act? My purpose in making this request is to facilitate action upon them. The object of the legislation in question is to provide a system under which fishing vessels of Canadian register may enjoy greater freedom of movement, by avoiding the delays which now occur owing to the present necessity of reporting at the customs house; to invite thereby more frequent landing of their fares by those engaged in the fresh fish branch of the trade; to aid in placing at the disposal of consumers in central Canada Canadian caught fish in the primest condition possible, and to help in stimulating fishing on the Atlantic coast of Canada by removing an exacting regulation which interferes with the movements of vessels, more especially those engaged in the fresh fish branch of the trade.

Last year I introduced similar legislation, but at the request of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) I did not press it that session for a good and sufficient public reason, namely that the Hague arbitration was then impending. This session I desired the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be present when these measures were discussed, but upon both occasions, when these Bills were reached the minister was unavoidably absent from the House, and I think, from the city of Ottawa. There is now a special reason why I think this legislation should be taken up as a government measure, namely, that if the present reciprocity agreement is carried into effect, American fishermen will have an advantage over Canadian fishermen with respect to the facility with which the movements of the vessels can be carried on. Fishing vessels of the United States under license are not obliged to report at custom houses in the United States, and in the alteration to be made in our regulations under the modus vivendi they will be permitted forty-eight hours instead of twenty-four hours to remain in a Canadian port without the necessity of reporting. It is for these reasons that I would make the request that the government take these two Bills over as government orders, and have them at least carried as far as the Committee on Marine and Fisheries where the merits can be considered.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether it will be possible to accede to the request of my hon. friend. But I would be very glad to consider it. If I remember aright the object of the Bills is already covered by a regulation of the Department of Customs. It is a matter which appertains to the Department of Customs more than to my department, and I think I would have to confer with my colleague the Minister of Customs before saying that I would adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend.

GRAND TRUNK TRAINMENS' STRIKE.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. King) to a matter in order that he may inform the House upon one or two points in connection with the strike of Grand Trunk Railway employees, who are in the train, and yard service, which terminated on the 31st July last. This is not a matter that will be dealt with by Judge Barron in the investigation which he is holding. It is a matter as to the status the men will occupy who have been taken back or who would be taken back. I desire to ask the minister, first, whether, by the settlement of the 31st July between the Grand Trunk railway and its employees in the train and yard service, it was intended and understood that the parties were putting an end to all existing disputes and difficulties, (2) that the men should be put back into the positions they held previous to the strike; and (3) was it understood that the men should be reinstated or were they only to be taken back as new men? I had the question jotted down, and I might pass the paper over to the minister so that he might understand them.

Mr. KING. I think I can answer my hon. friend. My recollection is that it was expected by the settlement, that all existing differences would be at an end, and that the men were to return to the company's service and to be reinstated in their former positions.

Mr. LENNOX. That is what I thought.

Mr. KING. 'Were the men to be reinstated or were they only to be taken back as new men?' In regard to that question I think the agreement will have to speak for itself. The word in the agreement is that the men should be——

Mr. LENNOX. Put back.

Mr. KING. Yes, put back in their former positions.

Mr. LENNOX. What I want to call the attention of the minister to is that it is a very important point whether the men were reinstated in the broadest sense of the term or were being put back as new men. I can hardly conceive that it was contemplated that they were to be put back as new men. Are we to understand from the minister that that distinction was not adverted to at all and that he did not take that into consideration? I certainly would think that it would be the object of the minister to see that the agreement was in such a form as that the men, when they were taken back, would get the same positions that they would have occupied if no strike had taken place. Otherwise, it would be an idle sham, and it would deceive the men. If it meant that a man who had been in the service of the company for twenty years or more and who would be entitled to a pension was to be taken back as a new man, and not to be entitled to his pension it would certainly be a most unfortunate result.

Mr. KING. As regards pensions, when the matter was under consideration, the leaders of the men who were negotiating on behalf of the employees took the position that they did not care about pensions one way or the other, that if the company cared to regard them as having violated its agreement with them to the extent of breaking any regulation which governed pensions the company was perfectly free to put that interpretation upon it. I was rather surprised myself at them taking that stand, but they did take it and they gave me to understand that in so far as pensions were concerned, if they had forfeited the pension by going out, and if the company cared to put that interpretation upon it they were free to do so.

Mr. LENNOX. Am I to understand the minister to say that his mind is clear that those who represented the men were at least indifferent as to the question of what position the men would occupy as regards pensions? That is what I understand the minister to say: that those who represented the employees of the railroad companies on that occasion expressed themselves indifferent as to whether the company should consider the pensions forfeited or not. I may say to the minister—of course, with every deference to what he says—that unless he is absolutely clear that that was the understanding, I would be surprised to hear that such was the case. The information I have got so far, and I am endeavouring to get more explicit information, is that the men throughout the country generally, and I understand, also, those who represented them—thoroughly understood at that time that except as to those who had been guilty of acts of violence such as expressed in the agreement, it put an end to all existing disputes and difficulties, and that the men would be restored to all the rights and privileges that they had before the strike had been declared.

Mr. KING. I am perfectly clear in my own mind as to what took place at the time, and I remember that the subject of pensions was never mentioned in any of the joint discussions between the men and the company. I remember, also, quite distinctly, that, apart from the joint discussion which took place, and at which the Minister of Militia and myself were present, the leaders of the men spoke nothing about the question of pensions. I brought that up myself.

Mr. LENNOX. To whom does the hon. gentleman refer as leaders?

Mr. KING. Mr. Garrettson, Mr. Lee, Mr. Berry and Mr. Murdock. I think all of these gentlemen took the same position on the matter. The question of pensions was a separate matter altogether, and it was not one that entered into the settlement one way or the other.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Labour being a party to the agreement that was signed on behalf of the men and the railway company, will it be laid on the table of the House?

Mr. KING. It was laid on the table of the House some months ago. We are going into Committee of Supply on the estimates for the Department of Labour, and possibly if any gentleman wishes to discuss that matter to-night it would be a good time.

Mr. LENNOX. So far as I am concerned, I am not proposing to discuss it. I only want to get information now, and at a subsequent date I shall discuss it.

DUTY ON FRUIT.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). Before Mr. Speaker leaves the chair I desire to read the following telegram, which I have received to-day:

Kamloops, B.C., Feb. 9, 1911.

Martin Burrell, M.P.,
Ottawa.

The British Columbia Inland Board of Trade fearing that the proposed reciprocity may seriously affect the lumber and fruit industry of this province strongly urges that the government thoroughly consider the question and respectfully suggests that a committee be appointed to investigate and report upon conditions before legally passing same.

M. S. WADE, President.
JOHN F. SMITH, Sec'y.

I might say, without wishing to discuss this matter, an opportunity for which will be afforded early next week, and no doubt the government have already had as much as they can stand in one day along that line, that I have had a great many messages of this kind, which I hope to refer to later on, and I presume the government has been receiving messages from my province fully endorsing this telegram during the course of the last few weeks.

Mr. BLACK. If it were in order I could bring a whole sheaf of letters from the fruit growers in Nova Scotia, all of whom, to a man, are in favour of reciprocity. I think it would be impossible to find a fruit grower in my province who is not in favour of reciprocity in natural products.

Mr. BURRELL. As this matter is on the Order Paper for discussion at a fixed date, I did not wish to discuss it further than to read the telegram at the earliest possible moment. I did not want to enter into the merits, and I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Black) should be allowed to discuss them now.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) is not willing that any one else should refer to the matter but himself.

Mr. SPEAKER. The discussion of the question is not in order now.

Mr. BLACK. I am not discussing it. I am only saying that if it were necessary I could bring any number of letters in favour of reciprocity in fruit. I only wanted to get in the fact that our fruit growers are all in favour of reciprocity.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Department of Labour—Conciliation and labour, &c., $27,300.

Mr. RHODES. I desire to take the earliest opportunity on going into Committee of Supply to consider the estimates for the Department of Labour, to bring to the attention of the Minister of Labour a matter of grave importance affecting labour conditions in the province of Nova Scotia. I refer to the strike at Springhill, where some 1,600 employees of the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company have been on strike since the 10th of August, 1909, or just 18 months to-day. The Minister of Labour has been informed of the situation in Nova Scotia by letter and telegram, and in the 'Labour Gazette' for a long period, and the situation is more or less familiar to him. I may say that I have not before this brought the matter to the attention of the House for the reason that since the passing of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act the Department of Labour has always taken the attitude that where that Act has been invoked and its machinery has been applied in a given case, that the action of the department would end there, and that if it were understood by those who invoke its machinery, that a resort could be had to the Department of Labour after the Act had been invoked, that it would tend to weaken rather than strengthen the machinery of the Act, and that therefore the parties to the dispute must, after the Act has been applied, resort to the arbitrament of war, and that the fittest must survive. I have kept in touch with the matter myself, and I find that at the very inception of this strike, or on the day before the men went out on strike, the Acting Deputy Minister of Labour wrote to the president of the United Mine Workers of America a letter, which I propose to read in full. It is fairly long, but it gives, in the shortest possible way, I think, the attitude of the department affecting questions of this character. It reads:

Ottawa, August 9, 1909.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge your communication of August 3 in reply to the letter of the Deputy Minister of Labour of July the 28th in respect to the strike in the collieries at Inverness, N.S. Your communication has been referred to the hon. the Minister of Labour and the minister directs me to say that he has had under consideration that part of your letter in which you stated you are inclined to the opinion that 'if the Department of Labour would investigate the situation in Nova Scotia they could do much to bring about a settlement of the difficulty in that province,' and has noted that in concluding your letter you express the hope 'that the Department of Labour may lend its influence to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the difficulties in Nova Scotia.'

With regard to the request that the department should investigate the situation or lend its influence to bring about a settlement the minister directs me to point out that the dispute at Glace Bay between certain of the employees of the Dominion Coal Company, members of a local union of the United Mine Workers of America and the said company, has already been the subject of government intervention by reference under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, and the report of the board appointed has been given to the public in accordance with the provisions of the Act. Were parties to industrial disputes encouraged to look indefinitely to government intervention or given reason to believe that the findings of boards appointed expressly for the purpose of inquiring into existing troubles, would be subject to further revision by the minister or other officers of the Department of Labour, it would seriously prejudice the effectiveness of the work of boards appointed under the Act and the value of their findings, and might only serve, having regard to industrial disputes generally, to prolong, rather than to minimize, the period of industrial strike.

Whilst the policy of the department in the matter of disputes referable under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act is as set forth herein, the minister wishes me to say that he will be pleased to discuss at any time with either of the parties to a dispute any of the facts or circumstances having a bearing upon the situation and best methods of effecting a satisfactory adjustment of existing differences.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) GERALD H. BROWN,
Acting Deputy Minister.

T. L. Lewis, Esq.,
President United Mine Workers of America,
Indianapolis, Ind.

In that letter the attitude of the Department of Labour was very clearly defined, and there is something to be said in favour of it so far as ordinary strikes are concerned; but the strike at Springhill is an extraordinary one. As evidence of that, I have only to refer the hon. minister to the report of his deputy minister on industrial conditions in the coal fields of Nova Scotia. At page 31 of that report he will find the following remarks in reference to the strike at Springhill:

I found evidence of strong feeling as between the management and the employees of this company. Leading spirits among the men manifest much feeling, not to say bitterness, toward the management, not only toward the person of the general manager, but to all subordinate officials; and since all these were drawn, with one exception from the ranks of the men themselves, the presumption is at least favourable to the theory that any estrangement that exists is not due to one side alone. With such an influence as this dominant among the men it would seem to be impossible for any manager or official to bring about a condition of good relations.

At page 32 of the same report he will find the following:

One is forced, therefore, to the conclusion that there can be no speedy termination to the present struggle, and that it will be a long-drawn-out contest unless some factor not now in evidence comes into play.

The record of strikes at Springhill, with which the minister is familiar, will bear out that expression. I believe that some five boards have sat under the Conciliation Act without alleviating conditions there, and there have been some 23 strikes in a period of 22 years. So that the conditions at Springhill are abnormal. I need not point out that the town of Springhill is an unusually good mining town. There is a good class of men there. The very appearance of the town is pleasing to the eye, vastly different from that of an ordinary mining town. Nor, need I take up the time of the committee to point out the disastrous results of this strike. In the country around the town of Springhill, and in fact throughout the whole county, the blight of this strike is felt. The revenues of the province have suffered from it to the extent of some thousands of dollars. I have shown you the attitude of the minister and the department with reference to the strike at Springhill. But in July of last year there occurred a strike among the employees of the Grand Trunk railway. On July 19, the editor of the 'Gazette' at Barrie, Ont., sent the following telegram to the minister:

Strike of trainmen declared here last night 9.30. Passenger trains being run this morning undermanned by inexperienced men in train service, and public seriously alarmed. Can you do anything?

To which the minister replied as follows:

Your wire received and contents duly noted. Am preperad to lend good offices of government to fullest extent possible towards adjustment of present differences, and have so informed parties.

Then, in a letter addressed by the Minister of Labour to Charles M. Hays, presi-

dent of the Grand Trunk railway system at Montreal, he makes an effort to bring the parties together. In conclusion, he suggests that a way be found for arbitration, and adds :

If such a reference to arbitration is agreed upon, all the necessary expenses incidental thereto will be met by the government.

Then, I find among other telegrams the following, which is typical, from the Minister of Labour to Wm. C. MacLaren, president of the Board of Trade of Brockville, Ont., under date of Montreal, July 29, 1910 :

Your telegraph July 29 received. The government is putting forth every effort to bring about a speedy termination of Grand Trunk dispute.

I could read a number of telegrams of the same tenor, but that may be regraded as typical. Then, at the conclusion of the strike I find that the Minister of Labour refers to his efforts in connection with the strike in the following terms, in a letter addressed to A. J. Anderson, Esq., Joint Secretary O. R. C. and B. R. T., Brockville, Ont. :

I much hope that the part taken by the Department of Labour and the government in helping to bring about a settlement of the differences between the members of the brotherhood whom you represent and the Grand Trunk railway will have commended themselves favourably to the members of the Brockville lodges.

So that the minister himself is not indisposed to take some credit for the settlement of that strike, and as to that I am not disposed to quarrel with him. I would be one of the first to congratulate him on settling a strike or upon doing anything he could to settle a strike, and I hope he will not withhold his efforts to settle the strike at Springhill.

If any proof were needed that the government did promptly intervene in this Grand Trunk Railway strike after the conciliatory board had sat on it, I could refer to the Toronto 'Globe' of Wednesday, August 3, 1910, in which I find this heading:

Grand Trunk Railway strike is over; an agreement is reached. The good work of Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Sir Frederick Borden.

Then the details are given. In this article, Mr. Garretson, a representative of the men, is quoted:

Further, said Mr. Garretson, I would like to pay my tribute to Hon. Mackenzie King and Sir Frederick Borden for their work in settling this trouble. They both did everything possible to reconcile the conflicting parties, and they are entitled to the thanks of not only the railroad interests, but of the people of the Dominion. By the manner in which they aided the negotiations they have earned the gratitude of the railway and of the men and also of the whole public.

And the 'Globe' not only refers to the matter in its news column, but also in its editorial column, from which I shall quote a few lines out of many:

The services, the very great servics, rendered by the Minister of Labour throughout this controversy have been of the highest value. Hon. Mackenzie King has illustrated what may be done by government representative with adequate knowledge, a sense of justice, a conciliatory spirit and an eye single to the good of the public.

The Montreal 'Herald' is no less forward in giving its mede of praise to the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Militia, but I shall not take up time by quoting the article. I may refer briefly, however, to the government organ, the Ottawa 'Free Press,' in its issue of August 3, 1910. It is just as fulsome in its praise of the two ministers I have mentioned. It says:

The usefulness of the Labour Branch of the Dominion administration has been doubly vindicated as the result of the recent dispute between the railway companies and certain of their employees. When, months ago, the companies were unable to come to terms with their men, a strike was made impossible because of the necessity under the Lemieux Act of first appointing a board of conciliation to investigate the dispute. The report of that board immediately solved the trouble so far as the Canadian Pacific railway was concerned, and an agreement which was mutually satisfactory was signed between the employers and the employed.

That was vindication number one.

Unfortunately, that report did not, offhand, settle the dispute between the Grand Trunk railway and its men and open war resulted.

There was no law on the statute-book empowering the government to interfere. There was nothing to compel the disputants to submit to arbitration. So far as legislation was concerned, the government had no standing.

But while the government had no compulsory powers, it did have in the Labour Department machinery which it could at once set in motion with the object of bringing the regrettable war to an end.

Before the Labour Department was created, it was anybody's duty when a strike occurred to make an attempt to stop it, and what is anybody's duty is often nobody's duty. But things have changed. Immediately the strike occurred on the Grand Trunk, the eyes of the public were focussed on the Labour Department. Everybody said it was the duty of the Labour Department to act as mediator. There was no casting around for a man or men who would be unprejudiced with the delay consequent upon such a search. The one man at whom all pointed for this arduous and urgent task was the Minister of Labour.

Hon. Mr. King rose to the occasion and once more he has come out of the ordeal with flying colours.

The editorial goes on somewhat further, but I shall not quote any more. I have no

quarrel to find with the minister or the department for having intervened in the Grand Trunk Railway strike. All credit to them for having done so. As a matter of fact, if the Labour Department is to serve a useful purpose the Minister of Labour must exercise just such powers at Springhill as he did in connection with the Grand Trunk Railway strike. But if the Department of Labour is to content itself with merely sitting still and allowing the machinery to be invoked, and then, if the parties fail to come to terms under the Act, let them fight it out as in the old days before there was an Act, we might just as well do away with the Labour Department altogether, because otherwise all that would remain for the department to do would be to gather a certain amount of statistics, as was done before. In the strike which occurred in the town of Springhill, the department took the stand that it would not intervene after the machinery of the Lemieux Act had been invoked. But that is not apparently always the policy of the minister and the government, because we find that when there was a strike among the employees of the Grand Trunk railway, the minister did intervene. He might say that the policy of the department had changed since the strike at Springhill, but I would point out that the strike still exists there, and is still of great importance, and I hope my hon. friend will take the committee into his confidence and let us know why he has made this distinction between the two.

Mr. LENNOX. Lest my silence be misconstrued, I wish to say that I do not subscribe to the doctrine of the 'Free Press' or the 'Globe'; but aside from that altogether, let me point out that having been intimately connected with the men who are affected by the Grand Trunk Railway strike—not speaking of the strike from second hand but from first knowledge—I say very emphatically, much as I regret it, that I cannot endorse the enconiums which have been showered by the press on the minister or admit that the settlement of the Grand Trunk Railway strike was a satisfactory one. The contrary position is the one I am forced to take. From my knowledge of the situation in the town of Allandale, a portion of the town of Barrie, and from my general knowledge of the matter, I know that the settlement does not absolutely remove all disputes, because I understand there are employees, who by reason of that settlement, are cut off from their pensions. There are numerous instances among the strikers in which men, who had been from 10 to 25 years in the service of the Grand Trunk railway, find that the company entirely repudiate any obligation in any way or to recognize as entitled to his pension any one who had been out on strike and was afterwards restored to the service. What the company say is that these men come back as new men. If I understood the minister correctly, these men would probably not get a pension. He cannot say whether the agreement does or does not cover cases such as those I refer to. I am not now saying that I condemn the minister nor that I applaud him, but what I say is that from my knowledge of the matter, the indications are that this settlement will be exceedingly unsatisfactory, and in all probability a very unfortunate one for the men. I understand the hon. member for Cumberland to be dealing with another matter, and, incidentally for illustration I presume, he finds it proper to refer to the Grand Trunk employees' strike. If I could add compliments to the Minister of Labour in relation to the Grand Trunk strike, I should be prepared to do so, and I may be able to do so in the end. At present I am not in that position. If I am to judge of the facts as they are before me, my reference to the matter must be uncomplimentary. For the present, however, I leave it. I am collecting information on the subject, and when I have collected it, I may bring the matter again to the attention of the House.

Mr. RHODES. I am sorry that my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) did not understand my object in referring to the Grand Trunk strike. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour did. I did not refer to it for the purpose of dealing with it. I pointed out that there has been a strike in my county for the last eighteen months. The policy of the department, it was stated, was not to interfere with the strike where the machinery of the Act had been put in operation and had proved of no avail. But, in the strike of the Grand Trunk employees, the machinery of the Act was applied without effect, and yet after that the minister took it in hand. I was asking him the reason for this difference of treatment.

Mr. LENNOX. I think I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rhodes) and said so. I thought he was referring to the Grand Trunk strike incidentally and by way of illustration, while dealing with the case in his own riding with the facts of which he is specially familiar.

Mr. KING. Replying, first, to my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), I would say frankly that I agree with him that, to appearances there seems to be a difference in the action on the part of the department in regard to these two strikes. But I think he will agree with me that circumstances must govern actions at all times, and there are occasions when the

exception itself proves the rule. In regard to the general policy of the department as to intervening in industrial disputes, it is precisely as set out in the letter of August 9, 1909, written to Mr. Lewis by Mr. Brown, the Acting Deputy Minister of Labour. In that letter it is pointed out that where a dispute has come under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act it is not the policy of the department to follow up any intervention of that description by intervention on the part of any officer of the government or department. But my hon. friend will notice—for he has read it—that this communication closes with these words:

Whilst the policy of the department in the matter of disputes referable under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act is as set forth herein, the minister wishes me to say that he will be pleased to discuss at any time with either of the parties to a dispute any of the facts or circumstances having a bearing upon the situation and best methods of effecting a satisfactory adjustment of existing differences.

In the case of the Springhill strike, notwithstanding that this intimation was made some sixteen months ago, up to the present time neither of the parties to that dispute, so far as I am aware, has cared to take advantage of it. They have not intimated to me, either directly or indirectly, their desire to discuss the situation at Springhill with a view to bringing about a termination of the strike. The Grand Trunk strike was different. When it had assumed such proportions that there was hardly an interest in the province of Ontario that was not suffering in consequence of it, I received the following telegram from one of the representatives of the employees on strike at that time:

Montreal, Que., July 27, 1910.

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour, Ottawa.

Messrs. Garretson and Lee held a conference to-day with Mr. Hays without result. May I be permitted on behalf of the men on strike to request that, as a Minister of the Crown and representative of the people you come to Montreal and by further effort try to arrange an honourable settlement either by arbitration or negotiation.

JAMES MURDOCK.

Mr. Murdock was a representative of the men out on strike at that time. I point out to my hon. friend that there, at any rate, is a difference: in the one case the department has not been requested, up to the present time, to intervene further than by the action under the Act; in the case of the Grand Trunk strike the department was requested by one of the parties to the dispute to take action. I am sure my hon. friend will agree with me that, in the absence of any request from the parties after the communication that was sent them, it would hardly have been proper for the department to have proceeded. I say frankly that if the parties had come and discussed this matter with me I should have been only too glad, if a suitable way could have been found to have assisted to the extent of my power. I do not say that I would have intervened actively, but I would have endeavoured to assist in bringing about a readjustment. I may say that, without making it publicly known, I have had a talk with the present manager of the Springhill mines with a view to understanding the situation thoroughly, to see if, in some way, it would not be possible for the difficulty there to be brought to a close.

Mr. RHODES. The hon. gentleman is referring to the new manager?

Mr. KING. Yes. But I would like to point out that, not only was there the difference in regard to there being no request to intervene in one case and not in the other, but in the nature of these disputes there was a marked difference. The difficulty in Springhill, as I understand it, is over the question of recognition of the union. I say frankly to the House that I have yet to find any means whereby the question of recognition or non-recognition can be satisfactorily solved without at least one of the parties agreeing to give up its stand. I cannot imagine any other method short of a statute being enacted making it an offence for an employer to refuse to employ men because they belong to a union or for men to refuse to work with those who do not belong to the union. I do not say I would endorse legislation of that kind. The strike for recognition is different in kind from strikes that have to do with wages, hours of labour and other conditions, and one taking a broad view of the industrial question will have to recognize that fact. There have been under the Act, since it was passed, nearly four years ago, 100 boards. In 91 cases out of the 100 these boards have effected settlements and have prevented strikes—only in 9 cases have strikes taken place. Of these 9, 5 have been concerned almost wholly with the question of union recognition, and in the others the strikes have been of extremely short duration.

Mr. Acland, the Deputy Minister of Labour, made a very full inquiry into the situation at Springhill. My hon. friend (Mr. Rhodes) has read part of his report. In that report Mr. Acland stated as follows:

I found evidence of strong feeling as between the management and the employees of this company. Leading spirits among the men manifest much feeling, not to say bitterness, towards the management, not only towards the person of the general manager, but to all subordinate officials; and since all these were shown with one exception, from the ranks of the men themselves, the pre-

sumption is at least favourable to the theory that any estrangement that exists is not due to one side alone. With such an influence as this dominant among the men it would seem to be impossible for any manager or official to bring about a condition of good relations.

That passage my hon. friend read, but on the next page, 32, we find:

One is forced, therefore, to the conclusion that there can be no speedy termination to the present struggle and that it will be a long drawn out contest unless some factor not now in evidence comes into play.

Mr. RHODES. I read that also.

Mr. KING. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I did not catch that. In addition to the work which the Board of Conciliation did at Springhill, an officer of the department, the deputy minister, investigated the situation, went into it carefully and fully, and gave what he believed to be an honest and unbiassed report, so that both parties, if they chose, could be guided by it. Mr. Acland's report was made in September, 1909. He said to the parties that the strike would be a long drawn out fight. It was a question of recognition. He had been in the confidence of the men on the one side and of the company on the other, and, speaking fearlessly as an officer of the department, he gave due notice to all parties concerned, that the strike would be a long struggle. That was in September, 1909. Here we are in February, 1911, and this struggle is still on. I say as a minister, speaking here, that I believe if the present position is maintained by the parties, in other words, if they insist on the question of recognition, if we are here this time next year, this strike will still be in continuance at Springhill. I say that because I have had a conversation with the present manager, who has informed me that on no consideration whatever will his company yield on the question of recognition. If that is a fact, what can save the situation? There is no good of the department trying to intervene and bring about a settlement by negotiation. The only thing is for the parties to settle it themselves, and take such responsibility as the facts seem to warrant.

So I say in regard to the Springhill strike there was additional intervention on the part of the government disclosing the full nature of the dispute, disclosing, also, the only line on which a settlement could take place, but there was no special invitation as in the case of the Grand Trunk strike for any officer of the government to intervene.

But my hon. friend will also see that the strikes were very different in their significance. The Springhill strike has gone on for a year and a half, and conditions have continued in Nova Scotia pretty much as they have been for some years past. Undoubtedly the locality immediately surrounding has been seriously affected, but the conditions generally in the province have not been. In the case of the Grand Trunk strike there was hardly a town in Ontario which was not being affected, in fact, some towns situated along the line of the Grand Trunk railway were really in the nature of communities in a state of siege. It was impossible to ship provisions in or manufactured goods out. Factories were closing, men were being thrown out of employment; the whole situation was one which was creating terror in the minds of the people of this province. A great system had been tied up from Chicago to Portland, a thousand miles of railway had been completely tied up, so far as the handling of freight was concerned. Boards of trade all over the province, city and town councils were sending telegrams daily to the government, and giving in detail the nature of the situation as it had grown up. There was a situation entirely different from a national point of view from the situation in Springhill. Had it been, as at Springhill, local in its nature, I would have maintained the attitude that has been maintained in the case of the Springhill strike and have hesitated about intervening. But when we had a situation such as there was at that time, I felt that no matter what the cost, even if it cost me my position as a minister of the Crown, should I fail in that duty, I would attempt it and do the best I could, because I felt it was my duty to do it; and I must say that I trust hon. gentlemen opposite will be spared from having to take their lives in their hands to the extent to which it was necessary to do so on that occasion, and to get in between two great fighting factions with a view to bringing them together. I do not wish to take any credit in the matter of bringing about a settlement in the Grand Trunk strike, but I do say that had it not been for the agencies which this government had established, had it not been that, in the first instance, the whole dispute had been made the subject of investigation by a board, so that when we came to a final adjustment it was a matter of taking the report of the board and sifting out certain features, and for the fact that there was existing, through agencies which the government had supplied, some means of bringing public opinion to bear on the whole situation, that strike, instead of lasting two weeks, might have lasted several months, and instead of being brought to a termination and of the men who were out being restored to their situations to the extent they have been, there might have been several hundreds who would never have got back their situations at all. My feeling is that had the government not intervened the result would have been disastrous all around, disastrous to the

Grand Trunk, disastrous to the men and still more disastrous to the general public. To the extent to which disaster of that nature has been averted, the government has rendered the country a service, albeit that there may be certain features in connection with that settlement that are not quite as we would wish to have them.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MONTREAL PARK AND ISLAND RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 45) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—Mr. Ecrement.

On section 1,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a proposed amendment, notice of which was given by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. BELAND. I was asked by the promoter of this Bill that it should stand until next Tuesday.

Progress reported.

McCLARY MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 75) respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company—Mr. Beattie.

Further consideration of section 1.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose the committee have considered this Bill carefully, but it looks like a merger. Probably my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) has given thought to it.

Mr. BEATTIE. What is the objection?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a principle involved in the Bill. We have on the other occasions declined to allow mergers to be consummated in this manner. You see it gives to the company the power to purchase stock in other companies carrying on similar business. If that is allowed it permits in the very clearest way the possible consummation of a merger among all the manufacturing industries in the same line. I am not quite sure that there is any strong objection to that but it seems to me that there is a principle involved, and that it would be well that it should come before a fuller House than we have to-night.

Mr. BEATTIE. This is a Bill introduced on behalf of the McClary Manufacturing Company. The only persons interested in this company are the members of the McClary family, and I think that you will find in the law as at present existing all that they are asking for. They have an establishment in every province of the Dominion, and agencies in different places, but instead of sending their own agents out on a paid salary to dispose of their goods they propose to entrust that work to persons in business in that line of goods in different towns and they ask for this power in order that they may be able to take some stock in their business. They think that by giving the sale of their goods to a business man in a town and then themselves taking an interest in the business he will push the sale of their goods more energetically, and will at the same time make a little money for himself. I have a statement explanatory of the Bill which, with the permission of the committee, I shall read :

The McClary Company were incorporated by chapter 116 of the Statutes of Canada, 1882. The Companies Act, contained in the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and being chapter 79 of these statutes, contains clauses similar to the clauses in the McClary Bill. Part 2 of the Companies Act applies to the McClary Manufacturing Company. Section 122 of the Companies Act provides that Part 2 of the Act shall apply to every company incorporated subsequently to the 22nd day of June, 1869 by any special Act of the parliament of Canada. The McClary Manufacturing Company, being incorporated by special Act of the parliament of Canada in 1882, comes within the meaning of this section. Part 1 therefore of the Companies Act does not apply to the McClary Manufacturing Company. If it did, section 44 gives the right to purchase stock in other companies in a broader fashion than that in the McClary Bill. Section 44 permits a company, to which part 1 of the Companies Act relates, to use its funds in the purchase of stock in any other corporation, when the directors have been expressly authorized by by-law passed by them for that purpose and sanctioned by a vote of not less than two-thirds in value of the capital stock represented at a general meeting of the company duly called for considering the subject of the by-law. You will notice, that in section 12 of the McClary Bill, it is provided that the directors must be authorized by by-law, sanctioned by a vote of not less than two-thirds in value of the subscribed capital stock represented at a general meeting duly called for that purpose, before they can use the funds of the company in the purchase of stock in any other company.

They had a strike some years ago, and an agent in a town refused to sell their goods on account of the attitude of the workingmen in the town, the result being that he gave up the agency. The company had to take one of their own men and start him selling the line of goods they manufactured. But their charter did not give them power to take any stock in his business. That is why the Bill has been brought forward. It has nothing to do with a

merger. Everybody knows that the McClary Manufacturing Company is one of the largest institutions of its kind in this country. It employs 1,300 men, and the stock is owned in the one family. They are merged in themselves in so far as that goes. I do not believe that they will think of merging with any other company. They are too large a concern for that, and their purpose for asking for this legislation is as it has been here explained.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know the company very well, because they have a branch in my own city of St. John. I know they are a thoroughly respectable and exceedingly enterprising company.

Mr. BEATTIE. Oh, very.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The only reason I rose was, that there would seem to be a principle involved in this first section. If we pass it as it is, it may be difficult to refuse similar powers to other companies, which were ostensibly seeking to create mergers, and it is giving parliamentary recognition to the principle that it is quite right for mergers to be created in this way. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Beattie), desires to have the Bill go through as it is, I do not intend to press my views.

Mr. BEATTIE. Would the hon. minister like to see the letter; it will give him the facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, please send over the letter. The object, as I understand it, is to enable them to take an interest in another company, which might act as agents for the sale of their goods.

Mr. BEATTIE. That is entirely the object of the Bill. They have an agent in almost every city at the present time, and instead of sending out an agent, they thought it better to take a firm who is in business in a certain place, and give them entire control of their productions there. The McClary company is very extensively engaged in the manufacturing business, and they thought it would push their business better and lead to greater enterprise if they adopted this system. The McClary firm as every one knows, is an old firm, a wealthy firm, and a respectable firm.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not press my objection, Mr. Chairman.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ALBERTA RAILWAY AND IRRIGATION COMPANY.

Further consideration in Committee of the whole of Bill (No. 51) respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—Mr. Crothers.

Mr. BEATTIE.

Mr. HERRON. I move:

That in section 1, subsection 3, the words 'Spring Coolie' be stricken out and the word 'Cardstone' be substituted therefor.

Mr. FIELDING. Is the promoter of the Bill satisfied with the amendment?

Mr. HERRON. Yes, it has been agreed to between the promoter of the Bill and myself.

Mr. FIELDING. In that case, I suppose there would be no objection.

Mr. HERRON. I would also move:

That in the second line of subsection 3, after the word 'westerly' the words be added: 'at, in, or near the town of Pincher Creek.'

Then the subclause will read:

From a point between Cardstone and Mountain View, westerly, at, in, or near the town of Pincher Creek to a point on the line of the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. FIELDING. Has that also been agreed to?

Mr. HERRON. Yes, it has been agreed to by all parties.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ALGOMA CENTRAL AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 62) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill to the provisions of section 3:

The conversion of fifty thousand shares of the capital stock of the company from common stock into five per cent non-cumulative preferred stock, and the issue of such shares as such preferred stock, is declared to be valid and binding upon the company and the shareholders thereof, according to the terms of such conversion and issue.

I would like to know if the committee had information that that was agreed to by all the holders of common stock. This section makes valid a priority which is given to 50,000 shares of the common stock. That of course is unusual, and would I think, be improper unless all the holders of common stock were parties to it. I would suggest that progress be reported on this Bill so that we can get information on that point.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 76) respecting the Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Bay of Quinte Railway Company.—Mr. Currie (Prince Edward).

Bill (No. 20) respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Canadian Northern Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Lancaster.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Indian River Railway Company.—Mr. Turcotte (Quebec).

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—Mr. Hunt.

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Lafortune.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Conmee.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Peoples Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 113) to incorporate the Dominion Development Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Mr. KING. With reference to the question raised by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) before recess regarding pensions on the Grand Trunk railway, I said that my impression was that during the discussion between the parties, at the time of the negotiation, the matter of pensions was not mentioned, but the leader of the men declared that in that matter it was a matter of indifference to them what attitude the company might take. I took occasion during recess to look up one or two documents, and I find in the Toronto 'Star,' of August 4 last, the following interview given to a 'Star' reporter by Mr. Murdock, who was one of the representatives of the employees concerned:

PENSIONS DON'T BOTHER THE MEN, SAYS MR. MURDOCK—'TWAS A GIFT OF THE COMPANY AND MEN LOSE NOTHING. THEY CAN DO WITHOUT IT.

'What about the restorations of the pensions?' Mr. Murdock was asked.

'We are not paying any attention to that pension talk,' was the reply. 'It was not touched on in the final settlement, as you know. The aim of most of these pension schemes is to test the fidelity of the men to the union. In the strike there it was easily seen what effect it had on the allegiance of the men to their union, was it not? If railways will pay proper wages to their men there will be no necessity for these pension schemes at all.

'If the Grand Trunk sees fit to pension its employees for years of faithful service, well and good. If, now, after the strike it chooses to be vindictive, and to say 'because for fifteen days you left our service we will disregard all your years of faithful work, and cancel your pension,' well, we have nothing to say as to that.'

In the Toronto 'Globe' of August 5, I find the following interview of Mr. Berry, who was the representative of the other organization involved in the strike:

CONFERENCE OF STRIKE LEADERS.

The object of Mr. Berry's visit to Montreal is to meet in conference with Mr. Murdock and the other strike leaders, and to go over the terms of settlement with a view to issuing an official explanation to the men. Also to arrange about the strike pay, and generally wind up the strike campaign. Mr. Berry was accompanied by Messrs. Todd, Dodge and Curtiss.

SAYS PENSIONS ARE A FAKE.

'I am not particularly concerned about the pensions,' said Mr. Berry, in response to another query. 'I believe that the company have the option of granting or refusing them. I have always looked upon pensions as a fake devised to deceive the workers. I believe in the men receiving a proper salary and being independent of any consideration such as pensions.' Mr. Berry also expressed himself as satisfied with the way in which the men were being taken back. He was not surprised at what the company officials were saying, and he dismissed their arguments with the advice to the men and the public not to take any notice of what the company said.

This came as a surprise to me. Messrs. Garretson & Lee, who were negotiating for the men, did not bring up the question of pension at all, and the other leaders took a stand in conversation, not unlike what they appear to have publicly taken in the interview I have quoted here. Speaking this afternoon my remarks may have seemed to imply that Messrs. Garretson & Lee also took the same stand in regard to pensions. I am not quite sure in regard to that, it may be they said nothing about that. As to the other men, dealing so far as Canada is concerned, the position they took was similar to the position they gave out in these interviews to the public.

In regard to the Springhill strike, to which reference was made by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), while the strike took place notwithstanding the report of the board which investigated it, nevertheless, the report of the board has had an effect on the situation which ought

to be helpful at the present time, in bringing the matter to a termination. The three members of the board were, Mr. Justice Longley, of Halifax, Mr. Archibald, of Halifax, and Mr. E. B. Paul, M.P.P. They agreed in the following, before the strike took place:

Under the circumstances your board cannot help recognizing that the only rational policy to be pursued by all parties concerned, is one of conciliation and forbearance in order that this large and important industry may not be compelled to cease operations, with most far-reaching and disastrous consequences to all, including the business men of the town. Heavy loses have been already entailed by twenty-two strikes which have exhausted the energies and wasted the resources of the company. In the judgment of the board, the present is not a time to agitate for changes, but rather a time a common effort should be made to improve the situation and secure the permanence of the industry.

Your board saw tokens during the somewhat lengthy investigation of the matters in dispute that unpleasant feelings, if not distinct hostility, existed between a large number of employees and the management. It would perhaps be invidious to attempt to place the responsibility for this, but the board feel it their duty to bring this state of affairs to the attention of the directors of the company in a formal manner by means of this report.

This board recommends the directors to make a careful investigation into this unpleasant feature of existing relations with the hope that they may be able to adopt such a policy or make such changes as will prevent the possibility of this unfortunate condition prevailing in the future.

In this report of the board then, attention was drawn to the fact that it was an inopportune time to bring on the strike, and if a strike did take place, it was likely to last a long time, and do considerable injury to the community, and also that evidently there was something in the personality of those who had to do with the management of affairs, that was in part responsible for the continuous friction, and the board suggested that the directors should look into that matter. The directors have looked into this, and I understand that the former manager is no longer manager at Springhill, his position has been filled by the appointment of Mr. Butler, formerly deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, in connection with this government. Therefore, in so far as the element of personality may have had an influence on the situation—and my own opinion is altogether in accord with that of the board, and also with that of Mr. Acland, who later investigated the situation—that factor has been removed, and it would therefore seem that the present is at least an opportune time for the men who may be still out, to go and negotiate with the new manager, Mr. Butler, and see if it is not possible to come to some sort of a settlement. As I said this afternoon, I spoke to Mr. Butler only a day or two ago, and Mr. Butler said he would be glad to have a talk with the men who are out. He also said that he would like me to state, if I had an opportunity of doing so in public, that so far as he was concerned in the management of these mines, he would not yield on the question of recognition. I think it only fair, that the parties in the dispute should know that fact, that the manager has stated he will close the mines before he will yield on that point, and I feel that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), could not render a greater service to his riding than to go down there with the knowledge which he has of the situation, and see if it is not possible himself to point out to the parties involved what the meaning and the ultimate probable issue will be of their continuing as they are at present, without endeavouring to get together and end what has been altogether a lamentable industrial dispute.

Inasmuch as these two strikes at Springhill and on the Grand Trunk railway have been discussed a good deal, and attention has been devoted to them in this parliament, I think it is only right, in order to give the country and the members of this House, a true impression as to the service which the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act has rendered this country, that I should attempt to give the House, in a few words a statement of what has been actually accomplished under that Act. In the first place, I would draw attention to the fact that the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act was enacted about four years ago. During that time, there have been altogether 100 boards applied for under that Act. In 91 out of the 100 cases, which have been referred to boards for settlement, strikes have been prevented, and in only 9 cases have strikes ensued. In other words, this legislation has been the means of averting over 90 per cent of the strikes which would otherwise have taken place in the Dominion in industries in the nature of public utilities. There are two ways of verifying these figures. If we compare the record of disputes which took place in the industries in the nature of public utilities for the four years prior to this legislation, with the record which has since been enacted, it will be found that the statistics verify what is given here as the result of the operations of this Act, that, as I have already said, in the industries in the nature of public utilities over 90 per cent of the strikes have been averted. Then there is the actual showing based on the sworn statement of the parties. For ten years the department has been gathering statistics of strikes and lock outs in Canada. It has been possible from these

figures, and by comparison with similar statistics in other countries, to find the average duration of strikes. In Canada for the last 10 years the average number of working days lost in each strike amounted to something like 24. In some cases the strikes lasted much longer, in other cases a shorter time, but 24 days seems to be the average. The men involved in the disputes that would otherwise have given rise to strikes, numbered 99,542, in other words, almost 100,000 men have been involved in these disputes that have been settled by boards and in which no strike has taken place. If we assume that the average wage for the men employed in these industries thus affected was $2.50 a day, and that in the cases where there have been settlements had there been strikes, the strikes would have been of the same average duration as in the case of other strikes, there has been saved through this legislation to the workingmen of Canada, in wages alone, a sum not less than $5,972,520; or in round figures $6,000,000 has been saved in wages to the workingmen of this country through the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. I am not just sure as to how one can calculate the amount saved in profits, but if we assume that an employer would receive in profits 10 per cent of the amount which has been spent in wages to his employees, then there has been saved to employers in profits, in round figures, something like $600,000. If we try to form an estimate of the value of goods that would have been produced with that amount of labour, and with the capital that would have been employed, the smallest figure at which it could be placed, would be something like $10,000,000. That is to say, had strikes taken place where settlements have been effected and had these strikes lasted twenty-four days, commodities to the value of $10,000,000 would not have been produced, which have been produced. So, taking the inside estimate, the amount that has been saved to the workmen in wages is $6,000,000, the amount which has been saved to the employer is $600,000, and the amount saved in commodities that have been produced which otherwise would not have been produced is $10,000,000, or in round figures, something like $16,600,000 has been saved to this country by that legislation, and I might add the total cost of administering the Act, including all the expenses of the boards, has not exceeded in these four years $80,000.

That, I would point out, is only the monetary side of it. These industries to which I have referred are industries in the nature of public utilities. They are industries upon which the other industries depend, they are industries upon which the happiness and welfare of the community depend. Take the strike at Lethbridge a few years ago; there you had families freezing in their homes for want of coal. Take a strike on a railway and you have something that influences the whole community. In all these cases the community, and all that goes with it, in so far as its relation to the industry is concerned, has been saved the inconvenience and the loss which would otherwise have taken place. While attention has been drawn to the fact that we have had in Canada in the last four years one or two very serious strikes one should not lose sight of the fact that there has been saved to this country the vast sum of money and the vast amount of disorder which are indicated by the figures I have already given.

There is one other feature that I want to note in connection with the working out of this legislation, and that is the result of strikes that have taken place after the boards have given their findings and where the findings of the boards have not been accepted by the parties. As members of the House know, the parties to an industrial dispute in the industries covered by this Act are not allowed to strike or to lock out until the matter has been referred to a board. If they are not satisfied with the finding of the board then they may strike or lock out, and the returns indicate that while in 91 cases they have not struck, but accepted the findings of the board, in nine cases they have struck, and it is interesting to ask what has been the effect in the cases where they have gone on strike. The records show that in every one of those cases they have either returned to work on the terms which the board had granted or upon terms not as good as those which the board had granted. In no case have the working men who have gone on strike in Canada since this legislation was passed obtained better terms in consequence of their striking than they would have obtained had they accepted at the outset the findings of the board. Then, I think it will be interesting as well to note, the relative position of the different industries concerned.

Mr. LENNOX. That would indicate, as I understood the minister to suggest by reading it, that it would be wise for the employees in all cases to accept the finding of the board in so far as experience has gone?

Mr. KING. That is decidedly the opinion I have. My feeling is that this parliament, by enacting this legislation, has provided a better means of securing what is fair and just to the workingmen than it is possible for them to get in consequence of a strike. I do not say that the findings of the board are always the best thing that could possibly be obtained, but I do think

and I say this, as a result of a careful watching of the industrial disputes which have taken place in Canada in the last ten years, the workingmen will gain more in the long run by accepting the findings of the board than by going out on strike.

Mr. RHODES. The impression of the minister is that the Act has been successful in its operation from one view point. What is the view point of the labour men of the country?

Mr. KING. I think the labour men of the country will agree absolutely with what I am saying at this moment.

Mr. RHODES. I think the minister has an idea of what I refer to. I do not know that he has received them, but, speaking for my own constituency alone, I have received resolutions from all the lodges in the county calling for the repeal of the Act. Has the minister received any of these resolutions from Nova Scotia or elsewhere?

Mr. KING. I am well aware of the case to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rhodes) refers. Unfortunately, there has been, in the province of Nova Scotia, during the last year or two, a great deal of industrial strife. As the hon. gentleman knows that strife has come about largely through the endeavour of one union to get into possession and to be recognized, and the struggle that has been going on there has been largely between two different organizations rather than between employers and workingmen.

Mr. RHODES. That is true as affecting Nova Scotia, but has the minister received similar resolutions or requests from other provinces?

Mr. KING. I am informed that all the communications that we have received of the nature to which my hon. friend makes reference have been from lodges of the United Mine Workers' Association, the organization that is concerned in the difficulties in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. RHODES. But have they all come from Nova Scotia?

Mr. KING. They have come from the lodges of this organization in other parts of the Dominion, and it would appear therefore, that in so far as the united mine workers are concerned many of them are not satisfied with the Act. But, I would point out that, while that is true, I know some members of the United Mine Workers' Association who are strongly of the opinion that the Act is the best piece of legislation that has been enacted in the interest of workers. There is a difference of view between them in that regard, but I can refer my hon. friend to the stand taken by the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress which represents the union has pretty generally in the Dominion and which body strongly endorsed this legislation, and also to the communications which I read to this House last year from the representatives of the several railway organizations in the Dominion also endorsing this legislation.

Mr. RHODES. I may say that in the report of the Deputy Minister of Labour with regard to conditions in Nova Scotia he pointed out that politics enter quite largely into the trouble down there, and that is illustrated very forcibly by the fact that while the United Mine Workers' in Nova Scotia are entirely opposed to the Act, and are calling for its repeal, the other body of organized labour, the provincial Workingmens' Association are taking a stand in its favour, but, it is interesting to note that while this organization is now at war with the United Mine Workers', at a meeting in Halifax in 1907, the Grand Council of the Provincial Workers' Association unanimously passed a resolution calling for the repeal of this Act in so far as it affected the province of Nova Scotia. While the minister is discussing this question I may say that the great grievance they have in so far as the Act is concerned is that there is no compensating feature in the Act to make good the loss to the men of the thirty days which they must work before they can go on strike. Under the Act there is no compensation coming to them at all. It simply means that the management receives 30 days' notice that there is going to be war which means that the management is able to fortify itself and consequently the efforts of the miners by means of a strike prove largely abortive, after the 30 day period. That is the great difficulty.

Mr. KING. If my hon. friend had read the Act carefully he will see that the company is not allowed to change the conditions during that time.

Mr. RHODES. Unfortunately they do.

Mr. KING. If they do, then my hon. friend and those interested in the welfare of the men should point to the clause of the Act which gives the men redress, and under which the companies are liable to prosecution if they take steps of that kind. The Hillcrest Coal Company of Alberta did lock out its men on one occasion without giving notice, and they were fined under the Act.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). How much were they fined?

Mr. KING. I really forget at the moment.

Mr. RHODES. That is all right if it is a lockout, but if the company should choose to say that they closed down be-

cause business was dull, or because the plant calls for alterations and so on, it is a simple matter to have, in effect, a lock-out.

Mr. KING. Granting all that, they would have that power if the Act was not on the statute-books at all. But what the Act does give the workingmen which they never had before is the right to put their own man on the board, and he has the power to summon before him the members of the company by which those whom he represents are employed, to examine their books, and get a complete statement before the public, in order to show who was right and who was wrong, and thus bring to bear upon the situation public opinion properly shaped and properly defined which is of all factors the strongest in bringing about justice in these industrial disputes.

Mr. MADDIN. Does the minister wish the House to understand that employees may summon their employers to disclose their books, their sources of revenue, their cost of manufacture, their market price, and lay it before the public. I am sure he must know that the members of the board alone can receive that, and that they are sworn to secrecy. The public are not allowed to know that and quite properly they should not know it.

Mr. KING. What I stated was this—

Mr. MADDIN. The Minister of Labour did say that this Act empowered workingmen to appoint one of their own number to the board.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. MADDIN. To summon their employers and have the employers produce their books?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. MADDIN. And lay it before the public?

Mr. KING. No, I did not say that.

Mr. MADDIN. The Act does not make any such provision, and it would be very unwise if it did.

Mr. KING. I have the Act before me, and it provides, just what I said, that a body of workingmen, where a board is granted, may name any workingman they please, provided he has not a financial interest in the dispute, to represent them on the hearing, and that man once appointed has all the powers of a judge in the matter of summoning an employer, compelling him to produce his books, to show what profit he is making, what wages he paid, what is his output, and all the rest of it. This is the power under the Act, and it is a great power to give to any body of men ; a power very much greater than that of simply going out on strike and waiting while they are losing their wages day by day to see whether their endurance is stronger than that of some great corporation. I think that an enlightened view of the industrial situation will lead one inevitably to see that strikes are the last thing in the world which workingmen want. If there is any means whereby justice can be secured to the parties without that extreme measure, it should be resorted to. The record which I have given to the House to-night goes to show that our legislation which was inaugurated by this parliament as a whole, has done very great service to the working classes, and to all classes in this country. To cite only one instance in addition, take the case of street railway strikes. In the period of four years before this Act was passed there were six or seven strikes on the street railways of Canada, and they were among the worst we had in the Dominion. They entailed considerable loss, and the community suffered very considerably. Now, since this Act was passed there have been seven boards in the large cities, Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton, Winnipeg and Vancouver, and there has been only one street railway strike in four years, that being the strike which took place in Winnipeg a few weeks ago, when the men did not accept the award. The result of that strike is well known to the House. There is a concrete instance, taking only one industry, showing the immense service this legislation has been not only to the workers but to the public as well. I think that is a matter with regard to which we can afford to have a little national pride.

I should like to put on record a comparison between the effect of our legislation, and the effect of the legislation in New Zealand, and New South Wales. A great deal has been said in the world at different times about the effect of the legislation in both these countries where compulsory arbitration laws exist ; it is sometimes said that there are no strikes there, and that they have found a panacea for these industrial difficulties which no other nation has found. When Mr. Beddoe, our Canadian trade commissioner went to New Zealand, I asked him if he would let me have a report in regard to strikes there in so far as he could get information and verify it on the spot. On August the 22nd last in a report which he sent to the department he gives a list of 16 strikes as having occurred in New Zealand within the preceding 18 months. If you make an allowance for the difference in population between the two countries, the strikes in New Zealand would amount to under their system of compulsory arbitration, 96, as

compared with 69 in Canada during a corresponding period. We had only 69 strikes in 1908, and if they had the same population they would have had 96. It is also of interest to note the effect of the enforcement of their law. Under the compulsory arbitration law the means resorted to by the state is to penalize employers, and employees when they do not abide by the findings. Suppose we had a similar law in Canada the effect would have been as follows : Had prosecutions for infringement occurred in Canada to a degree proportionate with the larger population of the Dominion there would have been during the last fiscal year no fewer than 9,672 employers, and 5,840 employees fined in our courts ; a total of 16,514 cases. This does not take into account the very considerable number of prosecutions in which convictions failed, so that it is not unfair to place the number of prosecutions on which the courts have been compelled to pass at 20,000. This comparison is made on the basis of 8 to 1 ; the population of New Zealand being in round numbers 1,000,000, and that of Canada 8,000,000. New Zealand has had 16 years experience of the Act, and this record obtains in the latest year, so that a country newly entering on similar legislation might reasonably expect to find the proportion of similar prosecutions higher. Then, New South Wales, which has also attempted legislation along compulsory arbitration lines, has had an experience hardly less satisfactory than that of New Zealand.

Mr. Harris Weinstock who was recently sent as a special commissioner from the state of California to visit Australia, in a special report with regard to New South Wales, states that the following figures as to strikes were given to him by the registrar of that State, having been taken from that officer's private file. In 1901, 2; in 1902, 12 ; in 1903, 11 ; in 1904, 11 ; in 1905, 36 ; in 1906. 29 ; in 1907, 52 ; in 1908—in the first three months only—33.

It is worth while comparing these figures for a moment, representing a state under compulsory arbitration, with the Canadian figures for the two years 1908-09, under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. The strikes in Canada during each of those years were 69 only, a total of 138 for two years. The strikes in New South Wales for 1906 and 1907, two years nearest the Canadian years (the New South Wales figures for 1908 are incomplete, though very high so far as they go) totalled 81. The population of Canada is in round figures about five times that of New South Wales. Were our strikes proportionate in number with those of New South Wales they would have reached during the two years the very high figure of 405 or over 200 a year, a higher figure than has been shown in any of the ten years during which a record has been kept in Canada.

Mr. RHODES. Has the minister any statistics to show the percentage of strikes before the enactment of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act as against those since?

Mr. KING. Yes, certainly. The record has been kept in Canada for nearly ten years, and the statements that I have just been giving to the House are based upon the figures which are to be found in the annual report of the department; and if hon. members will take the trouble to verify what I have given to the House, they will find that since that Act passed we have in those industries to which the Act applies cut out some 90 per cent of industrial disputes by virtue of the legislation as compared with those which occurred before.

Just one further word in regard to the Grand Trunk strike to which my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has referred. It appears that some hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavouring to hold the government responsible for all that has taken place since the settlement of that dispute. To give the government no credit, or as little as possible, for the settlement, but to make it responsible for everything not entirely satisfactory that has taken place since. In other words because two ministers were present and did their best to bring the parties together and to effect a settlement they would make the government liable for the carrying out of any agreement that might be arrived at under the operation of the Industrial Disputes Act. If the help of the state to bring about a settlement of an industrial dispute is to make the state responsible for everything the parties do in working out that settlement, that is imposing an unwarranted responsibility on the government and going a length which I do not think this parliament would approve. In November 1906 there was a serious strike at Lethbridge in Alberta. The mines had been closed for some months, and the people of the prairie provinces were facing a fuel famine at the beginning of the winter. I was sent out as deputy minister to try to effect an agreement between the parties. An agreement was arrived at upon every point except on the matter of discrimination as between union and non-union men. On that point a compromise was finally affected, both the men and the company agreeing to a clause which I drafted as representing, fairly I thought, the view of both. But we could not get the decision of the company for some little time after the men had given theirs, as to the acceptance of the proposed clause. After waiting some days, I

received the following telegram from the manager of the company :

The managing director still thinks our clause fair to all parties, but under circumstances existing in country is willing to accept your substitute clause provided all other conditions are accepted.

In reporting to this government on that settlement I made this statement:

I showed this wire to the representatives of the men with whom I had gone to Indianapolis, gave them an assurance in the name of the government that the company had accepted the clause which I had drafted and the conditions agreed to at the joint conference, and an hour later the strike was declared at an end.

I mention this case because it is a parallel one to the intervention of the government in the settlement of the Grand Trunk strike. The parties to the Lethbridge strike had been negotiating for a settlement. The miners on the one side and the company on the other had come to a final agreement. It was an agreement between these two parties. But what the miners wanted was that the clause referred to should be known publicly to have been accepted by both sides; and I said to them, as an official who had been sent to endeavour to bring about a settlement: 'I will vouch for that; I will see that there shall be no misrepresentation on that point'; and on that pledge being given, the strike was declared at an end. What happened? The mines opened up, work was resumed, and there was no further trouble there for some little time. But what hon. gentlemen opposite contend is that if some trouble had taken place subsequently, the government of this country should have been held responsible, simply because an officer sent by the government had witnessed a term in the agreement, and was prepared to vouch for that being one of the terms of the settlement. That is what hon. gentlemen opposite are attempting to do in the case of the Grand Trunk strike. Now, the Grand Trunk settlement was arrived at between the parties themselves, Mr. Hays representing the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the one side, and Messrs. Garretson and Lee representing the men on the other side. These parties did the negotiating. The hon. Minister of Militia and myself spent two or three days doing our level best to get these parties to meet together, and when they did meet, to keep them together until they could arrive at some definite settlement. Feeling was running very high. The company had refused to negotiate with these leaders. Here is a telegram which I received from Mr. Murdock:

Messrs. Garretson and Lee held conference with Mr. Hays to-day without result.

The Canadian leaders had been trying to get a conference, but had been unsuccessful, and they sent to the United States for these two men, who were the heads of their organization, brought them to Montreal, and sought a further conference, but without any result. When Sir Frederick and I reached Montreal, that was the situation. The parties were unwilling to meet together, and we had to bring all the pressure we possibly could upon them to bring them together; and when we got them together we had to do our best to keep them together for a couple of days until we got the terms of the settlement threshed out. But the terms of the settlement were terms as between the parties themselves, not between the government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Railway Company or between the government of Canada and the men. We were there as ministers of the Crown prepared to vouch for the terms that were in that agreement should they ever be questioned. That position we are prepared to take up to the present. How was our action in that regard viewed by the men themselves? Let their own records speak. I have here a volume of the Railroad Trainmen of September, 1910. In an article on the Grand Trunk railway strike at page 297, there is the following:

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). The hon. minister has said that he and the Minister of Militia took an active part in bringing about a settlement, and I would like to ask him if he thinks that either of the parties broke any of the terms and conditions of the settlement arrived at ?

Mr. KING. Well, I would say this, that if I had been one of the parties to the dispute, I would not have carried out the settlement in the way it has been, but every man can do as I have done, draw his own conclusion. I am prepared to state the terms of settlement, but every one is competent to judge for himself as to whether they have been carried out or not. In this article to which I have referred, I find the following:

The strike on the Grand Trunk railway system which was commenced July 18 under the direction of the Order of Railway Conductors and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, was ended on August 2 at six p.m., when the agreement was signed by Mr. Hays, for the Grand Trunk railway, and the committee of the Order of Railway Conductors and Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen for the men.

The strike was not ended by my colleague, the Minister of Militia and myself signing any agreement, but by this agreement being signed by President Hays and the representatives of the men. Here was the position at the time of the settlement,

as described in this article, by the leaders of these organizations: Referring to the situation prior to the settlement the article goes on to say:

The company, however, was able to secure enough strike breakers to enable it to run 148 freight trains within the 24 hours ending at six p.m., August 2, handling an average of 22 cars per train. While this average of trains run was far below normal conditions, a start had been made in the freight service, and it was only a question of time when the entire service would be resumed.

I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, when they are endeavouring to saddle the responsibility on the government, of the non-reinstatement of some of the men—I think the number is around 200, out of a total of 4,000 involved in this dispute—to bear in mind this statement I have just read of the men themselves. According to this statement, it was only a question of time, when the entire service would be resumed by the company. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether, in view of this statement, considerable service was not rendered to the employees by a settlement being effected. Instead of only about 200 men being out of employment to-day, there would have been considerably more had that strike been continued.

Passenger service on the main line was but slightly impaired at any time during the strike, while the branch passenger line service was demoralized for about a week.

That is what 'The Trainmen' say. The article continues:

The settlement includes the return to the service within 90 days of every employee who left it with the exception of those who can be proven guilty of illegal acts against the company. The settlement was effected principally through the efforts of the Minister of Labour, the Hon. Mackenzie King, assisted by Sir Frederick Borden, Minister of Militia, to whom full credit is given for their efforts in bringing about the settlement.

My hon. colleague and myself are generously credited with having brought about a settlement, but the terms of the settlement were agreed to by the parties themselves. The parties, I believe, would not have got together, if we had not worked as we did, and the fight would have gone on until the railway company and the workingmen and the country as well, would all have suffered tremendous loss.

Then in the Railway Conductor's Magazine, published by the other organization, I find at page 718, the following:

In connection with this settlement, the thanks of the Canadian membership and that of our entire organization as well, are due and tendered to the Hon. Wm. L. Mackenzie King, Minister of Labour, and Sir Frederick Borden, Minister of Militia, for their untiring efforts in behalf of the men, for the influence they brought to bear upon the Grand Trunk Railway management contributed in no small degree in producing the satisfactory result and the ending of the controversy.

That statement goes to show that the efforts of the ministers contributed to bringing about a settlement, but the men themselves are responsible for the settlement finally reached.

Similarly, in a pamphlet issued on the Grand Trunk Railway Central Vermont strike, by W. G. Lee, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, I find at page 10, the following statement:

The ministers of the Crown and particularly the Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Minister of Labour, and Sir Frederick Borden, Minister of Militia, were largely instrumental in bringing about a settlement of the strike. They kept in close touch with the strike throughout its duration and made the most of every opportunity to bring the two parties together.

There was the service that we had been able to render, but the settlement had to be effected by the parties themselves, when they came together.

They are due high praise for their interest in the welfare of the striking employees and of those affected by the interruption of the company's traffic. Their efforts in behalf of the men are appreciated by both organizations and by officers and individual members of the brotherhood.

Then Mr. Garretson, president of the Order of Railway Conductors, sent the following communication from Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on August 10, to myself, and I believe sent a similar one to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Militia:

Cedar Rapids, Iowa,
August 10, 1910.

Hon. William L. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—I take this opportunity of expressing to you on behalf of not only myself and my associate officers, but of the organization at large and the more especially the Canadian membership thereof, the profound obligation under which we lie for the services of yourself and your associate minister in connection with the settlement of the strike upon the Grand Trunk and the Central Vermont railways. The ready recognition by you of the justification for the claims of the men on those properties and the exercise of personal and governmental influence toward securing a termination of the strike on those properties will not be forgotten by our membership and I sincerely trust that those most directly affected, namely, our Canadian citizens, will, in the future, make that appreciation thoroughly apparent.

In conclusion, kindly accept my expressions of highest personal regard, and believe me,

Sincerely and gratefully yours,
(Signed) A. B. GARRETSON,
President.

I would ask permission to read just one further communication, which I hope will be a satisfactory answer to my hon. friends opposite. This is signed by Mr. S. N. Berry, vice-president of the Order of Railway Conductors, and James Murdoch, vice-president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, and is dated, Windsor Hotel Ottawa, December 13, 1910 :

Windsor Hotel,
Ottawa, Dec. 13, 1910.

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In further reference to conference held yesterday between the Premier, the honourable Minister of Railways and yourself with a committee of unreinstated Grand Trunk employees, accompanied by the undersigned, at which meeting the facts in connection with the Grand Trunk Company's failure to equitably apply terms of settlement made when strike was called off were discussed.

The committee desire to assure you, and through you the government, that they deprecate the attitude taken by certain gentlemen (presumably well intentioned) whereby an effort is being made to hold the government responsible for the failure to apply the terms of settlement made.

I hope hon. gentlemen will keep that sentence in mind when they try to saddle on the government every failure on the part of either of the parties to live up to the terms of the settlement.

We appreciate fully the assistance given both at the time of the strike, and since, by the government in its efforts to bring about on behalf of the Canadian public and the citizens of Canada who were involved in the strike a settlement, and an equitable carrying out of the terms of that settlement. It is definitely understood by the men interested and the undersigned that it is not on account of any failure on the part of the government that the present unfortunate situation obtains, but that the existing conditions are rather the result of the obstinate disregard for contract obligations on the part of Grand Trunk officials.

The assistance given so far in a conciliatory and mediating way by representatives of the government is much appreciated, but the committee would further request that if consistent the government should take further means, if possible, either by the appointment of a Royal Commission or in some other consistent manner to enforce from the officials of the Grand Trunk an acceptable carrying out of the agreement made and understandings reached.

It appears to the committee that the government can consistently lend its further aid in straightening out this matter when the fact is recalled that the unreinstated Grand Trunk employees who are asking for the carrying out of the agreement made, are placed in such a position on account of the fact that aliens or American citizens who are present in charge of Grand Trunk affairs, have repudiated an agreement made with Grand Trunk employees and an understanding reached with ministers of the Crown.

It is insufficient for those American officials to hide behind the statement that they have carried out their agreement as 'acts are more forceful than words' and the facts are that more than 200 reputable Canadian citizens who have not been guilty of any overt act are being wrongfully held out of service to satisfy the vindictive and retaliatory desires of officers in charge.

We would again assure you that if the government can consistently arrange to take any further action in this matter either by the appointment of a Royal Commission or other investigation, that the employees will be governed by any decisions reached as a result of such impartial investigation.

Will you kindly advise at your earliest convenience as to any further action taken or contemplated by the government.

We remain, very truly yours,
(Signed) S. N. BERRY,
Vice-President O. R. C.
(Signed) JAMES MURDOCK,
Vice-President B. of R. T.

There is the attitude that the men involved in this strike take towards the intervention of the government. And I must say that is the attitude I would expect workingmen, with the sense of honour that I know workingmen to have, to take, in view of the service that was performed. They know what was done to help in bringing about the termination of that strike, and, being grateful, they deprecate, naturally and rightly, the attitude of gentlemen for political reasons trying to make out that the government in some way is responsible for any incident or failure on the part of one of the parties to live up, in the way which might be expected, to the terms of that settlement.

Mr. LENNOX. I have something to deprecate too. I deprecate that the minister (Mr. King) should think it necessary to try to provoke difficulty for himself in getting his estimates through. He must be Irish, I think. He seems to throw down a challenge in order that a quarrel may be provoked. I would not speak at this time if it were not that the minister particularly challenged me by referring to me directly. The minister is on the wrong track. If I might use a vulgar expression which, probably, he would hardly appreciate, he is barking up the wrong tree.

Mr. KING. I am not aware of having challenged the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) in any way.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman (Mr. King) began his remarks with a reference to the hon. member for South Simcoe—I take it that he must have meant me.

Mr. KING. If I may be allowed, I think the hon. gentleman misunderstood. My reason for mentioning the Grand Trunk

strike was that it was referred to before we got into Committee of Supply. In my remarks I did not have any personal reference to any member of the House whatever.

Mr. LENNOX. We will see. 'Hansard' to-morrow will be our sufficient record as to what I say. The hon. gentleman (Mr. King) started by referring to the hon. member for South Simcoe, and he proceeded then to deal for a moment or so with the Grand Trunk strike. Then he wandered off to Lethbridge, and excused himself for that excursion by saying that the Lethbridge situation was illustrative of the position in the Grand Trunk strike. Then he wandered off to somewhere in the United States. I wrote a letter during the time he was discussing that matter, so cannot profess to have followed what he said. But he did try to give the House the impression that hon. members on this side, notably myself as chief sinner, were attacking the government in reference to the Grand Trunk strike. Speaking for myself—and others can speak for themselves —I believe that all I have said about the Grand Trunk strike in this House at any time has been in the form of two sets of questions put upon the Order Paper and the two or three questions that I asked this afternoon. And at that time I told the hon. gentleman distinctly through Mr. Speaker, who was then in the Chair, that I did not propose to pursue this matter until I had knowledge of the facts. The minister has thought fit to delay the passage of his estimates for several hours by bringing before the House—hoping, I suppose, to bring it before the country, but I do not think he will be successful in that—a lot of matter very eulogistic of the Minister of Labour. That we would naturally expect. Who can watch the course of the Minister of Labour and fail to be his admirer?—the gigantic work he is doing, and so on.

Mr. MADDIN. If the hon. member will pardon me, I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, if the number of members present constitute a quorum? I have seen estimates before Committee of Supply when there were more members on the government side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I find there are twenty-one members present—a quorum.

Mr. MADDIN. Including one hon. gentleman who has just entered?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Labour (Mr. King) has not altogether emptied the House, and we can proceed. I would suggest to him that if we are to act harmoniously, he, at an early day, should discontinue his practice of to-night. We would take it for granted, if the minister would let us do so, that he is doing well. I will take it for granted, at all events, that he is doing as well as he can—that he intends to do well. But it is not necessary that the time of this House should be taken up in placing on record, and thereby burdening 'Hansard', with a lot of stuff that may prove to be mere twaddle to a great extent. The minister says he has the certificates of the men, and that they being actuated by a sense of honour, could not say anything else than that the government had done all it possibly could for them. The men have not spoken yet at all. Some representatives of theirs, who may or may not have acted well, have spoken, it is true. It is by the result of what I referred to this afternoon that we shall be able to judge whether these men did well or not. We cannot judge by these letters; we will judge by the facts and by the results. The minister is trving to crawl out of it already. He says the government are not responsible: they intervened, it is true, but the men must take the responsibility through their agents, for the government was not their agent— that, I think, summarizes what the minister says. But the men know that the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Militia intervened. That is a guarantee—or ought to be a guarantee—to the men that their interests will be watched, and that they will not be thrown down. And if it turns out that the agreement entered into at Montreal between the representatives of the striking employees and the Grand Trunk railway was a gold brick; that the men thought they were getting an absolute and complete settlement of all difficulties, that the slate was being cleaned, that all differences were being removed, that they were being reinstated as if no strike had taken place, and that all would be reinstated except those guilty of violence—if it turns out that these men were thrown down, it will not redound to the credit of the government, but the government will be held responsible. That is what I want to say to the minister since he has challenged the position. And I want to tell him also that he intervened in this strike at a critical time. And he did not do much. All that he and the Minister of Militia did, as far as I can ascertain, was to get from the railway company finally a statement which they would not put in writing, that when they spoke of taking on these men as soon as possible, that meant that they would take them back within ninetv days. But what I am led to understand by the men themselves, whatever these representatives may have said to the minister is that they believed when that strike was being settled by the intervention of the government that they were to be restored to the same

positions they stood in at the time the strike was called. If it turns out that that is not the case, I for one, and I have a right to speak of it in this House, whatever the agents may say, will say that the government is not without blame in the matter. If it turns out, on the other hand, as I hope it will, that these men were to have been secured in all their rights and the Minister of Labour did not see to it that the agreement was broad enough to cover those rights, then too he will be responsible. If it can be placed in a better position than that I will be quite ready to say that I have no condemnation of the minister in that matter. I do not intend at this moment to make any charge of default on the part of the minister of any kind but, as I said this afternoon, when the proper time comes and when I have my facts, I will then, if they justify such a course, bring it up in the House.

Mr. RHODES. In response to an inquiry which I made of the minister this afternoon as to why it was that he intervened in the case of the Grand Trunk strike, and not at Springhill, the minister has stated that in the former case he had a request, and in the latter he had not. Practically that summarizes the distinction between the two strikes. That he did not interfere in the case of the Springhill strike or tender his services for the purpose of mediating between the parties because he was not requested to do so. It seems to me that for that very reason the minister ought to intervene, and I say this with the utmost deference and good will, and because I have the interests not necessarily of my own constituents but of labouring men throughout the country at heart, and am prepared to believe that the Minister of Labour has their interests at heart as well. My contention is that if the Department of Labour is to be of full benefit to the people of this country it must exercise, if I may use the term, its plenary powers to go, and attempt to adjust differences wherever they may occur. If there is a fight on between individuals they get rather hot headed, they are not amenable to reason, and they battle away until one or the other wins, it is a question of the survival of the fittest, and the man having the greatest brute force wins, but that does not necessarily mean that the better side wins. What is true of individuals is true of organizations and of nations. When two nations resort to the arbitrament of war, the nation having the greatest number of soldiers, and the greatest financial resources wins out, but it does not follow that the nation having the right side of the quarrel wins. In the case of industrial disputes, where the parties are at daggers drawn, as at Springhill, it is perfectly natural that they will not ask some third party to intervene. I think the minister gave a very good reason why he should intervene in a remark he made with reference to the Grand Trunk strike. He said that no agreement would have been effected there had we, referring to himself and the Minister of Militia, not worked very hard. He goes to show by that fact alone that a third party coming in, not knowing either side of the dispute, and there only to bring the parties together, is able to accomplish a much greater work than can be done by the parties themselves. The minister was pleased to say that I could glorify myself if I could settle this strike. Allow me to say to him that there is a member of parliament covering every constituency in this Dominion, and that you could not have an industrial dispute without a member being affected. If you are going to place the responsibility of settling strikes on the members of parliament, why have a Minister of Labour at all? Otherwise the duties of the department are simply clerical, they consist in getting statistics, and publishing the 'Labour Gazette' which could be done by a staff of officials working under any other department. I did not like the attitude of the minister in attempting to make it appear that our efforts on this side were largely partisan. I did not see any attempt before the minister spoke on the part of members on this side to place the responsibility for the failure of the settlement of the Grand Trunk strike on the government.

Mr. KING. I was not referring to anything that took place in the committee, I was referring to previous discussions in the House when I spoke of these things.

Mr. RHODES. But a minister, a man clothed with authority, coming from a long distance away, can do a great deal towards the settlement of a strike, whereas a member of parliament, who happens to be on the ground, who may know the conditions, who is himself a representative of some one political party has not the same opportunity of doing effective work as the man from the outside, or the man occupying a higher office. If the minister is to act as negotiator only in cases where he is called on, we might as well dispense with his services altogether, because the parties could call in a judge or a member of parliament or a clergyman or a professor; but if we are to have the full benefit of a labour department, we should have a minister or a deputy or some competent man in the department prepared, wherever there is a labour dispute of any dimensions, to go to the scene of the trouble and stay there until a settlement in some form or another is effected. I hope that the minister will see his way clear without a request to go down to Springhill, and I may say that if there

is anything I can do I should be very happy to go along with him, because I believe in the interests of the men who are struggling there to-day, in the interests of the country, and of the community at large, if there is a possible means of settling that strike, it ought to be settled.

Mr. MADDIN. The Minister of Labour in his speech to-night has gone to some trouble to paint a very good picture of the Minister of Labour. Lord Macaulay, in his essay on Warren Hastings, describes a distinguished gentleman who sat to Lely the painter, and who said to him: Paint me as I am; if you leave out one scar or pimple I shall not pay you a penny. I am quite sure that when the distinguished gentleman who occupies the portfolio of labour had finished adorning himself to-night he had such a halo around his head as would astonish Michael the Archangel. He decked himself with a wreath that contained everything from roses to sunflowers. I would like to add to that wreath one thistle—only one—and I take it from a fellow countryman of his own, a good Scotch Liberal fellow newspaper man in the province of Nova Scotia. True his political faith was not always as good as it is at the present time. I refer to the Hon. Robert Drummond, member of the legislative council of Nova Scotia, and publisher of the maritime 'Mining Record.' There appears in an issue of that paper an article referring to a description of the Minister of Labour published in the Canadian 'Courier,' and I am quite sure that the minister cannot be held responsible for observations contained in the 'Courier.' But, these are the deductions and conclusions that the Hon. Robert Drummond drew from this article and published in his paper last August. He said:

> The 'Canadian Courier' in an article highly eulogistic of Hon. Mackenzie King refers to him as the 'boy minister.' No one dares to criticize any of Mr. King's actions without a swarm of liberal press bees swooping down on him. This raises a doubt in the minds of some, as to Mr. King's alleged towering abilities. If in the Department of Labour he has been a towering success, his works are all the praise he should need. We in Nova Scotia are not in a position to fairly criticise the boy minister. He has never shown us any of the tricks of his department. Perhaps we did not give him the right opportunity. We did give him one opportunity but then it may not have been to his liking, and that perhaps accounts for his not making much of a fist of it. Indeed the boy minister acted in a way which could not be called other than boyish. There was a strike at Springhill and Mr. King came all the way from Ottawa to fix it up. On coming to the junction he found that Mr. Cowans was in Halifax. Instead of taking the next train to Halifax he sent a long telegram to Mr. Cowans and took the next train back to Ottawa. So like a boy.

Mr. RHODES.

Why did'nt he telegraph to find out if Mr. Cowans was at home before taking so long a journey. Was it because he was a boy and inexperienced that Laurier sent Sir Frederick to assist Mr. King in the Grand Trunk Railway strike. What is the use of beslobbering the boy over the settlement; any one with ordinary brains could have done all that the minister did with the government at his back. By and by when Canada grows bigger the Department of Labour will need a heavyweight. By that time Mr. King's boyhood days may be over and by age and experience he may be fitted for so ticklish a post. Give Mr. King an open field and no favour, but for pity's sake don't say he is a wonder because he does the work of his office to the best of his ability.

And, Mr. Chairman, with the canniness of a Scotchman, Mr. Drummond would not continue by saying 'and that is not saying much.' In his eulogy of himself this distinguished gentleman to-night told us that he hoped hon. gentlemen opposite would not be obliged to take their lives in their hands as he had been. He did not indicate whether it was his physical or his political life. He told us since dinner that he had gone out to Lethbridge during the strike there when people were dying. He crowns himself with everything he can bedeck himself with, he makes himself a great hero indeed; in fact, I wondered how it was that he did not come back from Lethbridge with the Carnegie medal for heroism, or something of the kind.

However, Mr. Chairman, this distinguished gentleman has told us to-night about the strike situation in Nova Scotia, and he has given us the reasons why he did not intervene at Springhill. He was discreetly silent with regard to the county of Cape Breton, and with regard to the strike there in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. I would like to say that when the minister makes the statement that he made here to-night that the difficulty of the labour situation in Nova Scotia was due to a war between the two unions, he is not stating what is absolutely correct. When he was asked to-night if he had received petitions himself against the Industrial Disputes Act asking for the repeal of it, and said that he had, but that they came from the United Mine Workers of America, I would remind him that in September, 1907, when this Act had been taken up by the Provincial Workingmens' Association at Halifax at their annual convention, and after they had studied it in all fairness and all reason, they unanimously passed a resolution which was submitted to the then Minister of Labour, the present hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) who, I am pleased to see in his seat to-night, asking for the repeal of the Act. The Minister of Labour tells us that the strike situation has some political significance in Nova Scotia. I want to remind

him again that before the United Mine Workers of America had taken up a position in Nova Scotia, and while that very resolution was receiving perhaps the due consideration of the Postmaster General, who was then the acting Minister of Labour, the miners of the Dominion Coal Company had a grievance, they called a special meeting of the council of the Provincial Workingmens' Association, that convened at New Glasgow, and who did the lobbying? The very gentleman who eulogizes in such a beautiful manner the Minister of Labour, the Hon. Robert Drummond, was on the scene. Not only did that special meeting of the grand council of the Provincial Workingmens' Association ask for a board of conciliation, but under such special auspices as they had on that occasion and with delegates from amongst the employees of the Intercolonial railway, from amongst the employees of Halifax and Truro, the miners of Cumberland, Pictou and Inverness, but they undertook to discuss, compare and study the Nova Scotia statute which has reference to arbitration, and the Industrial Disputes Act. Not only did they settle in favour of the Industrial Disputes Act, but these gentlemen from the various lodges undertook to name their representative on the board to represent the employees of the Dominion Coal Company, and with Mr. Drummond outside manipulating the discussion there was named Dr. Arthur Kendall, M.P.P., who sits on the Liberal side of the legislature of Nova Scotia. There was no United Mine Workers' in Nova Scotia then. I would like, however, to point out that the protests that came at that time from the Provincial Workingmens' Association have been followed since by protests from the United Mine Workers of America, numbers of which I have received from day to day, and some of which I have here in my hand to-night. I wish to say I have every sympathy with the Minister of Labour with regard to a situation of that kind. He talked about taking his life in his hands. I am prepared to take my political life in my hands and to stand with the Minister of Labour for the preservation of the Act if he will amend it, so as to make it a reasonable working Act. I wish to repeat, in order to make myself plain, that I am not in favour of the repeal of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, but I do wish the minister would take steps to render it more effective in practice and to remove the objections to it. I realize that this is new legislation, embarking in a new field. It is a new industrial tribunal, as it were, and naturally it is not a perfect one. The Canada Temperance Act, when it was passed originally in 1868, was over-burdened with imperfections, but in 1908—and I think as a lawyer I am safe in saying it—it is one of the most perfect pieces of legislation to be found on the statute-books of Canada. And how was that brought about? As breaches of the Act arose, as offenders escaped the penalties of the Act, parliament amended it and by amending it perfected it. And in the light of our experience with the Industrial Disputes Act, I believe it could be so amended as to make it acceptable to employers and employees alike. I am not one of those who, if I build a dike to secure my lands from the overflow of the river and find that notwithstanding my efforts the water had inundated my lands, would say: Destroy the dike. No; I would seek the weak spots; I would look to the holes in it; I would repair these, strengthen the work, and try to make it a perfect dike. If the minister will seriously take up this Industrial Disputes Act, if he will follow the counsel given by the leader of the opposition in the resolution he moved in 1907, and which was talked out at six o'clock by the member for South Cape Breton of that day; if the Minister of Labour will take the counsel offered in that resolution to consult the employers of the country, and to consult the employees and labour unions of the country and get them together and have each side point out the imperfections of this Act, I believe he would be able to secure a more perfect piece of legislation than we have at present. Surely there can be no objection to such a course as that. The minister quoted statistics, and if we accept his figures (and figures can be made to serve almost any purpose) 91 per cent of the disputes that have arisen under this Act have been settled without a strike, and the remaining 9 per cent have been settled according to the decree of the board, or on terms less acceptable to the men who had asked for the board. Let me point out to the minister that this law was enacted in 1907, and since that year the cost of living has been going up in an ascending scale. From whom would the demand come for a conciliation board? I asked him if he would furnish this House some time with the percentage of the number of requisitions from employers and employees. I will venture to prognosticate that 90 per cent of these petitions emanated from employees and not employers. Above all other times this is a time when employees should be receiving increased wages. This is a time when the cost of living is greater than ever before, and consequently the men must ask for an increase, and when they are refused they are met with this Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. They dare not strike until they get the board, and how do they get the board? They must ask for it. But is that all? No, Sir. They must accompany their application with a sworn statement that unless the board is granted there will be a strike. Is not that a beautiful

piece of legislation? Doesn't it encourage strikes? What are the men to do when the board decides against them? They are compelled, first of all, to swear that they will strike unless the board is granted, and when the board gives a decree that is not acceptable to them every principle of manhood forces them to make good the statutory declaration which they are compelled to send along with their application for a conciliation board. Let me tell the minister that it would be very interesting to this House to have statistics to show how often the employer met the request of the employees when they presented their petition to the Department of Labour; how often they met it in a conciliatory way, and how often they stood aside and said: The men have no case, and we won't appoint anybody. The Act provides, in that case, that the government shall appoint a representative of the company. This forces upon the department a species of patronage which I have no doubt is quite distasteful to them. It forces them to look for some one to represent the corporation, and what is the result? We are told that politics creeps into these things at times. Is it not a fact that that corporation wherever it may be situated, from Vancouver to Sydney, or from the Great Lakes to the Arctic ocean, will invariably, through its representatives, proceed to Ottawa and say: We won't have anything to do with this board, and whilst under the statute it becomes your duty to appoint a man to represent us, you must be mighty careful whom you appoint. There is appointee No. 1, by the government, after the precautionary measures taken by the employer. What follows: The corporation, or employer, then goes to its representative appointed by the government and says: Don't you agree with the other representative as to a chairman. Don't you dare do it; you are appointed to represent us; we are very reluctant to have anything to do with this thing, but we instruct you now as our representative to be very careful; you must not agree on the third man. Then, under the law, at the end of five days it is up to the government again to appoint a chairman, and it is then the pressure is brought and that the representatives of corporations all over the country get around the department and say: You must be mighty careful in the appointment of the chairman.

Mr. KING. Will my hon. friend allow me to make a statement? While he is throwing out such suggestions as he is doing now I may say that in at least 60 per cent, or probably more, of the cases the parties themselves have agreed on a chairman. During the time I was deputy minister, I think there was one occasion when a corporation suggested to me the name of a man whom they would like as a chairman. I told the person who suggested it to me very plainly that that man certainly would not be appointed, and that hereafter I would thank them if they minded their own business. No corporation and no individual has ever approached me since I have been minister, or brought any kind of pressure to bear as to who the chairman of the board should be, and any corporation or individual who ever does may expect to have his or its name publicly disclosed.

Mr. MADDIN. The hon. minister has stated his position in matters of this kind, but I wish to tell him that he will spend a good many nights and Sundays before he will be able to disabuse the minds of the employees throughout the Dominion of Canada that where the government is vested with the appointment of two members of a board of conciliation the men are going to get a square deal from that board. The workingmen of this country know the power of corporation influence, and whilst the hon. minister cites one particular case, he does not give the name of that case. Then, he tells only of one instance where one of the parties affected, came to him. I wonder if he will go into the confessional now and tell us how often he was approached by members of this parliament who counselled him as to making appointments either as representatives of constituents, of their own, or as members of a board.

Mr. KING. I have consulted with the members on both sides of the House, with regard to members of boards. I am not aware of a single member of the House having come to me to ask me to appoint a single man to a board.

Mr. MADDIN. Will the hon. minister go a step further and tell us the names of some of the members on this side of the House whom he consulted ?

Mr. KING. I cannot think of a name at the moment, but I think I can give him one or more.

Mr. MADDIN. The hon. the minister thinks if he had time he could name one man. When it comes to the selection of a chairman, the government appoint him. I say this, without any apprehension of successful contradiction, that when a government which makes appointments of postmasters, harbour commissioners, overseers of fisheries and rivers and streams by the score, and makes appointments such as this government makes, which appoints men that have nothing to do, but draw their salaries—and their name is legion—I ask the hon. minister if he thinks the common labourers of this country are going to accept as bona fide, a tribunal so constituted that two out of three of its members are appointed by this government ?

Mr. KING. I have no hesitation in saying that I think the workingmen generally know that the appointments made have been eminently satisfactory, and that the hon. gentleman will be unable to cite a single instance where any chairman of any board or any appointee of the government has given ground to any one to believe that he has done other than fill his position honourably and fairly and in the best interests of all parties concerned.

Mr. MADDIN. I have not made a study of all the cases under this Act; they are not compiled and put into a volume which one can see in a law library. They appear only from time to time in the 'Labour Gazette.'

Mr. KING. They are all compiled in the annual report.

Mr. MADDIN. Not by themselves. They are overwhelmed with a lot of rubbish.

Mr. KING. No, by themselves.

Mr. MADDIN. I have not followed the decisions of conciliation boards in other provinces, but I am familiar with a number of those which have been given in the province of Nova Scotia. I do not complain particularly of any one who has acted, either as an appointee of the government or on behalf of a corporation, from my own personal knowledge of the gentlemen who have acted on conciliation boards in Nova Scotia. I am presenting to the minister complaints with which the labouring communities are pregnant, and which you will meet with on every hand, and the natural deductions which thoughtful men will draw from the decisions of tribunals so constituted as these conciliation boards are at the present time. A dispute between the employees of the Dominion Coal Company and that company arose in the county of Cape Breton in the spring of 1909. A board of conciliation was applied for, and it sat during the month of April. While the board was sitting at Glace Bay, and witnesses were going up and testifying as to the discrimination against them on account of the union they belonged to, after Mr. Mackinly Cameron, a barrister of Glace Bay, presenting the case on behalf of the men, had called 15 witnesses who swore that on the morning after the night they joined the United Mine Workers of America, their lamps were stopped and they were refused employment, and when Mr. Cameron asked: 'do you think it worth while to call any more witnesses?' Mr. Duggan, the vice-president of the company, said: 'I will admit that there was discrimination, but it was without the knowledge or consent of the company, and the company regrets it, and will put an end to it.' While the board was sitting, over 500 men in the employ of the company had been dismissed for no other reason than that they had joined the United Mine Workers of America. What happened! If it had been a trial before the Supreme Court, the company would have been brought before the bar for contempt. It demonstrated its intention throughout the whole proceeding, not to be bound by any finding of the board, because, while the board was sitting, it went on erecting an eight foot fence, miles in length, surrounding its property, and stringing over it three strands of wire, carrying about 1,000 volts on which it put up notices: 'Danger, live wire.' This was done while the board was considering whether or not the company was discriminating against its employees. With the statement of Mr. Duggan, that there would be no further discrimination, those men returned to work. Matters went on smoothly for some time, and the number of 500 went up by the first of July to 900, and on the 6th of July the men called a strike—not for recognition of the union. You cannot put your finger on a single published utterance, or find a single officer of the United Mine Workers of America, from its president, T. L. Lewis, in the United States, or the president of district No. 26, in the province of Nova Scotia, Mr. Dan Macdougall, down to the president of the humblest local union in the province, who demands recognition. But what they did say, and what they had a right to say, was this: 'You had no right to dismiss us, or any one of us, for joining the labour union of our choice.' I ask the hon. minister if he concedes to the people of this country, what our statutes have afforded them, what has been made an exception to the law of conspiracy, namely, the right to form labour unions?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. MADDIN. The moment that is conceded he must agree with me when I say that labour in this country has the right to choose its own labour institutions and not the organizations which are the choice of the employers. That being the case it would be much better if the minister would deal equitably with the situation such as we have in Nova Scotia. It would be much better if he would deal fairly and frankly with the men and not take his version of the situation from this report which was furnished by his deputy under circumstances which I intend to speak of later on. It would be much better for him not to take his views from the columns of the 'Globe' and of newspapers in Nova Scotia anxious to make out that the strike was originated for the purpose of serving political ends. I would ask that he would deal fairly with the situation there rather than believe that the strike was for the recognition of a union.

Mr. Cahan, solicitor for the Dominion Coal Company, had a consultation with me on the 24th of August, 1909. I was acting as solicitor for the men, and the whole question was gone into there and then with the leaders of the union. And if Mr. Cahan, whose honour and integrity as a barrister and a gentleman, no man on either side of this House would deny, were here, he would tell us that there was not one word at that conference about any recognition of the United Mine Workers of America.

You would naturally suppose that having a Labour Department presided over by a genius so exalted as the present minister, who had studied labour statistics from the year 1900 down to the present, who had formerly occupied the position of deputy minister before grasping the portfolio—you would naturally suppose that the Dominion Coal Company would have immediately sought counsel from the Minister of Labour. But what do we find ? In the Montreal 'Star' of July the 8th, I find the following account:

Mr. F. L. Wanklyn, vice-president of the Dominion Coal Company, is in Ottawa to-day. He came up from Montreal last evening and immediately got into communication with the Militia Department. He was informed as to the procedure necessary for the despatch of troops to protect the mines at Sydney and was advised that a requisition from the municipal authorities or the county judge to the district officer commanding was all that was required. This was secured from Judge Finlayson. This morning Mr. Wanklyn received a message stating that the special military train bearing the Royal Canadian Regiment at a strength of 512 had left Halifax at 3.45 a.m. The despatch added that things are quieter this morning but that some tracks were dynamited last night and a rifle shot fired at No. 6 colliery. I think the arrival of the troops will end it all, stated Mr. Wanklyn this morning. My advices are that only 33 per cent of the men are on strike and most of these are unskilled labourers. We propose to fight them to a finish.

Further on the despatch says:

Mr. Wanklyn had a further conference with the acting deputy Minister of Militia this morning and afterwards called upon Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He explained that his visit to the Premier was wholly personal and to advise him of the conditions in which he is naturally interested.

On the morning of the 6th of July we had a strike down in Cape Breton, and on the following evening there arrived in Ottawa the vice-president of the Dominion Coal Company, Mr. Wanklyn, who called, not on the Labour Department—no, but on the Minister of Militia, to tell him that the company were going to fight to a finish. Naturally, under the circumstances, he called on the Militia Department and not on the Department of Labour.

Mr. KING. In what year was that?

Mr. MADDIN. In 1909. Mr. Wanklyn had come up to Ottawa for the purpose of consulting the Minister of Militia and not the Minister of Labour. Mr. Wanklyn was going to fight the men to a finish.

The hon. Minister of Labour has properly said that the last thing people want is a strike. He could picture the horrors of it, as I have seen them myself, time and time again before there ever was an Act on our statute-book. The men themselves do not want to strike, but I want to say to the minister that when he takes out of the hands of the labouring men of this country the only weapon they have effectively to enforce their rights and gives them no compensation, he is putting himself in a position which is anything but enviable.

Mr. KING. I hope my hon. friend does not intend to imply that anything of the kind is done.

Mr. MADDIN. Absolutely.

Mr. KING. Nothing of the kind is done. The right to strike is not taken away in any manner whatever, but the parties have to wait until the statute is acted upon.

Mr. MADDIN. That is an argument and an aspect of the case with which I propose to deal. But how does the Act work? The men say they have a grievance and the Act operates in the interests of the employers and not of the employees. The men want an increase in wages which the employers refuse to give, and the men require that increase to meet the increased cost of living. They must send their application to Ottawa and accompany it by an affidavit declaring that there will be a strike unless their demands are conceded. The minister has five days within which he must notify the opposite party. When the opposite party has been served with a notification, it must reply in five days and then it has five days within which to appoint a representative. And these two have five days more in which to agree on a chairman. If they do not agree within the five days, the Department of Labour or the Governor in Council appoints a chairman. In this way over thirty days may elapse before the board is constituted. Then the board sits, and after they have arrived at a conclusion, if it be not satisfactory, the men dare not strike until another thirty days. What could work better, in all conscience, in the interests of the employers than just such a provision? We have an alien law so loose and easily handled that from across the borders are brought strike breakers. That was done in the Canadian Pacific Railway strike, four or five years ago, in the Grand Trunk Railway strike of last summer, and in the strikes of the Dominion Coal Company and in Cumberland county, and that will continue to be done so long as the government is so

partial to the employers as to have this law on the statute-book which it is nobody's business to enforce.

In the particular case to which I have referred, what happened? While the board was sitting, the Dominion Coal Company were building their miles and miles of eight foot fences and stringing their wires by coming in contact with which two little boys were killed. That is what the company was doing during the not less than sixty days' notice they had of a struggle against organized labour. And what had the employees to do during those 60 days? Dig coal every day:—a public utility, therefore they must serve the public and incidentally earn more dividends for their employers. They must not cease to work under a penalty of $50 a day for every day they were not working. And think of these men who had petitioned for a board of conciliation—last week they reached their work by crossing an open field; yesterday they had to go round the end of a fence; to-day they have to go through a gate in that fence. And shacks are thrown up to shelter imported labour; every hardware store is canvassed for stoves and cooking utensils. Here was the enemy—if the employer can be called the enemy of labour? though I do not see why that should be, and I would like to see employer and employee come together and adjust their differences—here was the enemy preparing for war, while the men were forbidden to make any preparations. They had to raise a bank of 400,000 tons of coal while the employers were raising the shacks to shelter the scab labour that was to beat them out in the end.

The minister did make some inquiry into these conditions in Cape Breton. He did send down the Deputy Minister of Labour. But before I speak of that, I want to go on with the story of how they got the militia into the county. Mr. Wanklyn came up here on the evening of Wednesday, the 7th of July. And on. Wednesday afternoon shortly after mid-day, application was made to the mayor of Glace Bay, to the mayor of Dominion and to the warden of the municipality of Cape Breton, the company having coal mines in all these different districts. They refused to requisition the militia, and application was made to His Honour Mr. Justice Finlayson. And I wish to say here, as an aside perhaps, as it may not be strictly pertinent to this inquiry, that His Honour Mr. Justice Finlayson, sitting in the county court there, was obliged to try day after day many cases arising out of the strike, painful cases—distresses for rent, evictions from tenement houses and so on; they were ground out by the thousand. The application was made to Mr. Justice Finlayson for the militia. And, while there have been one or two who questioned his integrity and fidelity to his office in the discharge of his duties on that occasion, I wish to say here to-night, on the floor of parliament, that as solicitor for the men, their chief solicitor at that time, I found Mr. Justice Finlayson absolutely honourable, upright, fair, courteous and obliging from the beginning to the very end. Now, application is made to His Honour Mr. Justice Finlayson for a requisition for the militia. He granted that requisition. And what then? I regret that the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is not here, but they actually posted the orders at ten o'clock on Wednesday morning in Halifax—mobilization orders for the regular troops. The Militia Act only provides for the regular troops being called out in the event of the local troops being inadequate. Mobilization orders at Halifax, ten o'clock Wednesday; Mr. Wanklyn calling on the Premier, to inquire about his health, Wednesday afternoon and the Minister of Militia, or the acting deputy Minister of Militia, asking for forces. These were the steps taken to settle that labour difficulty, and so the troops came down to Cape Breton. And what now, do you suppose? They are actually charging the people of Glace Bay, Dominion and the municipality of Cape Breton thousands of dollars for the expenses of these members of the regular militia of Canada. Was there ever anything so outrageous on the face of the earth? Who is paying these men to-day? Do not the people of Canada pay them? But those who asked for them, or have their services reluctantly thrust upon them must pay for these soldiers. Had there been no strike in Springhill the regular troops of this country would have been paid. Annually the Minister of Militia takes his seat here and calls upon us to vote the money to pay these men; it is voted by this House and the country pays it. Why, then, should the municipality of Cape Breton, or the town of Glace Bay, or the town of Dominion pay for these men when their services are required on account of a strike or an invasion? However, the minister did show his hand in the situation in Cape Breton. He sent down his deputy to the county, and that gentleman made a report which came to hand in this House some time during the last year and a copy of which I have now before me. He says, referring to the strike at Springhill that there were several grievances referred to, one being that of recognition of the United Mine Workers of America, others relating to conditions of work. The hon. minister told us this evening that he did not wish to intervene in the situation at Springhill because there it was a fight for recognition of the union. But his deputy lays before this House a report in which he says that there were several grievances at Springhill, one of which was recognition

of the union What has the minister done to alleviate the friction in the other case? The men were paid by the 'box' and what constituted a 'box' was well known to be one of the vital questions One board of conciliation decided that 1,700 pounds of coal should constitute a 'box', But the company wanted to change that, making a heavier 'box' That was one of the things that the men protested against. Another question was the schedule of rates in connection with the mine. I wonder did the minister do anything to alleviate the circumstances in this case? His deputy reports that there were several grievances, one of which was the recognition of the United Mine Workers of America. And the minister washes his hands to-day and says: We could not intervene the whole question was that of recognition of the union. This officer proceeded to Sydney and spent some considerable time there—I do not know just how many days. But he gathered a good deal of information. He points out that there was a conciliation board held in March, 1908. That is the board I had reference to that was so ably constituted by Robert Drummond and Doctor Kendall at New Glasgow, and which was participated in by delegates from all over the province who were members of the Provincial Workmen's Association. He says:

It is to be noted in connection with the above list of men prominent in the agitation that Mr. MacDougall, now President of the District Council of the United Mine Workers of America, was a member of the sub-council of the Grand Lodge of the Provincial Workmen's Association in March, 1908, when the existing agreement between the Dominion Coal Company and its employees was concluded before a Board of Conciliation and Investigation established under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, and presided over by Professor Adam Shortt.

The deputy minister thinks it is his duty to incorporate in the report he lays before parliament the fact that the President of the United Mine Workers had actually signed and approved of a settlement, of a wage schedule between the employees and the company in March, 1908. Why, some newspapers in this country went so far as to say that the company could not deal with the United Mine Workers of America because they had a contract and they spell that contract in capitals in every Grit paper from the Halifax 'Morning Chronicle' down to the Sydney 'Record.' They spelled it in capitals and they underlined it and put quotation marks around it and nursed it and nurtured it and held it up to the public and said: There is a contract, we cannot negotiate with these men because of that contract. But the Deputy Minister of Labour knew there was no contract, there was an award accepted, not by the Provincial Workmen's Association but in the very words of the deputy minister, by the employees of the company, and it was only by a majority of the employees, for there were a number of lodges of the Provincial Workmen's Association, whose representatives refused to sign the award or accept it. But one would think that when this gentleman came down to the county of Cape Breton to investigate the conditions that obtained there he might possibly have called on the representative of the riding. The hon. minister to-night recommended to the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) that he should go down to Springhill and tell the men there what Mr. Butler had told him; in other words, he recommends the member for Cumberland to go down to Springhill and tell the men exactly what Mr. Wanklyn told the newspaper reporters in June, 1909: We are going to fight them to a finish, give us the militia. He recommends the hon. member to go to his constituency and inform those of his constituents who are on strike what Mr. Butler says. If that is his wisdom in this matter, if that is his judgment, if he thinks such action is incumbent on the representative of a constituency where a strike exists, I would think that his deputy, coming to Cape Breton, would have wired me as member for the constituency where the strike existed, and in addition to that the recognized solicitor of the men on strike. I was there in a double capacity, I was the member for the riding and the solicitor of the men.

Mr. KING. Does the hon. member mean to say that the deputy minister, when he was there, did not see him?

Mr. MADDIN. I could not help seeing him.

Mr. KING. He told me distinctly that he made a point of seeing the hon. member, and he was instructed to do so.

Mr. MADDIN. I am not taking issue with you there, nor are you taking issue with anything I said. I said I would have thought he would have notified me he was coming, either as solicitor for the men on strike or as representative of the county. Now if it had been Mr. O'Donohoe, who furnishes these plastic reports to the Trades and Labour Council, how he would have been notified and embraced on the arrival of the deputy minister. I received no notification. I saw Mr. Acland, in Glace Bay, with Mr. J. K. L. Ross, son of the president of the company, who drew $10,000 a year for doing little or nothing. I saw him accompanied by Mr. Dick, the sales agent of the Coal Company; I saw him going around with the nabobs of this concern. I rode from Glace Bay to Reserve Junction sitting across a sideseated

car from Mr. Acland, and I was told he was the deputy minister. I had never met him, if he were in the House now he would tell you I had never met him before a passenger said: that is the deputy minister, and he was with these nabobs I have mentioned. He got off at Reserve Junction. That was his second day down in the strike district, gathering information for that report to lay before this parliament and yet up to that time he had not come to see the member for the county nor the solicitor for the men who were on strike. He knew where I was engaged from 8 o'clock in the morning until midnight in Glace Bay, and when I went home on a certain evening at 6 o'clock, I found a card: F. A. Acland, Deputy Minister of Labour. My good dame said to me: Mr. Acland left the card at the house and said he would like to see you before he left town; he is at the Sydney Hotel. And so I saw him and he was anxious to go over to the north riding to consult with the hon. member who represents that riding, where there was no strike. He was going over on the boat in a few minutes and he said to me, just before going to the boat: I would like to have your opinion about this matter. I said: Have you got the opinion of the men who are in charge of the strike? He replied that he had seen two or three of the executive officers, whom he named. I told him that they had authority to speak about the situation and could doubtless have told him all I could tell him. He asked me about the conditions of order there. I gave him my opinion about the militia. He has not incorporated it in his report. There was not a word in it that should not have been printed, although I felt like saying a good many that would not look well in print. This emissary of the Department of Labour who had journeyed down so far and who on the day on which he was leaving town left a card at my house in Sydney with a pretty positive knowledge that I was in Glace Bay, and would not get out until the evening, and whose anxiety to consult with the hon. gentleman, the member for Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie).

Mr. KING. May I interrupt my hon. friend. Knowing Mr. Acland as I do, I feel that any action of that kind is not of a sort of which he is capable. I know Mr. Acland to be honourable in the highest degree, and that in going on a mission of this kind he would do his utmost to see every party concerned. I am sorry he is not here at the present moment, but I will have no hesitation in saying that I am quite sure if he did not see my hon. friend the moment he arrived, it was not because of any direct intention not to do so, but that he had every desire to see every person he should see. The hon. member says that Mr. Acland saw the representatives of the men, and I presume he thought it better to see the men themselves before he saw their solicitor.

Mr. MADDIN. I have every regard for the hon. gentleman who acts as deputy for the Minister of Labour. I have not imputed nor do I impute to him anything disloyal to the minister. He was serving his master, he was under instructions. I submit that when this department sends a representative into a county, if it be the fortune of that constituency to be represented by a Conservative that is no reason why that Conservative or that representative of the people there should not be communicated with. Take other instances. In this House and during this session I had occasion to refer to the visit of the Board of Railway Commissioners to the county of Cape Breton. They acted in the same way and what was the report from the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte). Why he said it was through the courtesy of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) who accompanied the board that we were going to have some necessary repairs done to the Terminal wharf in Sydney. I did not know, and was not told that the board were coming to the town or to the county of Cape Breton, but I was told that they were actually going to repair the terminal wharf in Sydney. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that if the Deputy Minister of Labour's efforts in Cape Breton had been of a conciliatory rather than an aggressive character, if he had succeeded in stopping the strike we would have been told that it was through the efforts of the hon. member for North Cape Breton, whom he went to see that very evening, that the strike had been amicably adjusted. I have no reference to being slighted personally. I have no desire to get in the private cars of the Board of Railway Commissioners or to ride around with them at all but I would like to know when they are coming to South Cape Breton, and I would like to extend them a little hospitality, and take them around the confines of the city. I would like to do as much for the Deputy Minister of Labour, or the Minister of Labour, when they come there in their official capacity, but, if they come like a thief in the night, if, I am only to see the Deputy Minister of Labour on a street car twelve miles away from the Intercolonial railway station at which he had landed, and then have him pointed out to me by strangers, I submit it is not doing justice to the man who is elected by the common people as their representative nor is it treating the solicitor of the United Mine Workers of America with the slightest measure of consideration. I hold the Department of Labour responsible for this, and not the

deputy. Common courtesy would have imposed on the minister himself, when he sent his deputy down there, the necessity of giving the instruction : Notify Mr. Maddin that you are going down ; wire him, or, he could have wired me himself and we might have been able to discuss the situation. But no, this gentleman comes down, prepares a report and summarizes the situation on pages 11 and 12. He says :

Many people who are entirely opposed to the United Mine Workers of America and wholly friendly to the Grand Secretary of the Provincial Workmen's Association, state that that official's extended retention of office was a source of discontent among a number of miners. He had become well known to the officials of a number of companies, including the Dominion Coal Company, and had grown into the habit of dealing with the companies on behalf of the men without always going through the form of consulting the men's committees. In this and other ways he had aroused the suspicion and jealousies of a number.

And, now, Mr. Chairman, listen to this gem that we have from the student who went down to study the conditions. He says :

In addition, politics came in. Moffat is frankly a Liberal——

I would like the minister to inquire from his deputy where his deputy found out that Moffat was frankly a Liberal. He says :

Moffat is frankly a Liberal, but claims not to have taken unfair advantage of this fact in his capacity as Grand Secretary. He was opposed for Grand Secretary some years ago by Mr. James Madden, now counsel for the United Mine Workers of America, and Conservative member of parliament for the riding.

There is wisdom for you from the man who left his card at my house, and said that he would like to see me, the man who met me and who did see me but who did not ask me one word about it. In 1901, eight years before the strike, when a very callow youth, I did contest with Mr. Moffat for the position of Grand Secretary of the Provincial Workmen's Association. In 1906 when I ran for the local legislature in Nova Scotia, Moffat took the hustings and campaigned against me. I had the first Conservative majority within the town of Dominion, where he lived for ten years, and in which he took the hustings against me, that had taken place since the town was incorporated. But, in 1904, where was Mr. Moffat, this man who was frankly a Liberal?—supporting Stephen B. McNeil the Labour candidate, a man who could not find anything rank or vile enough to say against Alexander Johnston when he was contesting the county in the interest of the Liberal party and who won. Not content with going through the district, at the Lyceum, the theatres and the rinks, he journeyed into the country districts, went amongst the farmers and fishermen, and gave them his opinion of Mr. Johnston and the Grit and Tory governments. That was in 1904. In 1906 he shot his bolt in favour of Kendall and Gillies, and in 1908 there was not a man in the Dominion of Canada in a position to say that he did not vote for me. I have no reason to believe but what he did vote for me. I may say that there is no political difference between us, he certainly did not take the hustings against me, he certainly had no grudge against me, and he certainly made no canvass against me. On the contrary, I am assured by some of his brother grand officers of the Provincial Workmen's Association that I had his assistance and support in the campaign of 1908, and yet the deputy minister says that :

He was opposed for Grand Secretary some years ago by Mr. James Madden.

Whoever that may be. He doubtless thought it was I. He did not know my name or how to spell it, but he says that 'Mr. Madden' ran against Moffat, 'who is frankly a Liberal.' I would like to find out where the deputy minister got that information. The whole thing summed up is that there was politics in the situation. True, the Sydney 'Record,' the Glace Bay 'Gazette,' and Mr. Pearson's papers in Halifax and Glace Bay said so, but, when they alleged that the strike arose out of politics, that it was promulgated and promoted for the purpose of making political capital they were uttering falsehoods, which were not only false but false with the knowledge of those who penned and published them. Political capital is ballots marked in favour of the party who seeks the political capital, and I want to review the political occurrences of the province of Nova Scotia, and show him that these base slanders are absolutely unfounded. In 1906 I had the honour of being a candidate for the local legislature in the province of Nova Scotia. I was running with Mr. Butts of North Sydney against Dr. Arthur Kendall and Neil J. Gillies of Glace Bay. Mr. Gillies was an underground manager at one time. He was a past Grand Master Workman of the Provincial Workmens' Association, and he was the candidate of the mining districts.

The hon. member for North Cape Breton had been elected for that constituency in the general election of 1901, he had a plurality of over 2,000 votes. Mr. Butts and I ran the election under those circumstances, and when the ballots were counted on the night of the 20th of June it was midnight before they knew whether Mr. Gillis or I had been elected, and on a recount of the ballots it was found that the Liberal majority of 2,000 plus which the hon. member for North Cape Breton had in 1901 had

dwindled down to 120. Where did these votes come from—a majority of over 275 from the town of Sydney Mines in the riding of North Cape Breton, and I led the poll in Mr. Gillis' home throughout the southern mining districts. The miners in 1906 in Cape Breton county voted for Butts and Maddin. In the county of Pictou Mr. Tanner had a plurality of 454 in the town of Westville a small mining town and in the Back Mines district in the town of Stellarton, and away from the round house and the influence of the Intercolonial railway Mr. Tanner also had a majority. The complete returns from the province of Nova Scotia in the local election of 1906 showed that the Conservative candidates had a majority amongst the miners of Cumberland county of over 500, that the Conservative candidates in Pictou county had a majority among the miners of over 500, and that Mr. Butts and I had a majority in the county of Cape Breton of over 500. There was political capital among the miners of the province. In 1908 how was it? The hon. member for Cumberland took a majority of 500 out of the county of Cumberland, and a majority of 300 in the town of Springhill alone. Mr. Tanner who opposed the member for Pictou had a majority of over 500 in the county of Pictou and in the county of North Cape Breton Mr. McCormack had a majority of over 200 in the town of Sydney Mines among the miners there. I stand here to-night as the representative of the votes of the miners of Cape Breton who gave me in the south riding a majority of between 400 and 500 in the mining districts. There was political capital again in 1908. And, you can run the whole gamut of the Grit newspapers in the province of Nova Scotia from the 'Morning Chronicle' down to the Glace Bay 'Gazette' or from 'Free Speech' or the 'Vindicator' down to the Sydney 'Record' and they are all filled with the idea that the matter is promoted for political purposes. Why, Sir, the interest of the Liberal Conservative party in the province of Nova Scotia lies in continued work, double shift, opening up new collieries, steady employment, that would have meant more political capital to the Conservative party than a strike with its incidental horrors. The emigration which takes place, the people who leave the country whether the strike lasts for a week or a month going from the mining districts operates to the disadvantage of the Liberal Conservative party. And the Liberal Conservative party as a party was the only party who had anything to loose, and the Liberal party is the only party which had anything to gain by keeping the strike going and that may account for the diffidence and backwardness of the department in dealing with the situation of South Cape Breton and Springhill. I have taken up more time than I intended when I commenced to speak and there are some publications that I would like to have before the committee and which I probably will present for their consideration at a future day.

Mr. McKENZIE. I have listened very attentively to the observations of the hon. member for South Cape Breton. He has wandered over a very wide field, and has spoken about a great many things which I do not think on reflection he will consider have very much bearing on the question before the chair. I do not know that this House is very much concerned about the number of votes that were cast at Glace Bay in the local elections of 1906 or the number of votes that were cast at Sydney Mines, or the number of votes that may have been cast at some municipal election in different parts of Nova Scotia. If my hon. friend wants to make a general statement about the political complexion of the province of Nova Scotia he could sum it up in a very short statement; he can say that since confederation the province of Nova Scotia has been in the hands of the Liberal party continuously with the exception of one lean four years that it happened to be in the hands of the Tories. The people of the province had a taste of what they were capable of doing for one four years, and they pitched them out of office at the very earliest opportunity and ever since 1882 they never had a look in, to use a vulgar expression, in the government of Nova Scotia.

Mr. MADDIN. I would like to ask my hon. friend what his observations, from the time he rose until the present moment have to do with the motion?

Mr. McKENZIE. My hon. friend has given such little attention to the business of this House this winter he possibly doesn't know anything that is going on.

Mr. MADDIN. I wish to repudiate that on the spot. I paid as much attention to the business of this House as the hon. member, and the chances are, with a great deal more advantage to the country, and this is the time and place to say so.

Mr. McKENZIE. My hon. friend may have had messengers back and forth to this House telling him what was going on, but I will venture to say that he graced this House very little during the session with his presence.

Mr. MADDIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make myself clear——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MADDIN. You will get all the order you want. I would like to make myself

clear with regard to this matter. I would like to know what the hon. member means by 'presence' in the House. I wonder if he conveys an imputation behind it; I wonder if he would like a Roland for his Oliver?

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not know what my hon. friend means by a Roland for his Oliver. If he says that he is Dr. Jeckel and Mr. Hyde and that Mr. Hyde was here and Dr. Jeckel was absent or that he is some double personage I don't know anything about it; all I know is that the honourable Mr. Maddin whom I regard as the representative for South Cape Breton has been absent in the body the most of the session, and that he was not here is what I mean by saying that he was not present. That is about as plain as I can say it, and I think my hon. friend will understand it. He may have been better engaged, I am not making any insinuation.

Mr. MADDIN. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Unless the hon. gentleman who has the floor permits, another hon. member may not interrupt.

Mr. MADDIN. I will ask for his leave.

Mr. McKENZIE. There are some explanations due to his constituents from the hon. member why he was not here, and he can make them.

Mr. MADDIN. That is very good indeed, and I appreciate the courtesy and the big heartedness and the benevolent and the generosity of the hon. member for Cape Breton. If he wishes to put me in competition with himself or some other hon. members as to the number of hours I spend behind a desk in this chamber, I think he has perhaps sat longer behind his desk than I have. But there is this to say, that at any time that I was absent from my chair I was within the precincts of the House, and when I have been there I have contributed more to the development, improvement and welfare of this country in one hour than the hon. member usually does in ten hours, and have given less offence in doing so.

Mr. McKENZIE. I thought that according to the hon. member for South Cape Breton, it was left to the hon. Minister of Labour to give glowing pictures of himself; but it seems that there are other picture painters in this country, and they are of the class I heard described by the Minister of Agriculture once this session, as painters who paint things not as they are, but as they would like them to be. That is about the description which the hon. member for South Cape Breton is giving of himself; but it is certainly not the picture of the hon. member which this House knows. Now, the general complexion of politics in Nova Scotia can be put in very small compass. After forty years of continuous Liberal rule, there is not one county in the province of Nova Scotia today represented altogether by Conservatives. Out of thirty-eight members in the provincial legislature there are I think five members representing the principles of the party of which my hon. friend boasts. That is all he has to encourage him in the conditions of local politics in the province. I do not think it was necessary for my hon. friend to introduce politics into this matter at all. He is not going to drag me into casting any reflection, one way or the other, on the men who were concerned in the strike in Cape Breton. My hon. friend would give you to understand that that strike was something like strikes in other parts of the province. As a rule, when men are out on strike, they are all out. It is a question of the men on one side and the corporation or employers on the other side. Such was not the case in the county of Cape Breton. It was simply a division among the men themselves, about one-half on one side and one-half on the other side; Provincial Workmen's Association men on one side, satisfied with the conditions under which they laboured with the company, stayed with the company; and on the other side the followers and supporters of the United Mine Workers. That was the situation. My hon. friend from South Cape Breton at once destroyed his usefulness to the people he represented by allying himself with one camp of the men. It was his duty and his responsibility, as the representative of that county, as the representative of the Provincial Workmen's Association men just as much as the United Mine Workers men, to conserve his duty to them all by keeping clear and not becoming the lawyer or adviser of one party more than the other. The moment my hon. friend became the lawyer and adviser and strategist of the United Mine Workers men, that moment he lost the confidence of at least one-half the workingmen of his county, and made it absolutely impossible for the Department of Labour to consult him as to what should be done. I say that advisedly, because the moment the Department of Labour consulted Mr. Maddin, one-half the men would say, to the deputy minister: Of what use is it for you to come here as representing the Department of Labour and expect to do fairly by us when you consult the lawyer on the other side? Therefore it was advisable for the Deputy Minister of Labour to get his information elsewhere than from the solicitor of one camp which was engaged in a pitched battle at the time with the other. The hon. member says that I was consulted in the matter by the Deputy Minister of Labour.

Mr. MADDIN. I did not make such a statement. I said that the Deputy Minister of Labour, when he called on me, said that he wanted to go across the harbour to consult with Mr. McKenzie. I did not say that he did consult with the hon. member or that Mr. McKenzie advised him.

Mr. McKENZIE. As men of affairs and men of some common sense, I think we are bound to draw the inference from the statement of the hon. member in regard to the deputy minister being in such a hurry that he would not talk to him, but wanted to go across the harbour and talk to the member for North Cape Breton, that the deputy minister was going to consult me about the matter in hand. In justice to the deputy minister, I must say that he never discussed with me anything connected with the trouble in the southern part of the county. There were troubles brewing in my own part of the county at that time. There was some rumbling that the men at Sydney Mines were coming out. Fortunately they did not. But they were negotiating for a conciliation board, and I spoke to the deputy minister about that. I felt that I had enough to do in trying to keep things quite in my own district without interfering with the southern district, and I did not interfere at all. The point I thought my hon. friend was going to make was in connection with the Industrial Disputes Act. He is a lawyer of some experience and capacity, and he has been dealing with that Act since 1907. He has had exceptional opportunity in this House of dealing with any weaknesses which he might find in that Act; but I have not heard of him making any suggestion as to how it could be made better or more workable than it is. I was thinking, before the hon. gentleman sat down, that he would give us some practical suggestions as to how this Act could be improved.

If there is anything the matter with this Act, why let us sit down and reason together and make it better. I am sure there is not a man here who would not be glad to do so; but at the same time, I must say representing as I do, a great many working men and some capital, that while I want to be fair to the labouring men, I must also, as a member of parliament, be fair to capital. Let us try and constitute a court which will deal fairly with both sides. I cannot understand that it is to the benefit of labouring men in this country that they should be advised or permitted to take an unfair advantage of their employers. I do not think that is what they want. What they want is a fair deal; and if this Act can be improved upon so that a better condition of things may be brought about and a fairer trial given, I am sure no one will be more pleased than myself, but why should my hon. friend spend hours threshing in this House the old straw, about the different things that happened when that unfortunate conflict was on at Glace Bay. I am sure he must admit that the strike was ill advised and badly conducted and resulted in disaster and defeat to the men. It has brought forth no good; and if the men had any grievances, I am sorry they did not meet with more success in having these grievances remedied. Knowing the labouring men as I do, I can say that there is not in Nova Scotia or anywhere east of Winnipeg, a class of people better paid, better housed or more comfortable than the miners of the county of Cape Breton. They are intelligent people, wishing to give a fair return to their employers and capable of understanding fair treatment if they are well advised. I think it is admitted by nine-tenths of the men who went on this strike, that they were ill advised and the hon. gentleman, who boasts so loudly of being their legal adviser, has nothing to brag about as regards the way in which the strike was conducted and concluded. These men were left at last to the mercy of the Dominion Coal Company without any protection whatever; they were left to shift for themselves without reaching any conclusion that will be beneficial to them.

I shall not say anything further about the political effect. We had an election down there a few days ago, and I shall allow my hon. friend to count the votes and let him tell the House what happened there last Thursday.

An effort has been made to show undue haste in bringing out the militia. The difficulty is, that when men introduce politics into everything, it is impossible for them to be fair. Does the hon. gentleman forget that the Militia Act has been on our statutes for over 30 years just as it stands to-day ? Does he forget that it is the product and creation of his own party friends, and that the clauses providing for calling out the military to help the civil powers are to-day just as they were from the beginning ? All that is necessary is to make certain affidavits and comply with certain provisions and no Minister of Militia can refuse military aid. My hon. friend tries to make political capital among men who do not understand these things by saying that the Minister of Militia had no business to send out the troops; but he will not dare say that Mr. Justice Finlayson would think of granting an order calling for the troops, unless the necessity for so doing was clearly established. The Mayor of Glace Bay was appealed to for further assistance in the way of furnishing policemen to keep the trouble down and what did he do ? What was the sage advice he gave ? I will give you aid, he said, 500 strikers to act as policemen. Did you ever

hear of such an absurdity? 500 of those who were on strike and against whom the property of the company had to be protected, the mayor suggested, should act as its guardians.

Another point my hon. friend tried to make, was that the county of Cape Breton was taxed for the payment of these men. I presume, as far as the municipalities are concerned, that we all have to pay our share. That is the law. If any municipality calls for the aid of the troops, it has to pay the extra expense, and that would have been the case in the county of Inverness, or Pictou, or Guysborough, had the demand been made in any of these. Why were not the volunteer militia called out, my hon. friend asked. He thinks there would have been a saving of money if they had been, but he knows very well, that he is not putting the whole truth before the House in that connection. The only charge against the town of Glace Bay or the county of Cape Breton is the difference between the cost of the militia from the barracks at Halifax and their cost when in active service on the field. When officers are engaged in the field they are paid higher wages than when in the barracks and I presume so also are the soldiers; and whatever may be the difference, it has to be paid by the municipality. I presume the county of Cape Breton had to pay the expense of transportation, but the same amount of money which would be paid these men in barracks is paid by the government and not one cent of that is paid by the county.

Hon. gentlemen opposite applauded the case made out by my hon. friend, but if they heard the case as it is being tried out in the courts, there would be no 'hear, hears,' from any hon. member on either side who understands the situation and the Militia Act. An effort however, is being made, to poison the minds of the people, particularly interested by giving them a false side of the showing. I do not think it is necessary to discuss this matter at any length. The only thing open to my hon. friend to show is in what way this Act could be improved. If he has any proposal to that effect, I am sure it will receive fair consideration at the hands of the government and this House, but so far, he has given us none, and therefore, he might well have spared us the meandering statements he has been making to no purpose.

He attacked the courts that have been constituted for the purpose of inquiries of this kind in the province of Nova Scotia, but when asked for particulars he had to admit that he had no fault to find with any one of them? What objection could he have to men like Prof. Shortt, or Mr. Justice Graham, of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, or Mr. Justice Paterson, or Mr. Justice MacGilvray, who have sat from time to time upon those courts? Why, my hon. friend himself has been a member of a conciliation court. He forgot to tell us that. And what was the result of his great wisdom as a member of that court? He was dealing with one of the mines of the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, and he signed, as the third arbitrator, a report which was signed by all, reducing the wages of the men. He had not the slightest objection to the powers he was given as arbitrator, nor to any of the proceedings. And he came before the miners of Sydney Mines and read them a lecture, declaring that they should accept this result and be satisfied that the Act was giving them everything that was coming to them.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was his decision just and proper?

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not saying whether it was or not. But it was a decision reached under the operation of this Act. And if a just decision could be reached in that investigation by Mr. Maddin and two other men, Prof. Shortt being one, what particular charm had Mr. Maddin in connection with that inquiry that was not present at the other inquiry?

Mr. LANCASTER. Why did not the Minister of Labour do as Mr. Maddin did and bring about a correct decision?

Mr. McKENZIE. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster), who professes to be a lawyer—

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not professing to be anything; I am trying to understand from the hon. gentleman what he is driving at. Will he permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will answer his first question, and then he can ask me another. He asks: Why did not the minister see to it that the decision of the board was a correct one?

Mr. LANCASTER. Why did he object—

Mr. McKENZIE. I will give the answer. Does the hon. gentleman say that, if a decision of the Supreme Court is reversed by the Privy Council the government should be called to task and told that they should see to it that the court shall give only such decisions as will be sustained? That is the position he takes when he asks why the Minister of Labour does not see to it that every decision given by a conciliation board shall be such as will be sustained by the men.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman, inadvertently, of course, has misunderstood what I said. I asked why it was not

competent for the minister to bring about a just decision which he says Mr. Maddin brought about when he was a member of a board?

Mr. McKENZIE. Perhaps I am one of those unfortunate Scotchmen upon whom a surgical operation must be performed in order to make him understand, but I must admit that I cannot understand the question of my hon. friend. There is an Act of this parliament which enables a court to be constituted under certain conditions, and he charges the minister who puts that law in operation with the duty of seeing to it that every court so constituted shall reach a decision of a certain character.

Mr. LANCASTER. I say an equitable and just decision.

Mr. McKENZIE. What is equitable and just depends upon the viewpoint. What I might regard as equitable and just might be regarded as quite the contrary by somebody else. It depends upon whose ox is gored, as the old saying is. It is absolutely absurd to say that the power that appoints a judge or creates a court can be held responsible for the decisions that court may reach.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman was a judge himself at one time, was he not?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes. I was, and I should have thought it very absurd, indeed, if the powers that appointed me had been held responsible for any eccentricity that might be found in my decisions. I think it would be as profitable for my hon. friend to leave me alone and let me finish the few observations I have to make.

Mr. LANCASTER. Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. An effort was made by my hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) to cast unfavourable reflections upon the member for Cape Breton in the local house (Dr. Kendall). I am sure Dr. Kendall does not require defence at my hands, so far as his efforts in support of the labouring classes are concerned, and I am not going to say anything further about it. But from what I can gather from the observations of the hon. member, they were entirely aimed at making political capital, and did not suggest anything that would better the conditions of the working men either in Cape Breton or in any other part of the province. I am sure that anything I say in answer to him must not be understood as opposed to doing everything possible for the working men of my county. At the same time, I think it would be advisable for myself and my hon. friend (Mr. Maddin) to keep clear of being counsel for one body of our constituents as against a body on the other side if we hope to conserve our usefulness in bringing them together. I commend the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) for having kept himself free from entanglements that would destroy his usefulness as a promoter of good understanding among these classes. Had the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) done the same he might have assisted the Department of Labour in improving existing relations. I am sorry he felt it necessary to make such reflections upon the Minister of Labour; I am sorry to find a disposition on the part of hon. members of the opposition in this House to make attacks upon that hon. gentleman. If he were no good, if he were not a credit to the party to which he belongs, to the government of which he is a member, and to the cause he represents, they would have patted him on the back and told him he was all right. It is an old saying that it is under the good apple-tree that you find sticks and stones. I think the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) can take it as a compliment that these attacks are being made upon him. I hope he will not take the observations of the hon. member for South Cape Breton in any way serious. They do not mean anything—he does not mean anything by them himself. I can assure the hon. minister that the people of eastern Nova Scotia who have to deal with great industrial matters will have the same confidence in him, and, indeed, a great deal more, than if he were applauded by the hon. member for South Cape Breton. As I have said, I stand here as a representative of labour, ready and willing to bring about any betterments that may be made by the Court of Inquiry constituted to investigate any difficulties that may arise between capital and labour in any part of the Dominion of Canada, particularly the part that I myself represent.

Mr. LANCASTER. After a speech of half an hour by the hon. gentleman from North Cape Breton in which he said a lot about inferences he was compelled to draw, I do not know whether or not he is in favour of voting this money.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am in favour of the vote.

Mr. LANCASTER. My hon. friend should have deferred arriving at that conclusion until a little later. Of course, in his speech there was not a word about party politics, no suggestion whatever on politics from this legal luminary who descended from the calm precincts of the bench to take part in party warfare. Turning the spear which he levelled against me back upon himself, I would ask him to search his own conscience a little and see to what extent his nice little compliment to the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) that his speech was so commendable and free from

any party questions would apply to his own remarks. This hon. gentleman who goes upon the bench, who tries cases there and then leaves the bench after about two years' occupancy to go into the party strife of politics, into the most vigorous contests, who escapes defeat by very small majorities and persistent running in all that party strife, who takes the time of this House for nearly half an hour on an item in regard to $27,300 without even stating whether he is in favour of the item being voted or not, has no justification for criticising as he did the address of the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) who has made a very strong and important statement in regard to matters that did pertain to the item before the Chair. When the hon. member disparages the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) he forgets his own history, that he descended from the bench to take part in this very party warfare, and I think that we must not be blamed in the future if we pay no attention whatever to anything that falls from his lips in regard to this or any other matter.

The hon. member has said that the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) has made no suggestions, has shown nothing wrong with this Act. The hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) may have been writing or reading letters in his seat, for he does very little else in the way of useful legislation in this House, or he would have heard as the rest of us did, the most pertinent suggestions as to the defects in this Act. As was prophesied by several of us, including the leader of the opposition, when this Act was being passed, it has turned out in a disastrous way. This Act is unfair and never can be made fair as it is drawn. The right of the men to strike is suspended until it is of no earthly use to them. As I illustrated two years ago when this was brought in it is like saying to the men : We will not prevent you from eating fruit, but you must wait until the fruit is rotten before you do so. It is the same sort of pretended benefit which is nothing but a gold brick. The man is not permitted to strike until the strike will do him no good or until there is nothing left to strike about or until he is starved to death, or must leave the country in order to avoid being starved. The Act is not working fairly to the workingman. If the Minister of Labour is not going to take any more interest in it than he has up to this time the only right thing to do is to repeal that Act and not have it on the statute-book, where it is an invitation to people to believe that they have legislation that is some good to them but which is really nothing but a broken reed that gives way under them when they try to lean on it. The Minister of Labour must not trifle with this any longer ; he must make the Act workable so that the men will have some chance to get a reasonable arbitrament under it in time to do some good or else repeal the Act, and not pretend he is defending or protecting or getting justice for the labouring man. As we prophesied when the Act was drawn, the men are induced to believe that the government are acting as a guardian over wards, to see that they get fair play, and need not resort to strikes, to get these rights and remedies and yet nothing was to be done for them because the pull of the capitalist was of more importance to the government than the cries or screams or murmurings of the labouring man and his family. The Minister of Labour seems to-night to be perfectly willing to have a hypocritical piece of legislation on the statute-book which is of no use to the working man, and it would be better, safer, more honest to the workman to repeal the Act and say : You must look out for yourself as before, we are no guardians of yours. When a deputy minister is sent down to inquire into the merits of the case he seems to think that when he has pointed out that one man is a Conservative and the other a Liberal that is all that is required to form a decision. I do not think it is fair that the Minister of Labour should take the position he does in this matter, and I as a member of this House protest against this money being voted for any such purpose as the Minister of Labour appears to be using it for.

Mr. MADDIN. In his remarks on this subject this evening the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), in referring to a possible excuse for the Deputy Minister of Labour not calling upon me when he came down to Cape Breton in 1901, stated that he should not have come to me, I being the solicitor for the men on strike, and therefore, that I was taking sides. I am very glad that it has remained for the hon. member for Cape Breton to say that; I am very glad indeed that the gentleman who occupies the portfolio of Minister of Labour did not offer that as an excuse. He got up to defend his deputy and he said that he regretted this lack of courtesy, and that it was not intentional. What does the hon. member for North Cape Breton say with regard to a situation such as this? He says that the deputy minister should not have called on me, because, forsooth, I was the solicitor of one of the sides to the strike. Has he so little wit, has he so little judgment as to imagine that one union was fighting the other? The men on strike were fighting the company.

Mr. McKENZIE. I certainly did not say so. I said that two bodies of men

were fighting each other, the United Mine Workers' and the Provincial Workmens' Association, that the hon. gentleman was the solicitor of one side of the men, not as against the company at all.

Mr. MADDIN. Has the hon. member so little wit or so little sense as to imagine that one union was fighting another? There was nothing of the kind taking place. The United Mine Workers' of America asked the Dominion Coal Company to meet them and discuss the situation which had provoked the strike, not the recognition of their union, not that the company had recognized the Provincial Workingmens' Association and refused to recognize their union, but merely to protest against the company dismissing them from their employment because of the union to which they belonged. The Minister of Labour was very quick to rise to his feet to defend the Deputy Minister of Labour from the imagined aspersion which he presumed I had cast upon that gentleman. I told him then, as I tell him now, that I have no complaint to make at all against the deputy, but I did not find the Minister of Labour so active as to rise to his feet, and defend him against what was clearly an aspersion which fell from the lips of the hon. member for North Cape Breton when he said that the deputy minister could not go near the hon. member for South Cape Breton because he was solicitor for one of the sides. Does not that in the plainest words impute the basest hypocrisy on the party of the deputy minister who left his card at my house, asked me to call at the Sydney hotel, and, when I had called, discussed the strike with me? The hon. member for North Cape Breton says that he should not do it, that he had no right to do it, that there was every reason for not doing it.

Mr. McKENZIE. The deputy minister did not see the hon. gentleman until he was through with both sides of the men and their officers. Then he saw the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MADDIN. When he came to my house with his card, is the hon. gentleman going to impute that he was playing the hypocrite? Does he know that he had seen both sides before he left that card at my house? Did he call knowing that I was away, and that he would not see me? I would like the hon. gentleman who is a lawyer, and an ex-judge to exercise the function of ordinary every day common sense which, as a jurist and a lawyer, and a member of this House, he has not always exercised, I would ask him to exercise it to-night and to explain it to the committee how the deputy minister left his card at my house during the day with the request to meet him unless he was prepared to meet me when he came to my house. Was he playing the hypocrite knowing that I was not there when he came with his card pretending that he was friendly to me and willing to interview me? The hon. member for North Cape Breton places himself on the horns of a very awkward dilemma. On the one hand it is little credit to the hon. gentleman, and on the other it is little credit to the deputy minister. There is one observation that I wish to make. The hon. member for North Cape Breton stepped aside to-night to cast an aspersion on my personal integrity as a member of a board of conciliation, and spoke of how I had found against the miners down in Cape Breton at one time and had gone to a building and talked them into submission. He thought it an extraordinary thing that the member for South Cape Breton should recommend and approve a reduction of wages. The hon. member for North Cape Breton occupied the very seat on the county court bench that is now occupied by the gentleman to whom I paid tribute to-night, and he did not always discharge his duties there with the dignity, fairness and uprightness that have characterized his successor, but rather with the attitude, and in the manner in which he has discussed this matter which is before the committee to-night. He referred to my acting on the board of conciliation, and he said that I had gone to the miners of Cape Breton and tried to persuade them to accept a reduction of wages. Earlier in the evening, while discussing this matter with the Minister of Labour, I pointed out to him that when the books of the company were exhibited to a member of the board it was not for the purpose of the public, but only for the information of the members of the board. Let me read to you from section 13 of the Act, the oath which a member of the board takes, and the oath which I as a member of that board, to which the hon. member refers, did take. It is this:

13. Before entering upon the exercise of the functions of their office the members of a board, including the chairman, shall make oath or affirmation before a justice of the peace that they will faithfully and impartially perform the duties of their office, and also that, except in the discharge of their duties, they will not disclose to any person any of the evidence or other matter brought before the board.

I made that oath, I accepted it with the responsibility that I would accept the oath of a judge in the Supreme Court or the county court or the oath of a witness giving evidence before any tribunal. Acting under that oath, when the books of the company made it apparent to me as a representative of the men

that for various reasons the increase in the wages of common labourers employed by the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company at that time could not, from the revenues of the company, be legitimately, honestly, fairly and equitably increased, I joined in a recommendation that a reduction should take place amongst another class of employees of the company. Who were they? Machine runners and shot firers at No. 3 Sydney Mine. Some of those machine runners, according to public and published evidence taken there earned as high as $14 per day—only a very limited number—but there was quite a number who made $7 and $8 per day. With a sense of fairness and equity, which the men themselves appreciated when I had explained it to them, I thought that they might very well stand a small reduction in order that the common labourers receiving $1.35 might receive $1.43. I went out and submitted that to the men, and I put it up to them as I put up the policy gospel of the Tory party to them, and they accepted the one as they accepted the other. I ask the Minister of Labour if he considers Dr. Adam Shortt, the chairman of the Civil Service Commission an honest and an honourable and an upright man? What does the minister say to that?

Mr. KING. I hardly think it is necessary to answer a question of that sort.

Mr. MADDIN. Would the minister place any reliance on his opinion of a fellow-member of the board?

Mr. KING. I believe the hon. member (Mr. Maddin) would be actuated by the highest sense of honour.

Mr. MADDIN. That is not answering my question. I am absolutely indifferent to the opinion of the minister with regard to myself; what I ask him is, does he consider Dr. Adam Shortt, who has served on nearly 30 boards of conciliation, who occupied the Sir John Macdonald chair in Queens University, who is the foremost economist of the Dominion of Canada, who is recognized from Vancouver to Sydney as one of the most upright men in Canada; would the minister consider Dr. Shortt's opinion of a colleague on the board of conciliation as being sound and and worthy. Yes or no?

Mr. CARVELL. Go on.

Mr. KING. I have the very highest opinion of Professor Shortt.

Mr. MADDIN. The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) might give his opinion when he is asked.

Mr. CARVELL. If you want it I have to say very plainly that you have a lot of impudence to hold up a member------

Mr. MADDIN.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MADDIN. I want the opinion in parliamentary language if the hon. member for Carleton can put it in parliamentary language.

Mr. CARVELL. I can tell my hon. friend that if any member-------

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am not sure that the hon. gentleman has a right to speak.

Mr. CARVELL. He is asking me a question.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point of order. I ask that the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) be required to withdraw.

Mr. CARVELL. That is all right. The hon. member for Cape Breton and myself cannot have any quarrel; he wants my opinion.

Mr. LENNOX. If we are to have matters conducted properly we had better have this ended. I ask that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) frankly withdraw the statement he made. It is not a matter personal to the members concerned, it is a reflection on the whole House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have considered the matter concluded. I understood the hon. member to withdraw.

Mr. MADDIN. If the hon. member for Carleton cares to answer the question I propounded to the Minister of Labour, I give him the opportunity of answering it if he can do it in parliamentary language.

Mr. CARVELL. I will try to answer in parliamentary language. I tell him that so far as I am concerned I think no member of this House has any right to address a question to the Minister of Labour and demand an answer in the way this question was put, and if I were the Minister of Labour I would not give an answer.

Mr. MADDIN. Very well, you have not answered my question. In the report of Dr. Shortt to the Department of Labour on this occasion, he states that he found cases where men made from $3 to $6 and $7, and even $10 and $11 per day, and in one or two instances as much as $13 or $14 per day had been made. I concurred in a recommendation that a reduction be made from the wages of such men and applied to the wages of those who were receiving a smaller sum. To-night I am charged by the hon. member for North Cape Breton that when I was on a board I recommended a reduction, and that I went out to a building to the men to urge them to accept it. Now, Dr. Shortt in his report to the government has this to say, and it is only in self-defence and in justice

to myself that I venture to read the following from Dr. Shortt's report:

My colleague on the board, Mr. J. W. Maddin, as the nominee of the miners, had a particularly difficult position to fill, where the award of the board was so little attractive to some of the most influential of the miners. He not only maintained an independent and judicial attitude in arriving at the award of the board, but accepted the fullest responsibility for the award and laboured most actively to secure its adoption.

That is a testimonial that I value as highly as the parchment I received with my degree from Dalhousie College in 1900. Now, Mr. Chairman, with this testimonial from Dr. Shortt in these circumstances, my integrity is to be impugned, and by whom? By an hon. member, who, after he had accepted the nomination to run for this House, filed a judgment in his court which was afterwards set aside by the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, by a gentleman whom the returns indicate, had no fewer than 125 men appointed as fish wardens in the county of Victoria, and to many streams where no one ever saw water flow during the months they drew the salary for guarding these streams---Little Mountain torrents, Black Brook and such places in the county of Victoria. That is the hon. gentleman who casts aspersion on my integrity, and my honour, and my character, when I was charged with the first and only judicial matter I had the honour to decide. This is my accuser. Why, Sir, I wish to say to you that with the oath I had taken under the provisions of this Industrial Disputes Act, with the knowledge that the men whom I represented had confidence in me, and with the endorsation which will live there in the records of this House, from such a man as Dr. Shortt, I think I may feel safe in laughing at the aspersions emanating from such a source as that.

Mr. McKENZIE. I think it is only fair myself that I should reply to the personal observations made by the hon. member for South Cape Breton. I did not make any personal aspersion upon him about his position. Far from it; 'Hansard' will show I did not. I simply said he was so satisfied with the working of this Act that he acted under it and gave a decision. I said, and I was telling the truth, that he gave a decision recommending a reduction of wages. He has the very ill grace of making a reference to a decision of mine when I was on the bench. I would like to see or hear of any judge that was ever on the bench who had not some of his decisions reversed. There may be a few but there are very few of them in this country. I take it as coming from a man who has no conception of the dignity of the profession to which he belongs, that he would descend to such low tactics as to make reference to the decision that a man may have given when he was on the bench which may have been reversed by the Supreme Court. That is the only thing in my history of fifty years in the county of Cape Breton with regard to my private character that he evidently thinks he can put his finger upon. I would like to know if the hon. member for South Cape Breton is prepared to make an open book of his conduct and his character in the county of Cape Breton for the few years he has been there.

Mr. MADDIN. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has put a question, and I would like to answer it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot even answer the question unless permission is given.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am forced to make an answer. The hon. gentleman makes further reference to guardians who were appointed over fisheries. I say the statement is absolutely false, a deliberate lie, with the knowledge of its being a falsehood and a deliberate lie.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. It is not allowable to attribute deliberate falsehood to any member of this House.

Mr. McKENZIE. I say the statement is a deliberate falsehood.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Even in that form I think the statement is beyond parliamentary latitude.

Mr. McKENZIE. Perhaps it is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In that case I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw it.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will put it in another shape.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is at liberty to change the statement to a form that is in order.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to order. I submit that when a member of this House calls your attention to the fact that another member has made a statement which is contrary to the usage of this House, before the hon. gentleman can make any further statement, he must withdraw the statement which you have ruled out of order. He must withdraw that statement absolutely before he can say anything more, and that is what I ask you to direct him to do.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think that the decision having been given, the hon. member for South Simcoe is correct. It is the right of the hon. member, before the

decision is given, to explain his words and to place what he has stated in another form which would be within the rules of the House. I think that in this case the decision has been given, and so I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement.

Mr. McKENZIE. I propose, if it is necessary, to deal with this question along the lines suggested by the Chair. If I were outside of this House I would not withdraw the statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. McKENZIE. If it is not parliamentary here, I would withdraw it. As I said, if I were outside of this House I would not withdraw it, I have the right now to put it in another shape.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member is, I believe, in the process of withdrawing the statement. The withdrawal is not necessary in a single word. He has announced his purpose to withdraw and has absolutely withdrawn the statement, and he is proceeding now to place it in what he considers it a correct form. I am not aware of any cause of a point of order in what he has said. If the hon. member believes there is, I will hear his point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). As I understand, the hon. gentleman aggravated the original offence by deliberately stating that he withdrew the offensive expression only in response to the demand of the chair, and that if he were outside of the House he would repeat it. It is new doctrine to me, if that is a parliamentary withdrawal of an offensive expression. Now, I think it is due to the dignity of this House that we should have a thorough understanding of whether we are governed by parliamentary rule——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. member must adhere strictly to the point of order and not discuss the dignity of the House or any other matter.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Mr Chairman, if necessary, I would like to appeal to the Speaker, because I think this is a very serious matter. I am serious, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member is not adhering to the point of order. The point of order must be stated clearly and concisely. What the hon. gentleman's feelings may be, whether he is serious or not, is not included in the point of order. The point of order must be stated clearly, the words objected to stated, the rule quoted if applicable. What the hon. gentleman's feelings may be does not form a part of it.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I will state my point. It is that the hon. gentleman has not obeyed the direction of the chair in a parliamentary sense in prefacing his withdrawal with the statement that outside of the House he would not withdraw the offensive words, and he only withdraws them in deference to the chair. I submit that that is not a parliamentary withdrawal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. member for Cape Breton wishes to discuss that point of order, he is at liberty to do it.

Mr. McKENZIE. I have already stated that in compliance with parliamentary procedure I have withdrawn the statement. I say that the purpose of the hon. member for South Cape Breton was to charge me with dishonesty in my election, by saying that in order to get elected I had made appointments which I had no business to make. I say that he cannot sustain that contention; there is no evidence to support it, and I challenge him either from the records of parliament or anywhere else to sustain it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the point of order is clear. The hon. gentleman has stated that he withdrew the expression that had been objected to. To that he had added the expression that outside of the House he would deal otherwise with it. I think the point of order raised by the hon. member for New Westminster is correct, that it would be an evasion of a withdrawal to state that outside of the House he would do otherwise. But in the statement made by the hon. member for South Cape Breton at the present time of rising, he has clearly withdrawn without adding the objectionable portion, so that I believe he is now within the rules of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. member for New Westminster is serious in saying that he desires further information on this item, I would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, because it is too late to continue to-night.

Mr. MADDIN. Before the committee rises, I would not want the hon. member for North Cape Breton to go away with any misapprehension of my statement, which he takes so heavily to heart. I did not say that he had made a decision which was set aside. All our judges do that, because they are human. All of them give honest, well-meant judgments which are set aside. What I did say was, that after

he had accepted a nomination he had delivered a judgment which was afterwards set aside. That is a mere statement of a fact, and I did not mention it because his judgment had been set aside. Any one's judgment is liable to be set aside.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.37 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 13, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY ON PASSENGER VESSELS.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 116) to amend the Telegraphs Act. He said: The purpose of this amendment is to require that all passenger vessels shall be equipped with wireless telegraph apparatus. Every one knows of accidents which have happened, and which might have been avoided if the vessels had been so equipped. In this Bill we provide that all vessels carrying more than fifty passengers, except those plying between ports not more than 200 miles distant from each other, must have the wireless equipment.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SALE OF FLOUR AND MEAL.

Mr. JOHN STANFIELD (Colchester), moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 117) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last, when I moved the resolution on which this Bill is based, I explained the object of the measure. It is for the purpose of compelling millers and packers to stamp the weight on each bag containing flour or meal, the term meal including rye meal, oatmeal and cornmeal. The Act at present does not make provision for the sale of flour or meal by the bag.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 115) to incorporate The Guardian Accident and Guarantee Company.—Mr. Doherty.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECURITY TRUSTS CORPORATION.

House in committee on Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Security Trusts Corporation.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I would ask that this Bill be allowed to stand in the absence of the hon. member for Regina. The only question between us is as to the name, upon which we have not decided yet.

Mr. FIELDING. There was another clause the subject of some consideration, and the Minister of Public Works suggested an amendment which it was thought would deal more satisfactorily with the question of the relative rights of the province and the Dominion. The Minister of Justice decided that on the whole that amendment might safely be adopted. Otherwise the only question is as to the title of the Bill, and I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg that in the absence of the hon. member in charge of the Bill, it had better stand over.

Progress reported.

MONTREAL PARK AND ISLAND RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 45) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—Mr. Ecrement.

Mr. BELAND. I would like this Bill to stand until to-morrow or Friday.

Progress reported.

CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 69) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

On section 2, lines of railway authorized to be constructed,

Mr. SPROULE. Are we to understand that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) is still determined not to make provision that a certain expenditure shall be made? He intimated in committee that that was his determination. Does he adhere to it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I pointed out that this is the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, with a very large capital stock of which a good deal more than 15 per cent has been expended in various undertakings, and that the usual clause calling for the expenditure of 15 per cent of the capital stock within a given time does not really apply.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose that means that they can run on as they like, and if, at the end of five years, they have not completed these branches they can come for a renewal of their franchise.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to see this line run to Georgetown also, an important town in the county. The railway

is running to nearly everywhere else, and I do not see why Georgetown should be left out.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Geoffrion). I understand that notice has to be given of such an amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. How could I give notice when I did not know what was in the Bill? This road is to pass through Acton and Brampton, and it might be said that it would necessarily pass through Georgetown, unless it veers too much to the north or to the south, but there is no harm in making it clear. As to irregularity, I think the whole thing is a little irregular. I move that 'Georgetown' be added after 'Acton.'

The CHAIRMAN. I think I shall have to rule that out.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the committee agree to it unanimously, can it not be done?

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the committee is unanimous; nobody will object.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that this cannot be done in Committee of the Whole. In order to be regular notice must be given.

Mr. NESBITT. I have no objection to the addition, but I do not wish to have the passage of the Bill endangered.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) that it would be absolutely irregular, in the case of a private Bill, to make an amendment of which notice has not been given. We may be unanimous on the subject here, but there may be parties outside whose interests would be affected and who would object. The hon. gentleman might move that the committee rise and report progress, and then notice could be given before the Bill comes up again.

Mr. HENDERSON. I know that it would be irregular, but we sometimes do things that are irregular—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not in private Bills.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not wish to impede the progress of the Bill, or I would move that progress be reported. Perhaps, on the third reading, there might be opportunity to insert the word.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the Minister of Railways to explain more definitely how this line is to run in western Ontario? The Bill says:

From a point on its authorized line at or within ten miles east of Toronto westerly passing near or through Toronto, Hamilton and London to a point on the Detroit river at or near Windsor, with a branch from London to St. Thomas and also from London to a point on the St. Clair river at or near Sarnia.

Is it contemplated that the line should run through Petrolia or north of the main line of the Grand Trunk?

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine, from the general direction, it would not touch Petrolia. I think the general direction would have to be shown in the plans of the company to be approved. Generally speaking, unless certain points are mentioned which would allow the road to deviate, it would go in a pretty direct line. I think, taking these points described by my hon. friend, the line would not touch Petrolia.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As the main line of the Grand Trunk railway runs within about five miles of Petrolia, passing from Sarnia to London, possibly the branch line would touch Petrolia.

Mr. NESBITT. More than likely.

On section 3,

Mr. SPROULE. This allows the company to raise on securities $40,000 a mile instead of $25,000, which it formerly had authority to raise.

Mr. GRAHAM. This line passes through an old settled country, and the right of way through this country costs so much more than it would through a new country, where the right of way practically costs nothing, we thought it proper to allow them to raise $40,000 per mile.

Mr. NESBITT moved:

The company shall not construct or operate its railway along any highway, street or other public place without first obtaining the consent expressed by by-law of the municipality having jurisdiction over said highway, street or other public place, and upon terms to be agreed upon with such municipality.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I object to that amendment. I think the Canadian Northern railway should be placed under the same jurisdiction and under the same terms generally as the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway. These are the three great trunk lines of the country, and I think they should all be under the terms of the General Railway Act. The Canadian Pacific railway has its main charter and a great many branch lines charters; the Grand Trunk railway has its main charter and the Grand Trunk Pacific branch lines charter, and so has the Canadian Northern railway, all now under the General Railway Act, which provides that they should only go across or along a highway on obtaining the consent and approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners. It is true that in the last three or four years we have inserted in

new charters the clause which has been moved by my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), that is, that they shall not go along or across a highway without the consent of the municipality, and upon terms to be agreed upon with the municipality. Now this is creating a discrimination against the Canadian Northern railway, if this term is imposed on this charter, and I think we would do well to leave it under the Railway Act where the other great railway corporations are. It might be that some municipality through which it passes would have power absolutely to block the road by refusing its consent. I think we can trust the matter in the hands of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and for that reason this amendment should not be added to the Bill. If it were a new charter and a new company, then this argument might apply. But this road was largely constructed before we ever placed this clause in Bills which apply to trunk lines.

Mr. NESBITT. I have no objection, so far as I am concerned, to leaving it to the Board of Railway Commissioners. It is a clause we have usually inserted in all the Bills that now come before the committee. I think it is a perfectly legitimate clause. The fact that it is not in the Grand Trunk railway or the Canadian Northern railway charters does not make any difference to me. If they came up for a charter now, so far as I am concerned, I would advocate putting it in their charter, and on the same principle as I advocate this. This railway proposes to pass through all the older settled sections of Ontario, and I do not think that any railway should have a right, even with the consent of the Railway Board, to go along a road in a municipality without its consent. It is not crossing a highway, it is merely going along a highway. The clause inserted there does not say crossing a highway, it simply says going along a highway.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that amendment should be withdrawn. We have been in the habit of putting it in all other Bills we have given of late years. Because the Canadian Northern Railway Company had its original charter before we commenced this practice is to me no strong reason why we should now treat it differently from the way we have treated others when giving them charters to build railways. It applies to a section of country where it is equally desirable that the municipal corporation should have some control, and something to say as to what shall be done with their highways, as it would with reference to a new corporation to which we give that power. Consequently there is just as strong a reason why it should be in this Bill as in any other Bill we give, and I see no reason why the Canadian Northern railway should be exempt from it any more than any other company who are asking for incorporation. I think it is a very proper one. I would be inclined to control them in that way, but when they propose to go along the highways or public places, the municipality should have something to say as to where the railway shall go and upon what terms.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not think the clause a bad one, but I think it ought to be in the Railway Act, and not in particular charters. This is not a new charter, but application for the renewal of an old one, which did not contain any such clause. I think, therefore it would be a hardship to insert that in the old charter. When a charter was before us a few weeks ago for a Grand Trunk Pacific branch, we did not insert any such provision.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). There is another objection which I think is serious against this proposed amendment. Under the municipal Act of Ontario, I understand, a municipality can only give a railway company a franchise for a period of 20 or 25 years. This would consequently limit the right of this road to run over a municipal roadway for that short period of time. Bonds issued upon a railway, usually extend for 30 or 40 years. Anybody who knows anything of this question, will know that it is impossible for a railway company to issue bonds over a piece of road on which it has no right to run except during a period of 25 years. For that reason, since this is an old charter, it would be just as well to let it through; but, in any new charter, a clause such as this, might seem to be advisable.

Mr. NESBITT. I think what my hon. friend refers to are corporations or railways, such as electric roads, which come under the Provincial, and not under the Dominion Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not aware that there was any such provision in the Ontario Municipal Act, and I am inclined to think that my hon. friend may not be exactly correct. That would be a serious objection, but I have never understood the Ontario Act to apply in that way. I want to say a word with regard to a suggestion made by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), that this is a clause which should be in the General Railway Act. That is an objection which comes to us whenever we propose to insert something new in the charter of any railway company seeking incorporation; but we have almost invariably decided that until these things are in some general Act, we should put them into the special Acts we enact. Parliament has deemed it wise to insert such provisions in special Acts and to continue doing so until such time as they are incorporated in a general Act. With re-

gard to this Bill, the hon. member says that if this were a new charter he would favour this amendment. I cannot appreciate the distinction. We are asked to give the company power to build these new branches, and are giving it new rights just as we would in the case of a new charter. We are not seeking to deprive the company of any of the rights it possesses under its original charter; but when it asks the right to construct other lines, we are only doing our duty if we impose such conditions as we think ought to apply to the case of any new railway.

Mr. NESBITT. I am perfectly willing to withdraw the amendment, if the committee thinks it is better that it should go into the general railway Act.

Amendment withdrawn, Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ALGOMA CENTRAL AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on (Bill 62) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Mr. GRAHAM. On Friday evening, I understand, a question was put as to the knowledge of those affected, concerning section 3. As a matter of fact, in the railway committee this question was asked, and the gentleman who represented this company assured the committee and myself that those who will be affected have unanimously given their consent.

Mr. GUTHRIE. We have the authorized record there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was I who asked the question, and I am entirely satisfied with the statement that my hon. colleague makes, in regard to the matter.

On section 3,

Mr. SPROULE. Are all interests safeguarded by this provision?

Mr. GRAHAM. Before this Bill came to the committee the gentlemen representing this company came to see me and convinced me that in this particular instance every interest was safeguarded. Those particularly affected agreed to this clause being inserted in the Act, and also before the committee, they submitted their record to show that the agreement had taken place. I considered it pretty fully, and I came to the conclusion that there was nothing at all in this to affect any persons but those who had given their consent to it.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the only question involved.

On section 4,

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Does not this clause give the right to issue bonds before the railway is constructed, or whenever it is under contract? I do not think that we usually do that.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CARVELL moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 9) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act be read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the hon. gentleman explain the amendments?

Mr. CARVELL. It is only a difference in the phraseology of the clause. The clause as it passed this House, stated that:

When potatoes are sold or offered for sale by the barrel the barrel shall contain 160 pounds.

The Senate were afraid that this might penalize a farmer who sold a little less than 160 pounds by mistake. They therefore changed the clause to read:

When potatoes are sold or offered for sale by the barrel the barrel shall mean 160 pounds of potatoes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a funny meaning for a barrel. We might say that a barrel means 100 pounds of apples.

Mr. CARVELL. I think it is, but I do not like the phraseology and yet it really accomplishes what I am after in the result.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think any judge would allow that at all. What do you think?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Was this Bill introduced by resolution? I raise the point that it must be introduced by resolution as the whole matter deals with trade.

Mr. CARVELL. It is a public Bill introduced in the ordinary way, was not introduced by resolution, and I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that, according to the custom of this House, it is too late to raise the point now. The Bill has been passed and sent to the Senate.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The Bill has been referred to the Senate, amended by the Senate and comes back to this House. The House is asked to read these amendments the second time. I hold that the Bill has not been finally committed to the House until the amendments get their second reading. If there had been no amendment made by the Senate it would be all right, but I raise the question now even on these amendments, and I ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the Bill is not before the House, that the only question before the House is that of the amendments made by the Senate.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I raise the question on the amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point cannot be taken on that question.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any citation that can be made as to the custom of the House in that respect?

Mr. SPEAKER. We can allow the question to stand until to-morrow, if necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that would be better.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion for the second reading of the amendments will stand until to-morrow.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. WALLACE.

Mr. WALLACE. I beg to call the attention of the House to the following statement which I find on page 1 of the Toronto 'Daily Star' of Saturday, February 11:

When the government's majority was reduced to 26 on Thursday, on Mr. Monk's amendment, regretting that time had not been given to consider the effect of reciprocity before the agreement had been reached, a large number of Liberal members were away from the House. Perhaps a few of these had not yet made up their minds as to the way they should vote on the general question, but others were away because no division was expected. Perhaps it may indicate Bourassa's influence, or it may be but a coincidence that of the 23 members who did not vote, nor were paired, 15 were from Quebec. Of the total, 18 happened to be Roman Catholics, and three were Conservatives—T. G. Wallace, M.P., Jos. Girard (Ind. Con.), and W. F. Maclean. Hon. Clifford Sifton was also absent. In spite of Mr. German's attitude toward reciprocity, as expressed at Niagara, he voted against Mr. Monk's motion. Had every member of the Commons voted, the result would probably have been 116 to 75, or a Liberal majority of 41.

List of Non-Voters.

Here is the list of those who did not vote:

A. M. Beauparlant, St. Hyacinthe, Que.
Albert Champagne, Battleford, Sask.
E. B. Devlin, Wright, Que.
J. A. Dubeau, Joliette, Que.
Jos Girard (Ind. Con.), Chicoutimi, Que.
J. E. O'Gladu, Yamaska, Que.
D. A. Lafortune, Montcalm, Que.
Ernest Lapointe, Kamouraska, Que.
W. F. Maclean (Con.), Toronto, Ont.
D. H. McAllister, King's and Albert, N.B.
J. A. McMillan, Glengarry, Ont.
L. J. Papineau, Beauharnois, Que.
George Parent, Montmorency, Que.
L. A. A. Rivet, Hochelaga, Que.
D. C. Ross, W. Middlesex, Ont.
Ernest Roy, Dorchester, Que.
F. T. Savoie, Megantic, Que.
P. A. Seguin, L'Asomption, Que.
Hon. Clifford Sifton, Brandon, Man.
O. E. Talbot, Bellechasse, Que.
E. W. Tobin, Richmond and Wolfe, Que.
T. G. Wallace (Con.), York Centre, Ont.
C. A. Wilson, Laval, Que.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, with reference to this article, that I was present here at that vote on Thursday afternoon, and I voted for the amendment. I wish to bring that to your attention as I do not wish it to go to my constituents that I did not vote on that occasion when such is not the fact.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

TRANSLATION OF DOCUMENTS.

Mr. ECREMENT :

Has the document intituled, 'Papers relating to commercial relations between Canada and foreign countries,' been translated into French? If so, has it been distributed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a matter over which the House, and not the government has control.

SASKATCHEWAN SCHOOL LANDS.

* Mr. LAKE :

What decision has the government arrived at, and what action has it taken in response to the request of the Premier of Saskatchewan, that the full control of administration of the school lands in that province be given to the provincial authorities, under such restrictions as may be deemed necessary to perpetuate and safeguard the trust established by the Dominion Lands Act?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER :

No action has been taken by the government in this matter.

SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA LANDS.

* Mr. LAKE :

Has there been any correspondence between this government or any member thereof, and the provincial governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan, or either of them, or any of their members, in reference to securing control by such provincial governments of the lands, timber, water-powers, coal and other minerals, or any of the natural resources which exist within the respective boundaries of said provinces, other than school lands? If so, will the government cause copies to be laid upon the table of the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER :

I do not remember at the moment what correspondence there may be, but if the hon. gentleman will let the notice stand as a motion for a return we will bring down what correspondence we have.

FRASER RIVER MAIL SERVICE.

* Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster) :

1. Has the Postmaster General received any application for or suggestion looking to the establishment of mail service to points south of the Fraser river by means of the recently established electric railway service?
2. If so, have any reports been made by officers of the department, and to what effect?

Mr. LEMIEUX :

1. Yes, communications in the matter were received from the Boards of Trade at Chilliwack and Cloverdale, B.C.
2. A report was made recommending the use for mail purposes of the British Columbia Electric railway between New Westminster and Chilliwack and intermediate points, and the petition was favourably considered and instructions issued by the department to put the service into effect. It is not customary to bring down a report unless a motion is made.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDUSTRIAL TRAINING.

Mr. ECREMENT :

1. Is the government aware that the Royal Commission on Industrial Training is now said to be pursuing its inquiry in the province of Quebec?
2. Is it informed that the official stenographer attached to the commission is incapable of taking the depositions of witnesses in French?
3. Have serious complaints been made to the commissioner, Gaspard de Gerres, on this subject?
4. If so, is it his intention to remedy this state of things?

Mr. KING :

When I saw the notice of this question I asked the deputy minister to communicate with Professor Robertson, chairman of the commission. The following telegram has been received from him.

Joliette, February 10, 1911.

F. A. Acland,
Deputy Minister Labour,
Ottawa.

Commission has had competent translators or interpreter. Satisfactory reports of all testimony are being made. Witnesses have always been given option of speaking French or English. Commission has competent French stenographer in attendance here. Commissioner DeGerres has received only one complaint on this subject; that occasion was in September when translator was late in attendance at one session.

JAS. W. ROBERTSON.

LAND APPLICATION OF E. V. BELLEROSE.

* Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster) :

1. Did Edwin Vincent Bellerose make application on June 21, 1906, for N½ of S.E. ¼ section 19, township 22, New Westminster district?
2. Did applicant make the statement that his father, George Bellerose, was willing to give up land above described?
3. Was the willingness on the part of George Bellerose acknowledged in the reply to Edwin Vincent Bellerose?
4. If so, did the acknowledgment imply knowledge on the part of the government or its official of application by George Bellerose for the land in question?
5. What disposition has been made of the application by Edwin Vincent Bellerose, and if not yet disposed of, will it be dealt with before the regulations in force when it was made are abrogated?

Mr. MURPHY :

1. No application is on record here by Edwin Vincent Bellerose on the 21st June, 1906, or any other date for the north ½ of southeast ¼, section 19, township 22, New Westminster district. There may be information concerning this in the Dominion Land Agency at New Westminster.
2. Not known here.
3 and 4. No reply was sent from department.
5. It is understood according to information on file that Edwin Vincent Bellerose is claiming the north ½ of the south ½ 19 and also legal subdivisions 4 and 5 of section 20. It is further understood that Edwin Vincent Bellerose has a house worth about $150 on said legal subdivision 4 probably outside the line of the timber berth.

The greater part of the legal subdivisions 4 and 5 is in timber berth 55 and contains about 5,000 ft. of merchantable timber, board measure, to the acre. The department would not have the power to grant an entry for the land claimed in the timber berth either under the old regulations or the new regulations.

TRANSFERS FROM CANADIAN REGISTER.

* Mr. CROSBY :

1. How many vessels have been transferred from the Canadian register to Newfoundland within the last two years, and how many vessels have been transferred from Newfoundland to Canadian register, within the last two years, and what are the names of the vessels transferred from Newfoundland to Canada?

Mr. BRODEUR :

Twenty-four vessels have been transferred from the Canadian register to Newfoundland within the last two years.

The following seven vessels have been transferred from Newfoundland to the Canadian register within the last two years: 'Olinda,' 'Muriel,' 'Mildred,' 'Dorothy Duff,' 'Nina L,' 'Falken,' 'Crissie C. Thomey.'

This information is for the calendar years 1909 and 1910.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Are these foreign or British built vessels? That makes a difference in the collection of duties, and I

understand there is a gateway there where they can walk through the Customs Act. I thought that registry had been stopped.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no information as to that.

OWL'S HEAD HARBOUR.

*Mr. CROSBY:

Has a petition from the people of Owl's Head, Halifax county, asking that a light be placed at the mouth of Owl's Head harbour been received by the honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? If so, what is the intention of the Marine and Fisheries Department with regard to same and when may they expect to have a light placed there?

Mr. BRODEUR:

Yes. The prayer of the petition was favourably considered by the Lighthouse Board at a meeting held November 10, 1910, and approved by order in council of December 22, 1910. Arrangements are being made to erect this lighthouse during the coming season.

FISHERY REGULATIONS—INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION.

*Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster):

1. With respect to the regulations to be framed by International Commissioners under the treaty of April 11, 1908, between Great Britain and the United States, did the two governments engage to put into operation and to enforce by legislation, these regulations with as little delay as possible?

2. Did the commissioners agree or was it recommended by any commissioner, to either government, that the regulations should take effect on January 1, 1911?

3. Was it agreed by the commissioners 'that no amendments shall be proposed at the present time, and that the system of regulations as presented on May 31, 1909, shall be allowed to take their course?

4. Have the regulations been put into effect, by legislation or otherwise, by Great Britain or by the United States?

5. Have both governments observed the agreement noted in question 3? If not, which government has proposed amendments?

6. Has the delay been caused by the hearing at Washington of interests affected by the provisions of the regulations? If so, has opportunity been given to Canadian interests to suggest or to influence changes in the regulations?

Mr. BRODEUR:

The first paragraph of article 3 of the treaty reads: 'The two governments engaged to put into operation and to enforce by legislation and executive action with as little delay as possible, the provisions with appropriate penalties for all breaches thereof; and the date when they shall be put into operation shall be fixed by the concurrent proclamation of the Governor General of the Dominion of Canada in Council and of the President of the United States.

2, 3, 5. The commissioners having made the regulations it is contended by the government that no changes can be made before the regulations have been put in force.

Reference to Sessional Paper No. 105, 9-10 Edward VII., which contains the regulations recommended by the commission, will show that the commissioners recommended that four regulations should become effective on January 1, 1911; but as to all the other regulations no date as to their coming into force was specified.

4, 6. Great Britain was not obliged by the treaty to pass any legislation. The United States authorities have not yet passed the necessary legislation.

BANKERS' ASSOCIATION.

*Mr. LOW:

1. Is the government aware of any arrangement or agreement made or existing between banks composing the Bankers' Association whereby it is arranged they are not to compete or are to withdraw from competition for business in certain towns and are not to establish agencies or withdraw agencies when established, so as to avoid competition?

2. If the government is not aware of this, will they take steps to ascertain the facts so as to deal with conditions before the Bank Act is discussed?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. The government have no information as to any such agreement.

2. The Bankers' Association will no doubt be represented before the Committee on Banking and Commerce when the revision of the Bank Act is under consideration, and there will thus be an opportunity to inquire into the matter before the Act is passed.

TORONTO MAIL COLLECTORS.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Does the government collect the mails from the various boxes and branch offices in Toronto under contract for their collection, or by the services of collectors employed by and immediately under the government?

2. What number of hours per day do these collectors work, and do they work on Sundays and holidays?

3. What is the average wage paid to such collectors?

4. If this work is let by contract, is the fair wage clause inserted in such contract, and what supervision does the government exercise, if any, with regard to the hours of labour?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. This work is done partially under contract and partially by foot collectors employed by and immediately under the control of the department.

2. The collectors employed by the department are divided into two staffs, those who collect during the day and those who collect at night, 5 p.m. to 12 p.m. The former work eight hours per day and the latter seven.

These men do not work either on Sundays or on holidays.

3. The wages paid to the men now employed in doing this work ranges from $2.25 per day to $2.75 per day, the average rate of wages paid being $2.60 per day.

4. This service is at present being operated under a temporary agreement, but specifications are now in course of preparation and public tenders will be invited in the very near future for a new contract in which the interests of labour will be safeguarded.

GRAND TRUNK DEVELOPMENT COMPANY.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar):

In a return brought down on 1st February, 1909, regarding the Grand Trunk Development Company, which states that there has been given, permission to buy from the homesteader thereof certain unpatented homestead lands, upon payment of $1 per acre to the government, in addition to the amount paid to the said homesteader, besides this sum of $1 per acre, does the government reserve any interests in the lands or profits out of the sale of such lands?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES SINCE CONFEDERATION.

Mr. GILBERT:

What is the total amount appropriated to railways since confederation?

Mr. GRAHAM. The total amount paid in cash subsidies to railways in Canada by the Department of Railways and Canals, from confederation to date, is $607,776,853.50.

MILITIA EXPENDITURES SINCE CONFEDERATION.

Mr. GILBERT:

What is the total amount expended for the militia since confederation?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

The expenditure by the Militia Department totals $83,193,389.47.

This does not include the following expenditure:

Northwest rebellion, 1884-5	$1,697,851.52
Contributions to British government towards maintenance of garrison at Esquimalt, between the years 1889 and 1906	1,237,208.00
South African war and Halifax provisional garrison, years 1899-1900 and 1901	2,826,608.99

Mr. LEMIEUX.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER COMPANY.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. What have been the annual payments to the St. Lawrence Power Company since the first year to the present time for supplying light and power respectively?

2. What has been the amount of traffic annually through the old Cornwall canal since 1901?

Mr. GRAHAM:

	Light.	Energy.
1904	$17,337 15	$ 6,444 03
1905	22,518 14	20,886 26
1906	21,887 10	25,199 60
1907	21,863 40	25,400 56
1908	21,820 13	25,268 64
1909	21,499 80	24,785 36
1910	21,891 60	25,199 71
	$148,817 32	$153,184 16

SUMMARY.

Lighting	$148,817 32
Energy	153,184 16
Total	$302,001 48

2. The traffic through old Cornwall canal has not been kept by the Department of Railways and Canals separate from the new canal. The department is unable to give the traffic separately.

HALL'S PRAIRIE POST OFFICE.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster):

1. Did the Post Office Department receive during last year a petition nominating a postmaster and suggesting a location for the post office of Hall's Prairie, B.C., consequent on the resignation of Mr. Alcock, the former postmaster?

2. If so, how many signatures were attached to said petition, and what action was taken with respect to it?

3. Were any representations made to the inspector for the district conflicting with the prayer of the petitioners? If so, by whom and to what effect?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Yes.

2. Eighty-one signatures. Before the receipt of this petition, recommending that the office be given to a Mr. Bamford, the department had already appointed Mr. A. J. Peschke to the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Alcock. Inquiry was, however, made as to the suggestion of the petitioners, and the official investigation showed that the site proposed by the petitioners would bring the office within half a mile of the Hazelmere post office, whereas by locating the office at Mr. Peschke's the Hazelmere and Hall's Prairie offices are one mile and three-quarters apart. The post office inspector was, moreover, strongly of opinion that the location of the Hall's Prairie office at Mr. Peschke's residence, placed it in the most thickly populated portion of the neighbourhood.

3. Yes; a communication was received by the inspector objecting strongly to the office being located at Mr. Bamford's on the ground that the location of the office at a point so close to the Hazelmere post office would operate inconveniently to some twenty families, who would be better accommodated by the office being placed at the residence of Mr. Peschke.

VANCOUVER DRY DOCK SUBSIDY.

Mr. RHODES:

1. What is the nature of the subsidy granted to the Vancouver Dry Dock Company?
2. Is said subsidy in the nature of a guarantee of interest, or is it a grant of interest?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 1 and 2. A direct payment, after completion of the dock, of 3½ per cent of the cost.

DRAINAGE OF GEORGETOWN GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. FRASER:

1. Has the government established sewerage from its public building, the post office and customs house, at Georgetown, P.E.I.?
2. If so, what was the cost of this work?
3. Have private parties been allowed to connect their drainage with the government sewer?
4. If so, from whom was authority obtained to allow this connection?
5. What are the names of the parties thus allowed to make use of the government system?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes; 6-inch tile to harbour.
2. Included in contract for alteration to building.
3, 4 and 5. Not to the knowledge of the department, and no authority was given to do so.

RED POINT WHARF.

Mr. FRASER:

1. How much money was spent during the year 1910 on Red Point wharf in Queens county, P.E.I.?
2. To whom were the different amounts paid, and how much to each?
3. Who supplied the material?
4. Who worked with horses, and how much was paid to each of these parties?
5. Who was the foreman or the inspector, how many days was he paid for, and what was his wages per day?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. $913.00.
2, 3, 4 & 5:

Malcolm Macdonald, conductor, $2.50 per day ..	$123.75	
Peter Cummiskey, carter	55.12	
Chas. Cummiskey, "	11.25	
Thos. P. Beagon, labourer	14.25	
Wm. S. McEachern, "	11.25	
" " cartage, 8.10	19.35	
J. H. Higgins, labourer ..	42.00	
Ernest Trainor, "	48.00	
James Smith, "	22.50	
David Fraser, "	22.50	
Patrick O'Halleran, carter	31.50	
Angus J. Campbell, labourer	15.00	
Stewart Higgins, carter ..	12.37	
Wallace Campbell, labourer	12.00	
Wm. Macdonald, carter ..	24.75	
John Macdonald, " ..	21.37	
Wm. Trainor, labourer ..	20.25	
Peter Trainor, "	25.50	521.46
Materials:		
D. J. MacDonald, lumber	$116.25	
David McDonald, " ..	90.46	
L. M. Poole & Co., hemlock	89.75	
Fennel & Chandler, hardware	26.39	
Hamilton Higgins, smithwork	1.00	
Thomas McNally, towing lumber	7.00	
John Quinn, services of pile driver, &c	30.00	
Wm. S. MacEachern, lumber	30.69	391.54
Total to date		$913.00

DUNNVILLE POSTAL AND CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS.

Mr. LALOR:

1. What is the postal revenue of the town of Dunnville, Ontario, for the year 1910?
2. What is the money value of post office orders for the town of Dunnville for the year 1910?
3. What is the value of imports of the customs of the port of Dunnville for 1910?
4. What is the amount of money collected for customs at the port of Dunnville for the year 1910?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. $6,918.54.
2. $25,769.70.

Mr. PATERSON:

3. $316,157 for fiscal year ended 31st March, 1910.
4. $38,577.48 for fiscal year ended 31st March, 1910.

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. What was the total amount paid last year in iron and steel bounties?
2. What was the total amount repaid last year by the government, or rebated by the government, on duties paid on materials imported by manufacturers, and subsequently exported by such manufacturers as part of that finished product?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. Bounties, $1,808,533.33.
2. Drawback, $382,912.73.

IMPORTS OF FIRE BRICKS.

Mr. MADDIN:

1. What was the number of fire bricks imported into Nova Scotia during the years 1909 and 1910?

2. What ports were they delivered at, and how many at each port?

Mr. PATERSON:

1 and 2. The value of fire bricks imported into the province of Nova Scotia by ports, during the calendar years, 1909 and 1910, was as follows:

	1909. Value.	1910. Value.
Amherst	$ 1,354	$ 2,221
Glace Bay	795	779
Halifax	1,136	2,237
Kentville	.....	36
Lunenburg	144	60
New Glasgow	2,296	2,345
North Sydney	10,658	22,330
Port Hood	110	.....
Sydney	78,120	162,763
Truro	.....	2,889
Yarmouth	814	100
Total	$95,427	$195,760

WESTVILLE POST OFFICE.

Mr. MADDIN:

How many bricks were used in the erection of the post office at Westville, Pictou county, N.S.?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

The department does not know how many bricks were used.

SESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SHARPE moved:

For a return showing the names and addresses of all sessional employees of the government in the House of Commons, beginning with the session immediately subsequent to the elections of 1896, and for each year succeeding to and including the present session, their duties in each case, their home addresses, their salaries, their transfers in each and every case to either other appointments of the sessional staff or to permanent employment in any department, the dates of each such appointment or transfer, upon whose recommendation each such appointment was made, their dismissals, if any, and the reasons therefor.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman's motion speaks of 'sessional employees of the government.' I may say that there are no sessional employees of the government, so that that term had better be struck out and sessional employees of the House substituted. This is no doubt what the hon. gentleman means, and if so, there is no objection to the motion.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. PATERSON.

TERMINAL AND TRANSFER ELEVATORS.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris) moved:

That in the opinion of this House, the present system of operating terminal and transfer elevators is detrimental to the interests of the Western grain producers, and that the government should take immediate steps to operate terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and the transfer elevators between those terminals and the Atlantic seaboard.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in submitting this important motion to the House, I do not think I need make any apology. I know that when questions of this kind, affecting Western Canada, have been brought before this House, some hon. members from eastern Canada have been inclined to regard them as of no interest to themselves. But, Sir, if there is any one question that is of national importance to this country to-day, it is the question of elevators. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition the other day referred to the splendid progress that is being made by Canada, as evidenced by the great growth in population and importance of the great cities of eastern Canada. If Montreal to-day has a population of over half a million and Toronto boasts of a population nearly as great, I think I can justly claim that 75 per cent of the advancement made by these large eastern cities is due to the progress and development of the three prairie provinces. I think it would surprise very many members of this House to have accurate statistics of the trade which has come to eastern Canada because of that development. That western country is overrun with commercial travellers representing all branches of trade and industry in this country, and I believe the great manufacturing concerns of the country admit that their trade and prosperity during the last ten years has been largely due to the development of the Northwest. If that is a fact, and I believe it is, why should not eastern Canada be deeply interested in the great question of elevators? It is true, my motion has reference especially to what are called terminal and transfer elevators; but to my mind there is a strong connecting link between all the elevators which are utilized in the handling of the grain from the time it leaves the farmer's wagon until it reaches its ultimate market. This subject has been debated before in this House. A few days ago the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) brought up a motion on the subject, and although it did not contain all that it should, his speech did. I read the speech of the hon. gentleman, and I do not think he will take any exception to the statement that his general conclusion was that the only way in which we could properly control these terminal and transfer

elevators was by the system which I propose to-day, of government operation. I want to say that I do not approach this subject with any partisan motive. If there is any subject upon which the western members can agree, it is this one of elevators, which is closely allied to the great question of transportation.

Now, we have in this country what may be termed three classes of elevators. First, we have the line elevators which are scattered over the three prairie provinces wherever there is a line of railway. We have the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and in some places the Great Northern. I am of opinion that eastern Canada would be surprised to know the number of elevators scattered over these three provinces and the amount of capital that is invested in this elevator business. I repeat, there is no question of such vital importance to the national prosperity of this country to-day as the elevator question. I think I would not be far astray in saying that there are some 2,000 of these line elevators scattered over the three prairie provinces. The Canadian Pacific Railway has over 1,100, the Canadian Northern some 460, the Grand Trunk Pacific some 111, and the Great Northern some 24. This is only a rough estimate, but it is within the mark.

These line elevators are the links between the farmer's wagons and the railways. They are not absolutely necessary. We have what we call loading platforms, and it was somewhat of a surprise to me to find that during the last year some 15,000,000 bushels of wheat were loaded from these platforms. But I am still of the opinion that the elevator is the most legitimiate and the most convenient method of handling our grain from the farmer's wagon to the railway. A great deal of the difficulty suffered in the western provinces during the early years has no doubt been remedied, and there is not to-day so much fault to find with these line elevators, yet there remains a problem in that connection which we have been striving for some time to solve. We had a very important meeting which was attended by the Prime Ministers of the three western provinces for the purpose of arriving at some solution but apparently they were not able to accomplish any result, and the great cry in western Canada a few years ago, at any rate, was for government ownership of these line elevators. The province of Manitoba adopted that principle. The farmers and producers of that province, whether Liberal or Tory, made up their minds that government ownership was the only way in which these line elevators could be operated satisfactorily. I had something to do with the last contest in Manitoba, and I make this statement, that I never on any platform heard any speaker, whether Liberal or Conservative, take the stand that the government operation of line elevators was not in the best interests of the country. The only argument used by our Liberal friends was this, that the government was not sincere, and that on the night of the election all government building and operation in this connection would cease. That, however, has not been the case. I mention that fact simply to show that both parties were then unanimously in favour of that system. As regards Saskatchewan, I am not as familiar with what that province has done as some of my hon. friends opposite, but, from what I have read in the press, it has not exactly adopted government operation of line elevators but appointed a commission to investigate, and that commission reported, as I understand, that a company shall be formed, the officers of which should be the executives of the Grain Growers' Association of the province of Saskatchewan, and that the government should guarantee the bonds to the extent of 85 per cent of the money required to build, the company furnishing the other 15 per cent. and the bonds to be redeemed in 20 years. I also understand that the government was to undertake the financing of the concern, but I do not know as to how that part of the money invested was to be repaid.

This question was debated by the Farmers and Grain Growers' association of Saskatchewan last week, and although there was some diversity of opinion, and although some two or three years ago nothing would satisfy any of the farmers except government ownership, it seems that the Saskatchewan grain growers, in the proportion of about six to one, decided to accept the report of the commission, and no doubt that report will be ratified by the local legislature, and the system recommended by the commission will be the way in which the elevators in that province will be operated. I presume that would be called government co-operation.

As regards Alberta, I am not aware that any steps have been taken to establish any such system of elevators. Although there may be diversity of opinion as to how these line elevators are to be operated, I do not think there is any diversity of opinion among the grain growers as to how the terminal elevators should be operated in the best interests of the producers. Other methods have been tried but we have all come to the conclusion that the warehouse men must not have an interest in the grain. As to the ownership, I do not know that it makes very much difference who owns these elevators, but it does make a tremendous difference to the producers who shall operate them. I am not one of those who desire any cleavage between the east and the west. I believe

that the east needs the west, and that the west appreciates to a very great extent the east. I believe in our working together and in encouraging interprovincial trade as much as possible. Therefore, as I have already said, this is not particularly a western question. There is, of course, a difference in the industrial development of the west and the east. The city of Winnipeg is becoming quite a manufacturing centre, but the three prairie provinces are essentially given to grain growing and cattle raising. In the east and in British Columbia you have your lumber, your fruit growing and manufactures, and a great many other industries from which you can receive a revenue, but that is not the case in the prairie provinces. Our industries being limited in these provinces as they are, it is the more necessary that we should find the means of deriving the very best financial results from the pursuit of the two great industries I have mentioned.

I may be asked: Why has the west so recently taken such a stand? There are different reasons. Conditions have changed somewhat in the west. The raising of wheat has become more expensive. One reason for this is that help, both indoors and outdoors, is more expensive. Another question that might be referred to in this connection, but which I shall not deal with to-day, is the transportation question—transportation has certainly become more expensive; freight rates, storage and loading. In fact, the business of the farmer to-day is to give close and intelligent attention to all parts of his industry that enter into the production and marketing of grain from the time he plants the seed until he receives his remuneration in the markets of the world. Until recently the farmers were willing to jog along in the old way, to be the victims, figuratively speaking, of the lightning rod exploiter and the shoddy-cloth peddler. But within the last two or three years a change has come over the farmer. What has brought it about? Nothing short of co-operation. The other branches of industry sought the aid of co-operation much earlier than the farmer did. The manufacturers of this country have found it advantageous—and I am not finding fault with them for it; there is nobody more pleased than I am that our manufacturers are making money. But, perhaps, some of them are making too much money. I know a manufacturer in the city of Toronto who lives in a palace that, I think, cost more than all the buildings in a whole township in my constituency. It is questionable whether that is exactly what we want. Millionaires may be good, but I agree with the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), who, if I understood him right, recently suggested that it is not particularly the business of this country to build up millionaires, but it is the business of this country to secure the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Our farmers are beginning to wake up; they are taking a leaf out of the book of the manufacturer and railways and are trying what co-operation will do. We have had for years, for instance, the Patrons of Industry and other societies for the benefit of the farming population, but the old excuse always came up, 'The farmers cannot stick together.' Thinking people reached a condition of mind in which they were unwilling to ally themselves with these associations, because of the want of stability and stick-to-it-iveness on the part of the farmer. But I thoroughly believe that that is all changed. We had a very good evidence of that here not long ago, when seven or eight hundred of these western farmers came down—and not with the money of Jim Hill either, but paying their own expenses—and this Chamber rang with the enthusiasm and earnestness of these people, as, I believe, it never rang before. These people are in earnest. Some will say—I have had it said to me: These farmers want the earth; they want too much. Perhaps they are asking for a little too much; perhaps I am asking a little too much to-day. But did never the manufacturers come to this House and ask for too much? Did never the railways come to this hall and ask for too much? They certainly have. And I assure you the farmers to-day are ready and willing, although they may be asking a good deal, to accept what is in their best interest and in the interest of the country. And that is what I stand for here to-day. I say the farmers have begun to think for themselves. And my advice to the agriculturists of this country is not to listen to sophistical arguments based upon the idea that the farmers are the best off people in Canada. I wish they were; I would like to see everybody well off. But eastern Canada has not yet quite understood how much sacrifice and toil has been needed to put the people of the western provinces in the position in which they are to-day. A man going into the western provinces—whether he went a few years ago, or whether he goes now—unless he has ample capital, or unless he enjoys unusual good fortune, will spend fifteen years of hard work before he achieves a comfortable position. Manitoba and the older parts of Saskatchewan have gone through that fifteen years, and I admit that the farmers there are in fairly good circumstances. But even the man going to the west to-day will need fifteen years to succeed, as I have said.

Now, I named the three classes of elevators, the line, the terminal and the transfer elevators. As to the terminal elevators, I believe our principal duty to-day lies with the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort Wil

liam. Before I get through I will read a report brought down by the government, which, I think, does not exactly agree with the remarks made by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) the other day as to the quantity of wheat heretofore shipped out. I was surprised when I saw the government's figures showing how little wheat has passed through to the markets of Ontario or the markets of the world except through the terminal elevators at Port Arthur or Fort William. I have already said that we had been trying to solve problems connected with the line elevators. But, even if we solved those problems in the most successful manner, of what advantage would it be to us if the terminal elevators are left in the hands of people who treat the producers unfairly, who, in fact, for the last number of years—and the term is none too strong—have been stealing their wheat? (There is absolutely no question about it, because it has been proved by government officers). Then, I say, it is exceedingly important that we do something to remedy conditions in connection with these terminal elevators. The principal marketable product of the western farmer is wheat. The quality of our climate and soil is such that we have gained a reputation for producing the finest wheat in the world, and in such quantities that western Canada has been called 'The granary of the world.' But our wheat, on its way to the markets of the world, almost all passes through Fort William and Port Arthur.

Our farmers have known for years that our wheat was being manipulated in these terminal elevators. Formerly all our troubles were in connection with the line elevators, but now they have been increased in connection with these terminal elevators. The government have tried ways and means, and it may surprise this House to know that to-day this government is employing 95 men at Port Arthur and Fort William—what for? To handle this wheat? No, Sir, just to watch the other fellows that are stealing the wheat. They are there for no other reason. There is an absolute duplication of the men, the men who own the elevators and the men who are operating, and this government is paying $61,000 in employing 95 men to watch these other men, and who pays this $61,000? It all comes out of the grain growers; the wheat must pay all these men, there is no question about that. Now has there been any manipulation of wheat in Port Arthur and Fort William? We believe that it has been going on for years. When I brought this question up before, an amendment was moved from the other side of the House for delay, on the ground that the government was going to appoint men to supervise this work, and they did make appointments. At the very time of the instance I gave this afternoon, there were some 75 men watching the operation of this mixing. Nevertheless this mixing is going on. I do not think that I am giving away any confidence when I say that I believe from information that the Department of Trade and Commerce is just as fully convinced as I am that it is going on, and they know that the only possible way we can protect the producer is that the man who operates the warehouse shall have no financial interest in the grain, and I think that can only be be accomplished by government operation.

Mr. NEELY. The hon. gentleman speaks of information. Has he information which would lead this House to believe that during the present or past years' operation the Department of Trade and Commerce have any reason to believe that there has been manipulation at Fort William or Port Arthur?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Certainly, lots of information, and I will give it before I get through. It was done last year, according to a statement by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) the other day. Now we may or we may not be in favour of government ownership and operation as a rule, I am not discussing that question to-day; but I do say that if there is any business in Canada to which the government operation is applicable, it is the handling of grain by these terminal elevators, and government operation can be applied to them with the least inconvenience of any industry I know of. Now, I will give my hon. friend the information for which he asks. I understand that to be in 1910.

Mr. NEELY. I was referring to handling the crop of 1910, not to any action that was taken by the department, or to something that had occurred previously.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The last report is that of 1910, and this work was going on under the government system of having 75 men to watch the men who were doing this work. At present the number is 95, and I think it has been increased since. The information was supplied by the inspection department of Fort William and Port Arthur. The chief inspector, Mr. Gibbs, reports:

There were serious discrepancies in the returns of the terminal elevator companies' reports, as compared with those of the Inspection Department covering the same period.

This was on the 22nd of April, 1910. Mr. Castles went to Port Arthur, interviewed Mr. Gibbs, and returned to Winnipeg, and he says now:

At my request Inspector Gibbs made a formal complaint in writing, under oath, to enable me to hold an investigation under the provisions of the Manitoba Grain Act.

Now it would be very interesting to the House if I were to give a number of clauses from the Manitoba Grain Act, but I will not take up time by doing so.

The charges made in this case (as in the other two cases) was that the company had sent in incorrect and untrue statements.

The companies involved were the Canadian Pacific railway, the Consolidated Railway Company, the United Empire Company and the Port Arthur Company. They employed a lawyer by the name of Phillipps. Now I want to say that the grain dealers in Port Arthur and Fort William put every obstacle they could—this is Mr. Castles' own report—in the way of this investigation, and nearly all their obstacles were met. But when it came to asking these men to produce their books, and to allow them to be audited by the government officials, what did they do? Did they give up their books? No, Sir, they acknowledged the corn. They refused to give up their books, and admitted the charge Inspector Gibbs had made about the practice of the warehouse. Mr. Castles was correct, and these men were fined. The Port Arthur Company was fined in 1910, but not nearly as much as they should have been fined, only $3,000; and the Consolidated Company were fined $50. The Empire Company $2,500. In all $5,550. I want to say with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that nothing could be found wrong with their handling of the grain, all that was wrong I believe were some technical errors. Eastern millers tell us that wheat that passes through Canadian Pacific Railway elevators is worth more for milling purposes than wheat of the same grade passing through privately owned and operated elevators. Mr. Castles and the government officials were convinced that there was nothing wrong, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was not fined. Now what is the inference? The Canadian Pacific railway had no interest in mixing the grain, in docking the grain; they were merely common carriers, and their only interest was to receive the grain and give it out again to the steamers, to be transported to the markets of the world. Now I think it is rather significant, and goes to prove exactly what we believe, that the elevators must be controlled by men who have no financial interest in the wheat.

One of the chief troubles that we have had has been with what is called mixing grain. This was done in 1910. Some years ago the same system that has been carried on at Port Arthur and Fort William was in operation at Duluth and some of the men who were engaged in it at Duluth are, I believe, those who have been carrying it on at Fort William and Port Arthur. The operation of mixing grain is carried on in this way: They buy a certain amount of No. 1 Northern, No. 2 Northern, No. 3 Northern, and No. 4 Northern. The Manitoba Grain Act distinctly states that grain of different grades shall be placed in separate bins, that No. 1 shall be in one bin, No. 2 in another and No. 3 in another. But strange to say the same grades that go into the elevator do not come out. I ask the attention of the House to these figures. The shipments out of an elevator at Port Arthur of No. 1 Northern exceeded the receipts by 437,884 bushels. That is 437,884 bushels of wheat bought from the farmer for No. 2 Northern, or No. 3, or No. 4 and at the No. 2, 3, or 4 price was placed in a bin with No. 1 Northern and went out as No. 1 Northern, the dealer getting the benefit of the difference in price which sometimes amounts to as much as four cents a bushel. That affects us in a number of ways. I not only have to accept a No. 2 price for my wheat when I should get No. 1 price and I am, therefore, losing in that way, but it works out in another way. The No. 1 wheat that goes into the bin would average up. Some of it would be splendid wheat, some of it not so good, but the inspector at Winnipeg, where most of this wheat is inspected, calls it No. 1. This wheat is shipped to Liverpool, and if wheat that would grade No. 3 and 4 is mixed with No. 1 the No. 1 grade is brought down to where it will just get through by the skin of its teeth; the whole of it is averaged up to a point where it will just grade No. 1 Northern. That goes over to the old country and the quality produced by the mixing operation reflects back on the price that we get for our wheat at home. Everybody believes to-day that the value of our wheat is largely maintained by the Liverpool price. One of the complaints that our farmers make is that although we are supposed to produce the best wheat in the world because of our soil and climate, the grades are so deteriorated before the wheat reaches its market that the value is reflected back and the result is that the farmers receive a lower price.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the wheat all graded at Winnipeg?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The wheat is mostly all graded at Winnipeg. Sometimes when there is a rush on and the railway yards are full, wheat is permitted to be sent on to Port Arthur and is graded there, but you can say that as a matter of fact nearly all the wheat is graded at Winnipeg. We used to have this mixing going on at Winnipeg, but it is not going on to any great extent now because the government has remedied that part of the trouble. There used to be a mixing elevator at Winnipeg. They would run the wheat into this elevator and after mixing take out a carload of wheat which Mr. Horn, or his officers, would in-

spect. If it did not quite come up to the grade of No. 1 or No. 2 Northern they would ask Mr. Horn to allow them to take it back to the mixing elevator, they would treat it a little more and bring it up gradually to where it would grade No. 1 or No. 2 or No. 3 Northern. But a change has been made in that regard. Wheat that has been transhipped in Winnipeg is not graded until the bill of lading has been made out or until the wheat is ready to go to Fort William or Port Arthur. Therefore, I think I might say, replying to the question of the hon. leader of the opposition, that the grain is almost all graded at Winnipeg, and that no mixing goes on until the wheat reaches the terminal elevators. The process by which wheat is graded at Winnipeg is an interesting one. A car of wheat comes into Winnipeg from any part of the western provinces. It is the duty of the railway company to notify the inspector of the arrival of a car, the number and where it is placed in the yard. The wheat is sealed when it comes into Winnipeg. The inspector and his officers break the seal and gain access to the car. They have a long tube which they thrust into the wheat in a number of different places. It is a good deal like the instrument that dairymen use for testing cheese, with the exception that it is filled with a lot of little holes so that when they thrust the tube down into the wheat they are able to secure samples from the top to the bottom of the car. The sample is taken out, the car is resealed by these officers, it is sent on to Fort William or Port Arthur and then the result of the inspection of the sample, the inspectors having the number of the car, is sent to Inspector Gibbs, or to other persons at Port Arthur. As I said, 437,884 bushels of No. 1 Northern were shipped out more than were taken in. Where did they get the difference? That is by actual measurement by Inspector Gibbs. He also found 389,159 bushels of No. 2 Northern less in the elevator than were shipped in. The greater quantity of No. 1 was shipped out while there was a less quantity of No. 2 in the elevator than had been shipped in. Of No. 3 Northern, deducting shipments from receipts, there should have been on hand in the bins 155,975 bushels but when they came to measure up they only had 5,502 bushels, showing a discrepancy or shortage of 150,473 bushels. Deducting shipments from the receipts, there should have been on hand of No. 4 Northern 47,879 bushels, while there were only, by actual measurement, 4,001 bushels, the discrepancy being 43,869 bushels. That was going on under the supervision of seventy or eighty men in the employ of this government, and I am strongly of the opinion that it will go on in spite of all the Bills that this government may possibly be able to bring into this House until the financial interest of the warehouseman is taken out of these elevators. In the Empire elevator the discrepancy is not quite as large, but they had the same difficulty. The officers at these elevators raised all sorts of objections. At last, when they were asked to produce their books in order to have an independent audit of them, they admitted at once that they had been doing wrong and refused to show their books.

Deducting shipments from receipts in this elevator, there should have been on hand on the 12th of December, 291,742 bushels, while there was only 175,000 bushels, or a discrepancy of 116,000. In No. 3 northern, deducting shipments from receipts there should have been on hand 346,000 bushels, but the examination showed only 166,000, or a shortage of 180,000; and so on. I think that should be very good proof of the kind of work that was going on. The railway terminal elevators were found to be conducted properly in connection with the Canadian Pacific railway, because there is no inducement for manipulation, and the warehousemen have no financial interest in the grain going through the elevator. Mr. Castles' report shows that the Port Arthur Elevator Company shipped out 169,066 more of No. 1 northern than they received. In the Empire elevator, Mr. Castles' report showed that the amount of No. 1 shipped out exceeded the receipts by 437,884 bushels, and that there was also a discrepancy or shortage in No. 2 and No. 3 northern. In view of this condition of things, I maintain that the farmers of the west should be protected to a greater extent in the transport of their grain than ever they have been protected in the past.

I have referred to another evil in the grading of our wheat, and I shall not say more on that further than to remark that the farmer loses in two ways, because he does not get paid for his grain as he should be, and the quality of the wheat is depreciated in the British market. A few years ago most farmers in Manitoba and in some parts of Saskatchewan were absolutely compelled to sell their wheat because they had implements to pay for and had incurred debts during the summer and when the fall rush of wheat was on it was said there was a glut in the market and grain dealers recommended that they should spread the sale of their wheat over the different seasons of the year. The farmers became sufficiently well off to be able to adopt that system but they lacked grain room, and wheat cannot be shipped at any time of the year, because, for example, this winter the snow is so deep and the climate so severe that it would be absolutely impossible to haul wheat. Some of the farmers thought they would send their wheat to Port Arthur and Fort Wil-

liam, put it in the elevators but still retain control of it, so as to sell it when they wanted to. However, although they thought they were not putting their wheat upon the market and they would eventually receive a better price by distributing its sale over different months of the year, they found their wheat was still going forward and that was one of the complaints against the Consolidated Elevator Company. The wheat that the farmers thought they were holding was being loaned and sent forward, and at the same time although they were doing this they were charging the farmer for the storage of this wheat all the time. These are facts that cannot be disputed. Another evil—and goodness knows I have already detailed enough to convince any government that one of the greatest Canadian industries should be better protected—another evil is that when the wheat is inspected at Winnipeg the inspector sends a certificate to Port Arthur that the wheat is of a certain grade with a certain percentage of dockage, which means that at Port Arthur and Fort William it should be cleaned of the 2, 3 or 5 per cent dockage, as the case may be, and then sent on. After the farmer had paid the freight on this dirty grain down to Port Arthur and Fort William, the elevators always had the privilege of using the dockage for their own purposes. But what did they do? If it was only about 2 per cent dockage, they allowed the wheat to go on without treating it at all, and when it arrived in the British market without being cleaned that reflected back again upon the quality of our wheat. The four principles for which the farmers of the west contend are: that there should not be mixing, that there should not be unfair dockage, that wheat should not be loaned, and that wheat should be cleaned at the terminal elevators, according to the certificate of the wheat inspector at Winnipeg. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of that western country are obliged to conform to the Grain Act to the letter, and if the farmers are compelled to keep to the strict letter of the law, my duty here to-day is to see that the grain dealer is dealt with in the same way. I am, however, of the opinion that no amount of supervision or inspection can eventually prevent manipulation in our terminals so long as they are owned and operated by private interests. In taking that stand I am reiterating the sentiment expressed by the hon. gentleman from Regina (Mr. Martin) when he spoke on this subject the other day. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) spoke as he did on this matter; I am not dealing with this question from any political partisan point of view; I believe we have suffered tremendously in that western country for want of proper supervision and because our grain has been manipulated by the grain dealer, and I think Liberals and Conservatives alike should endeavour to seek a remedy. The House may remember that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) moved an amendment to the motion, that I moved in this House, and with that I find no fault. A few years ago Mr. Martin's amendment was to the effect that the system adopted then by government should have a trial.

Mr. Martin now says:

> The system has now been given a fair trial with the result that it has proved itself absolutely inadequate to meet the situation.

He also says on page 2445 of 'Hansard':

> I have gradually come to the conclusion that we will never be protected properly in the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur until we have these elevators owned and operated by the government.

There could not be anything more pronounced than that, and I am thoroughly in sympathy with the remarks of the hon. gentleman. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I have referred to to-day all took place under a system of supervision which the government supposed would solve the problem. At that time there were 70 men in the employ of the government inspecting the terminal elevators, but the manipulation continued under their very eyes and they were powerless to prevent it. I say that it is an absolute impossibility to exercise such supervision as will prevent the mixing of the grain, even if you have 500 men there. These elevator people have belts running from one elevator to another, and from one bin to another, and what is to prevent them going in there at night and transferring grain from one bin to another? How is any supervision going to prevent that? And this manipulation and stealing of wheat has been going on for years. I believe I am not out of the way when I say that the farmers of the west have lost at least ten millions of dollars in the value of the wheat that has been taken from them by the operation of these privately-owned elevators. The farmers were here a short time ago to bring several matters before the government of the day. There was the reduction of the tariff, the Hudson Bay railway, the chilled meat question; last, but by no means least, the terminal elevator question. This question is as important to the east as to the west. because the more money the farmers receive, the more money Montreal, Toronto and every eastern manufacturing interest is going to get. I said at the beginning that there might be some difference of opinion on this subject; but three years ago the farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, stood almost to a man for government ownership of these

elevators. With regard to line elevators, they have to some extent, changed their opinion; but with regard to terminal elevators, I think I can fairly say that they are practically a unit to-day in favour of government ownership and operation. The trouble is not in the ownership of the elevators, but in their operation. This wheat question is becoming a big question, and we have only touched the fringe of it. It is estimated that there are in the three prairie provinces 171,000,000 acres that will produce wheat, and we have under cultivation to-day not more than 13,000,000 or 14,000,000 acres. The hon. member for Regina told us the other day that Saskatchewan alone produced last year 90,000,000 bushels. The other day I placed on the Order Paper some questions, which, with the answers to them, I think are worthy of a place in 'Hansard' to give this House some idea of the magnitude of this subject. They were as follows:

Statement showing Amount of Grain exported from Canada during 1908, 1909 and 1910.

Q. 1. How much wheat was exported from Canada for the crop years ending August 31, 1908, 1909 and 1910?

A. 1908, 39,591,383 bushels.
1909, 45,879,058 bushels.
1910, 53,298,643 bushels.

Q. 2. How much wheat was exported from Canada through United States ports during 1908, 1909 and 1910, naming said ports and amount exported from each port?

A.

——	1908.	1909.	1910.
	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.
Baltimore	88,432	465,773	1,801,294
Boston	7,687,745	7,420,969	8,012,253
New York	4,333,115	5,100,117	5,911,085
Philadelphia	2,473,284	5,690,749	4,995,553
Portland	5,186,129	4,809,880	6,409,286
Total	19,786,705	23,487,488	27,129,471

Q. 3. How many terminal grain elevators are there at Port Arthur and Fort William, and what is the name of each?

A. 3. At Fort William—

	No.
Canadian Pacific Railway	3
Empire Elevator Company	1
Consolidated Elevator Company	1
Ogilvie Flour Mills, Ltd.	1
Western Terminal Elevator Company	1
Grand Trunk Pacific Elevator Company	1
Black & Muirhead	1
Davidson & Smith	1
Total	10

Port Arthur—

	No.
Port Arthur Elevator Company Ltd.	2
David Horn & Co.	1
Thunder Bay Elevator Company	1
National Elevator Company	1
Total	5
Grand total	15

Here comes a rather interesting item. How much wheat was exported from Canada during each crop year 1908, 1909 and 1910 which did not pass through the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William? I was under the impression that the amount was very much greater but the figures I am about to give show that only a small amount passed through these two terminals. These figures are :

2. How much grain was shipped through each elevator at Port Arthur and Fort William during each year 1908, 1909 and 1910, and what are the names of the elevators respectively?

A.

CROP YEAR 1908.

Name of Elevator—	Total Grain. Bush.
Canadian Pacific Railway	22,360,510
Empire Elevator Company	8,858,508
Consolidated Elevator Company.	6,769,568
Total, Fort William	37,988,586
Port Arthur Elevator Co.	30,387,270
Jas. G. King & Co.	2,990,826
Total, Port Arthur	23,378,096
Grand total	61,366,682

I will skip over 1909.

CROP YEAR 1910.

Name of elevator—	Total Grain. Bush.
Canadian Pacific Railway	2,079,118
Empire Elevator Co.	12,019,973
Consolidated Elevator Co.	8,554,543
Ogilvie Flour Mills Co., Ltd.	7,873,114
Western Terminal Elevator Co.	3,587,419
Black & Muirhead	254,740
Total, Fort William	61,368,907
Port Arthur Elevator Co.	29,354,966
Jas. G. King & Co.	3,423,009
Thunder Bay Elevator Co.	6,212,614
Total, Port Arthur	38,990,589
Grand Total	100,359,496

Q. How much wheat was exported from Canada during each crop year 1908, 1909 and 1910, not passing through the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William?

A.	Bushels.
1908	1,350,340
1909	1,325,100
1910	3,542,190
	6,217,630

Q. How many men are employed by the government in connection with the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William, and what is the total salary paid the men per year?

A.

	No. of Employees.	Salaries.
Fort William..	96	$50,714 45
Port Arthur..		10,566 50
		$61,280 95

Out of three years' crops, all the wheat which did not pass through the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William amounted to but 5,200,000 bushels. This shows that the question as to the best way to operate and control these elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William is one that might well engage our attention. I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, and consequently may be wrong. The Bill which the government is going to bring down, no doubt, in the opinion of the government, meets the demand, but I do not believe it. I believe that there is only one remedy, and that is to take the operation of these elevators out of the hands of the men who have a financial interest in them. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, no amount of supervision or inspection can effectually prevent manipulation in our terminals so long as they are owned and operated by private interests, which can be benefited thereby. Our farmers in the past have been divided, through lack of organization they have failed to accomplish much, but they have started organizing. They have followed the example of the railways, and the manufacturers, and by means of organization intend to make their influence felt. To-day the ship of these farmers is afloat, it is controlled by competent officers and manned by able seamen, and the port to which it is making is the port of the greatest good to the greatest number.

Mr. ROBB. Can the hon. gentleman inform the House to what extent the farmers of Manitoba have taken advantage of the government owned elevators during the past season?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. My hon. friend will understand that the government operation of these elevators in Manitoba is a very new thing; at least half the crop was shipped before the government took charge of the elevators either by purchase or building. Further, for years there has not been such a small quantity of wheat to ship from southern Manitoba as this year. But the commissioner, who was the chairman of the organization which met in this room, told me that he believed the new system was going to work out splendidly. Furthermore, the farmers of Manitoba must be coming to that opinion because 90 per cent of the points at which elevators are located have petitioned the government to either buy or build and operate the elevators at those points.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt). As a similar resolution to the one before us was offered for our consideration a couple of weeks ago, I do not propose to discuss this matter at any length to-day. I only rise to say that, in view of the fact that the government have introduced into the Senate a Bill dealing with this whole subject, we might very well postpone discussion until we have this Bill before us. I am as strongly in earnest about getting a satisfactory solution of the grain difficulties in the west as my hon. friend can possibly be. I might say that, notwithstanding the very strong criticism he makes of the present method of government supervision and inspection, there are one or two points which he has overlooked, and to which I would call his attention.

In the first place, government supervision was carried on to a very limited extent—that is, the staff was a very limited one until two years ago. And while it is true that certain terminal elevators, so far as the handling of the grain crop of 1909 is concerned, were brought to book last year, it is also true that they were brought to book by the very method of supervision which my hon. friend condemned. These offences would not have been discovered and those guilty of them would not have been penalized had it not been for the supervision that is being carried on by the officers of the government. I asked my hon. friend if he were aware of any similar transactions in handling the grain crop of 1910. He did not give me an answer to that question. If this government supervision is absolutely valueless, as my hon. friend alleges it is, he ought to explain how it comes that it was by this very supervision that these transgressors were brought to book. I might also point out that my hon. friend has not taken cognizance of the fact that since the crop of 1909 was handled, further steps have been taken to protect the interests of the farmer who ships his grain to Fort William or Port Arthur by the appointment of the registration bureau to which I referred some days ago. The trouble in the past has been that the penalties have not been sufficiently severe. If the operation of mixing were carried on to any very large extent, the elevator interest could afford to pay a very considerable fine and still be very largely the gainer. However, I said in opening that it is not my intention to deal with this question to any extent to-day; because, while I take the position that my hon. friend may be correct and that ultimately it may be necessary to establish government ownership and operation of the terminal and transfer elevators, yet I hold that that fact has not yet been absolutely de-

monstrated. And I reiterate the position I took the other day, that until this is absolutely demonstrated such action as is proposed by my hon. friend is premature and might be dangerous even to the grain trade itself.

And, in view of the fact that the government have a Bill which will presently be before this House, in which, I understand, provision is made of a final remedy for the very thing my hon. friend proposes to meet by means of government ownership and operation, a Bill which, I understand, provides for a commission such as I suggested when discussing this question a couple of weeks ago, and gives the commission the very widest powers possible in dealing with this trade, giving them the same control of the grain situation in Canada as the warehouse and grain commission has in the State of Minnesota, where, I believe, the grain laws are probably more satisfactory than in any other part of North America—I say, in view of these facts, it would be unwise for this House to lay down finally and absolutely the principle proposed in the motion of my hon. friend until we have had some opportunity of seeing for ourselves, of investigating, of thinking over and discussing this measure which the government proposes to bring before the House within the next few days.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely) will permit me, I would like to ask a question. Does he believe, so far as he has information of the Bill, that it will provide for the government operation of these elevators? In other words, will it take the operation of these elevators out of the hands of the grain dealers?

Mr. NEELY. I am free to say that, until to-day, I have been quite as much in the dark concerning the provisions of this Bill as my hon. friend. I had no opportunity to see the Bill and consider its clauses. But, when this question came up to-day, I took the trouble to send to the distribution office and procure a copy of the Bill, and I believe my hon. friend could procure a copy in the same way. And I do find a provision which, if it is not out of order, I would like to read:

> The Governor in Council may authorize the minister to construct, acquire, lease or expropriate for His Majesty any terminal elevator if parliament has granted the money for such purpose.
>
> The Expropriation Act shall, in any case, apply to the leasing and acquisition of such terminal elevator and to the ascertaining of the compensation to be paid therefor.

That is as much information as I can give my hon. friend, because I have not had time even to look through the other provisions of the Bill except in a casual way.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question if it would not be interrupting him too much. I understand him to say that government ownership might ultimately be necessary, but that this had not yet been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the House. Does he say that the case presented by the farmers' delegation from the west is not sufficient demonstration of this point to satisfy parliament that it was absolutely necessary?

Mr. NEELY. While it was demonstrated, not only by the farmers, but by the prosecution made by the officers of the government that, so far as the handling of the crops of 1909 and preceding years is concerned, there probably was manipulation of the grain at Port Arthur and Fort William, and while the farmers demonstrated that a remedy was necessary, they only gave it as their opinion that the one method of reform was government ownership and operation. I can hardly go so far as to say that they did demonstrate the absolute necessity of government ownership and operation; they gave it as their opinion. But farmers' opinions change like other peoples. I notice that a large body of the Grain Growers of Saskatchewan, in convention assembled, have unanimously adopted a co-operative scheme in connection with the operation of interior elevators—line elevators—whereas, some years ago, as my hon. friend (Mr. Schaffner) has very truly said, the only remedy favoured by many of the farmers of Saskatchewan seemed to be government operation. The same change might occur in this case. But the point I am making is that, in any case, whether government operation be necessary as a final remedy or not, a commission must be appointed—that is, if the government so decide to take over these elevators, there must be a commission to operate them, some body in which shall be vested power to deal with the whole grain trade throughout the length and breadth of Canada. These must be men able to become thoroughly versed in the conditions of the grain trade—in fact the probability is that they will be men who are well versed in that business; they certainly should be men who know a good deal of the grain trade. If these gentlemen, after they have been in office for a reasonable length of time, come to the conclusion that they cannot stop evils in any other way than by government operation, and if they make report to that effect, I am convinced that the government will not hesitate a single moment in putting into effect the recommendation of this commission. That is my answer to my hon. friend's question, and that is the position I take on this whole matter. Now, Sir, in view of the fact that I hold these sentiments, in view of the fact, as I have said, that the government

have this Bill introduced in the Senate, and that it is presently to be brought before this House, I beg to move:

That all words after 'that' in this resolution be struck out, and the following be substituted—

Inasmuch as a Bill has been introduced by the government and is now pending in the Senate, dealing with the present system of operating the terminal elevators, it is not expedient to proceed with this question in advance of the consideration of the said Bill by this House.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Allow me, in the first place, to congratulate the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) on the able and thorough way in which he has dealt with this important question, and also on the way he has stuck to his point, a point that I think is endorsed by all the members from the northwest, and by all the men raising grain in that country, namely, the absolute necessity of government operation of the terminal elevators. I have already placed myself on record as saying that, in my opinion, nothing short of government operation will remove the evil under which the people of the northwest are suffering in regard to the handling of their grain at Fort William and Port Arthur. I have taken the position, which I think is a logical one, that once the government have assumed the responsibility of granting a certificate that grain is of a certain quality as No. 1 Northern, No. 2 Northern and No. 3 Northern, it should take such measures as will absolutely ensure that that grain reaches the consumer in the same condition in which it has passed from the hands of the grain growers, and that there should be no sort of tampering with it. Two years ago the members from the northwest, on the other side of the House, blocked a resolution which was introduced by my hon. friend from Souris, asking for government operation of terminal elevators. They proposed that an opportunity should be given for a fuller method of government inspection of those elevators. That system has been tried, and it has been found wanting. A few months ago the country was startled to learn that frauds had been perpetrated under the very noses of the inspectors. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Neely) has taken a good deal of credit for the government inspectors from the fact that it was they who called attention to the frauds. Now, it seems to me as rather singular that credit should be given to men who subsequently discovered a fraud which had actually taken place under their very noses, and which it was their special duty to prevent. The hon. gentleman went on to state that no charges of fraud could be substantiated at the present time in regard to the handling of the grain crop of last year. I think, if my memory is right,

that at the very time the grain growers' deputation was being received at Ottawa, a statement was made that such charges would be again preferred in regard to the handling of the grain crop of last year. Any way, let me point out that, although frauds took place at a very early stage in the handling of the crop of 1909, it was not, I think until April, 1910, that the matter reached a point where a prosecution could be entered in connection with those frauds. This is the system of government inspection that has been proved a failure up to the present time. The government now propose to introduce another experiment in the way of still further government control and inspection. Unfortunately, I have not been able to get hold of a copy of the Bill with which the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) seems to have been favoured. I went into the distribution office on Saturday afternoon, and they had not got the Bill at that time.

Mr. NEELY. I have a correction to make. The Minister of the Interior sent up to the distribution bureau a short time ago for a copy of the Bill. I was under the impression that the Bills were in the distribution office, and I have just discovered that the copy he handed to me was his own private copy, and that he was not able to get one at the distribution office.

Mr. LAKE. I have just sent up a written request to the distribution office for a copy of the Bill, and they send me word that they have not got it yet. So members on the other side of the House have an opportunity of studying the details of this measure, which gentlemen on this side of the House have not. During the debate which took place a few weeks ago I noticed hon. gentlemen opposite referring to some details of this measure; so we were certainly at a disadvantage in discussing the course which we understood was to be pursued when this Bill was brought in. Now, with regard to fuller inspection at Fort William and Port Arthur, my hon. friend from Souris has stated that it is absolutely impossible to have thorough and complete control of the grain which passes through these elevators. I confess that I had begun to think there must be something wrong, when there was a body of 75 to 90 inspectors at work there last year, and this year again, who had not been able to control the grain passing through those elevators; that seemed to me extraordinary. I was under the impression that the government were making appointments of men to act at those places as they were doing in other cases throughout the country, leaving the nomination in the hands of the Liberal committee at Fort William and Port Arthur, and were making appointments of inspectors at these places from the recommendations of the Liberal committee. If

that is the case, it only shows that the men thus appointed were not able to carry on the work which was entrusted to them, and it is another instance of the mischievous nature of the patronage system to which this government has absolutely surrendered itself since it has been in power.

When the Grain Growers deputation were down here in December last they were quite definite as to what they wanted with respect to this matter. Not only were they definite but they had grain dealers and millers with them who also gave evidence to the effect that the government operation of terminal elevators was the only thing which would satisfactorily control the passage of wheat through these elevators, and prevent any fraud in connection with it. They made out a remarkably complete case and I have heard practically nothing said by any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House to show that the stand taken by the grain growers at that time is not an absolutely sound one. In addition to that let me put in the evidence of a resolution that was unanimously passed by the legislative assembly of the province of Saskatchewan at the last session of the House, to this effect:

Whereas, this House is of the opinion that under existing conditions, both interior and terminal elevators being private and identical interests operate to the disadvantage of the grain growers of Saskatchewan;

Therefore, be it resolved, that in the opinion of this House the government of Canada should own and operate the terminal elevators.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the legislature of Saskatchewan at the last session, affording an additional argument why, in the opinion of men well fitted to judge with regard to this matter, government operation alone will meet the exigencies of the case.

I might point out also to the Prime Minister and to the hon. gentlemen who sit on that side of the House, the additional necessity at the present time that grain, which is going by the Canadian route, and which receives a Canadian certificate, should be absolutely above suspicion, and that the certificate should be absolutely reliable. It lies in the reciprocity negotiations which have been carried on during the last few weeks. If the certificate of our government can be absolutely relied upon by the consumers in Great Britain as giving the correct quality of the grain, I have no doubt in the world that our grain will once again command the very high value which it used to command on the Liverpool markets and which it has not been commanding of late years. The statement was made by gentlemen who were down here representing the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association just about a year ago, that for several months on the British market Manitoba wheat had been at a lower value than many other wheats upon that market. This is the statement which was made by them in a letter which they addressed to the government at that time:

Due to its own high quality for making baker's flour, Manitoba No. 1 Northern usually brings a premium over all other wheats in Britain, yet from early in October to December, 1909, 'Manitoba' was the lowest priced wheat in the Liverpool market excepting some United States wheat.

If that condition continues to exist then we shall see, if the reciprocity arrangement is carried out, our wheat going out through the United States, and not through the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William. That is a condition that I am sure we all most earnestly wish to avoid, and for that reason in itself I would urge that the government undertake the operation of these elevators and see, when they give a a certificate of quality, that that certificate is valid when the grain reaches the markets of the world. I only hope that in addition to the government undertaking the operation of the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur for the reasons I have stated they would hurry up the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. That will give us another and a far better route to the markets of the world than we have at the present time, and it will also assist in preventing our wheat from being carried to these markets by the American route.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. L. CASH (Mackenzie). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has, on behalf of the government, introduced a Bill in the Senate, dealing with this matter, it will not be necessary for me to-night, speaking on this motion, to anticipate the discussion which will ensue in this House when that Bill comes before us. There is, of course, no doubt that a great many irregularities have occurred at the terminal elevators, and the only question of difference between us is, or should be, as to what is the best remedy to provide for the prevention of these irregularities. When the grain growers from the west were here in December last, there was a conference between them and members of the government as to the measures which should be taken to regulate the terminal elevators, and as I understand it, the proposals then made by the government were satisfactory to the delegates. When I was home during the Christmas holidays, I found the idea prevalent among the farmers, that

they would be satisfied with the government measure which they were led to believe would be introduced and which has since been presented to parliament. One of the provisions of that Bill is that there should be a commission appointed to oversee the business of the elevators, to get a perfect knowledge concerning the conduct of that business, and, if the business were not conducted in the interests of the grain growers that this commission should make recommendations to the government as to the taking over of these elevators and the provision of a parliamentary grant for that purpose. When that Bill comes before us, as I say, it will then be time enough for us to consider whether it is calculated to mitigate the evils which undoubtedly exist, and anything we may say to-night would be unnecessarily anticipatory of that discussion. Of course, we know that when a great many bushels of grain go through these elevators, a very small margin on each bushel would amount to a good many dollars in the pockets of the men operating the elevators, and so we must suppose that those guilty of manipulation, have very good reason for urging that conditions should remain as they are at present. However, I believe the legislation introduced by the government, will put an end to wrong-doing in that respect. As we all know, government ownership has not proved a huge success in this country. Our experience with the Intercolonial railway teaches us that, and our experience with that railway also teaches us that since it has been placed under a commission, its operation has been fairly satisfactory. In view of the fact that we will have to consider this question on the government Bill, I think it is only fair that the hon. member from Souris should withdraw his resolution, which at the present time I deem to be inexpedient. I have great pleasure in seconding the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely).

Mr. W. H. SHARPE (Lisgar). The question of the terminal elevators is a most important one to the grain growers of western Canada, and I congratulate the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), that he has brought it to the attention of the House at the present time. I congratulate him also on his able presentation of the case for the western farmers, and upon the fact that he has been able to submit to us so many illuminating facts in connection with the question. This government has known for years that the grain growers of the west have been continuously robbed at the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. I well remember attending a meeting in the West Block during the session of 1908-9 when the grain growers and millers of eastern Canada and the grain growers of western Canada appeared before Sir Richard Cartwright and placed before him all the facts which would convince any reasonable man that the grain growers were being continually robbed and deprived of the just reward of their labours. It was shown to the Minister of Trade and Commerce then, that profits which were theirs were filched from them and handed over to whom? Not to Canadians—because with the exception of the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators, the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William are controlled by American citizens—but to men who come from a foreign land. For years has the government known that this state of affairs existed, but in this case, as in a great many others, they refused to interfere, for the benefit of our own citizens, and allowed these people to continue robbing the hard working people of Canada. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), has dealt with this matter so fully, that it is unnecessary for me to do further than endorse the sentiments expressed by him. I trust, that even though the Bill presented by the government does not give us government ownership, it will to some extent remove the grievances which during the past few years we have suffered in western Canada.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer). As a farmer, and as the representative of a farming constituency, it is most gratifying to me to find my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner), and his friends so anxious to meet demands of the western grain growers. Their attitude in this respect, makes me very hopeful that we shall have an early collapse of the reciprocity debate, because, if the hon. member from Souris, and his friends will canvass the western farmers, I am sure they will find a large majority of them in favour of this particular method of getting larger markets for their produce. Having no desire to impugn the honest sincerity of my hon. friend (Mr. Schaffner), and his friends in their express desire to find new markets for the farmers, and especially to meet their demands and wishes, I repeat that I am extremely hopeful they will see their way to support that great measure of reciprocity which has been presented by the government for our consideration.

Nothing could possibly give me greater amazement than to see the light-hearted manner in which it would appear that a party calling itself Conservative is prepared to take up a great scheme of state socialism. I am aware that so great a thinker as Sir William Harcourt in the field of politics once said: 'We are all socialists now,' and in a limited sense there is some truth in that statement. But Conservat-

ism, as I have always understood it, is in its very nature opposed to socialism. There seemed to be some glimmering of that thought in the mind of my hon. friend from Souris when he calmly informed this House that he had no desire to discuss the question of state ownership. But the question as he puts it is a question of state ownership, and in that sense it is nothing but rank, pure, simple unadulterated socialism. Socialism is defined by its leading advocates on both sides of the Atlantic as 'government ownership and operation of the means of producing and distributing wealth.' The elevators are a great means of the distribution of wealth, and our hon. friends opposite propose, before other expedients have been exhausted, light-heartedly to commit the government and the parliament and the people of Canada to this very large and serious instalment of state socialism. Well, I cannot understand their attitude upon that question. In debating this matter with socialists themselves, I have pointed out that in their criticisms of government they stand in the same position as all opposition parties in this country. They are continually saying in plain language what the opposition here is continually saying, and what Liberal oppositions in provincial legislatures in this country are continually saying, that they are none too sure of the uprightness with which governments today are handling public funds, public departments and public affairs generally. Now, where is the logic—I would like to put this to my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), who had a good, old-fashioned education in his youth—where is the logic of continually basing opposition to governments as they exist upon their alleged incompetence to handle business matters, and asking this House to commit itself to an indefinite extension of the field of government operation? I cannot see the logic of it; and, to be truthful, Sir, I am very frightened at such an extension of the field of government operation. I believe that as a rule a man will do better work for himself than he will get done by a partner; I believe an individual field of operation is better than a partnership; I believe a partnership is better than a company in handling business affairs; and I believe the worst thing in the world to handle business affairs is a government, and the more its operations are restricted to the proper functions of a government the better it will be for the country.

To put it plainly, what our hon. friends want to do is to put a stop to thieving. They allege that there is absolute thieving going on in connection with the handling of grain. They call it manipulation. Well, that term would be a very good periphrasis for an act of burglary, but I do not think the moral quality of manipulation in this instance is very different from that of thieving. I have always thought that the proper way to deal with thieves was by the criminal law, and one of the reasons for delay in this particular instance is that in the measure of inspection which the government at present has in its hands you have a means which has proved to be so far efficient that some of the thieving has been detected, and punishment has been meted out to the culprits. I want to put it to my friends fairly: is it not likely that if we increase our vigilance, if we improve our machinery, we may still be able under the criminal law to put down this thing without committing ourselves to a great scheme of state socialism?

There are other reasons for hesitation in this matter which I would like to impress upon our hon. friends opposite. The very last debate in this House, followed by a division upon a farming question, so far as I remember, was just before the Christmas adjournment, on the question of establishing a government system of handling chilled meat; and our hon. friends opposite were at that time perfectly prepared to encourage the government of this country to embark upon a huge system of government interference in the chilled meat industry. But what do we find to-day?—and I draw the particular attention of my hon. friend from Souris to this point. We find that some of the very men who were making these demands, which he is so solicitous to meet in the exact way in which they were presented, are saying that so large a market will be obtained for the meat producers of the west under the proposed scheme of reciprocity that there will be no need for this chilled meat project.

I was very much impressed with the excellent speech of my hon. friend from Humbolt (Mr. Neely) on this question, in the debate on the resolution of my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin). One of the points that he made was that we are just at the beginning of our wheat production in the west. I have mentioned in this House before the fact that we have in the three prairie provinces 300,000,000 acres of splendid arable land. We have not to-day under cultivation 20,000,000 acres. If the government were to embark on such a course as has been suggested, no man could see the end of it. You would be indefinitely enlarging the field of government interference in a matter which is much better handled by private enterprise, with a strict and rigid enforcement of the criminal law.

In all these considerations there appears to me to be very good ground for giving pause to hon. gentlemen opposite, for taking time to consider this question, and especially to consider a measure which is to be almost immediately presented to the Senate for the more efficient handling of elevators under that scheme of individual-

ism which after all is the outstanding quality of the race which upholds this Empire, and which is the only quality the exercise of which can in the end build up a strong people and a strong nation. On these grounds I shall vote without hesitation against the motion of my hon. friend from Souris at this time, and shall wait with some degree of confidence for the production of the government measure on the subject.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to hear the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. He has a very refreshing manner of dealing with things, and certainly a manner entirely his own. He is greatly concerned with the attitude of hon. gentlemen on this side, and would be exceedingly glad if he could recruit some supporters for the government on the question of reciprocity, which appears to be a kind of nightmare for him as it is for some members of the cabinet as well.

The hon. gentleman talks of socialism. I do not know whether he speaks as an expert or not, but he is very much alarmed over the name of state socialism. Let me say that I care not what name you give this proposition, if it is in the interests of the country and particularly of the farmers of the west, who more than any other class are making Canada great, I shall support it as a good measure. We are told that the government have introduced a Bill in the Senate under the sponsorship of Sir Richard Cartwright. Well, we have not yet seen that Bill, although this House has been in session three months and this question is one of the greatest importance to the most important class in the community. Is not this really an attempt to sidetrack the farmers when we know that this Bill of which the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) speaks does not touch the question before the House? The steps which the government have taken so far, having proved utterly inefficient as the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) demonstrated the other day, the government should not put the farmers off with promises any longer but do something practical. What is this measure, which has been introduced in the Senate after this long delay, going to do? It is simply going to give us a little more of what we have too much of already. It proposes to establish another court. The Lord knows we have quite enough courts in Canada as it is. It is not courts we want but justice. It is not a multiplication of officers, but efficient work that we require ; and to tell us that the government are going to establish another tribunal similar to the railway board, is simply to tell us that this wrong-doing is to get on just as before, and that when any offence is committed the offender may be brought before this court and punished. What we want, however, is not punishment but a remedy. A commission would be all right but not such a commission as the government proposes. What is required is a commission to operate the elevators, to do justice in the first instance, and put a stop to the thieving, which my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) so much deplores. My hon. friend speaks of Conservatism as he understands it. Why, he never did understand it. In that respect he is not very much different from many hon. gentlemen on that side, they are so wedded to their idols, although often elected as independents. I do not know whether my hon. friend got in as an independent but I would almost think he did, to judge by his intense partisanship, because I notice there is no man so utterly subservient as the so-called independent. I see my hon. friend dissents from this suggestion of independence. He is worried about our being light-hearted. Well, every man is light-hearted when he knows he is doing what is right, but when a man knows he has to come forward in response to the party whip to do the government's bidding, if he has any conscience at all—and a few of those gentleman have—he can not possibly be light-hearted, he is despondent as my hon. friend certainly is on this occasion.

My hon. friend asks where is the logic of constantly condemning the government, and then asking the government to undertake additional work. If they are inefficient and incompetent, why should we ask them to do more? My hon. friend does not understand the situation. Those men opposite are not going to be at the head of affairs forever. What we want is to get good laws, and then a good government ; but I admit that if I thought those hon. gentlemen were going to be in power much longer, I would hesitate committing anything to them. I look, however, for a better era, I look for a bright day in the not far distant future when Canada will have a government which will respond to the wishes of the people, and particularly the wishes of the great farming class.

The hon. gentleman says that the government are not doing so badly after all, because some offenders have been brought to punishment. Well, I leave the hon. gentleman to fight that out with the hon. gentleman from Regina (Mr. Martin), who told us the other day most explicitly that the action of the government had been an utter and complete failure, and that he could see no remedy except by government operation, in which he agreed with my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner). Either government operation, directly under a department, or through the agency of a commission. This is what the farmers

demand. A hurry up call was sent to the Senate and with little consideration—perhaps with none at all—a Bill is to be brought in towards the end of the session. That means putting off the farmers until another session, for I do not believe that any substantial benefit will be conferred on the farmers by reason of the proposed legislation. The farmers have studied this question, and I venture to think that they understand their wants. If the farmers who have been handling this grain do not know what they want, how are other people to decide what is good for them? Speaking as a farmer myself, I think they do know what they want, and you can depend on their judgment as much as on that of any class in the Dominion, and they are the class who should above all others receive consideration from the government; for, upon the action of the Canadian farmer more than on anything else rests and depends the Dominion's prosperity. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), spoke this afternoon, as he spoke a few days ago ; and he has made his position definite. He comes from the west, but, like my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) though he comes from the west, he speaks for the government. Rarely, if ever, does either of these gentlemen speak in the interest of the farmer. The hon. member for Humboldt takes it upon himself to say that he does not think the government has been doing so badly, in fact, their action is quite satisfactory to him—not very much surprised at that —and that he is altogether in favour of leaving this matter for six months or a year longer in the hope that it will be worked out under a Bill of which he practically knows nothing.

I shall have no hesitation in voting for the resolution of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner). I have never thought myself a Socialist, but I am not concerned as to that. I believe the measure proposed by the hon. member for Souris is in the interest of the farming class. I believe that the hon. member himself has very carefully studied it out. I can see that his heart is in the movement. Persistently and at all times he has brought the matter forward. He has worked at it when it was less popular than it is to-day, and has created in this House a strong feeling in its favour. And, when the government is ultimately forced—as it will be—to adopt this method, to my hon. friend from Souris will be due the credit for what is accomplished.

Mr. GEO. E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon). I think this House is indebted to the hon member for Regina (Mr. Martin) to the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), and to the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) for the very interesting information which they have given us with reference to terminal and transfer elevators. I hoped, when this discussion commenced, that it would proceed on the lines laid out by my hon. friend from Souris. But when the discussion got to my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) it developed into an appeal against the proposed Bill, which will come into this House from the Senate, and was practically a request to the House to vote for this resolution and throw out the Bill. From the information which I have been able to gain, I have arrived at the conclusion that we are only taking up time in following any other method than government ownership of the terminal and transfer elevators. I could hope that some other means would be satisfactory, but there is this fact which makes the grain question different from other products—it is impossible to identify different consignments of grain after they have been placed in the elevator. And when frauds can be committed by the turning of a spout, it becomes very apparent that the conduct of these elevators, which are the clearing house of the grain of the west, should be taken out of the control of those who are interested in the grain, and should be placed in the hands of some authority which has absolutely no interest whatever in the grain itself. I think that the experience of the past has demonstrated this, and I must believe that the representations which were made by the farmers from the west should be followed out by this government, and that a Bill should be brought in which will in the end produce satisfactory conditions, and, if necessary, that public ownership should be undertaken by this government. I have not seen the Bill referred to by some hon. members, but I heard the clause read by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely). It appears to me that, whether that clause does all that some hon. members of this House, perhaps myself included, would wish, or does not, it is an admission of the principle of government ownership. I think it will be well to postpone the discussion of this whole question until that Bill comes down. The discussion can then go on with the legislation actually before us.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It is rather interesting and amusing to hear such arguments addressed to the House as those the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) has just used. He thinks this resolution is a request to the House to throw out the government Bill, and, therefore, it should be opposed. Why? Because the government Bill, presumably, will provide something that will suit the requirements of the farmers of the west, and this resolution, if carried, will not provide it. Is he aware that the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) read to the House

a clause of that Bill which provides that the government may do exactly what this resolution asks them to do—take over the elevators. Now, if that is provided by the Bill, and if this resolution only seeks to give the sense of the House on that question, how can the resolution be said to be antagonistic to the Bill? Why, it would strengthen the hands of the government to have unmistakable evidence that the sense of the House was supporting that very portion of the Bill, and, therefore, that they might safely go on with it. So, the argument seems neither consistent with itself nor in harmony with what is demanded by the people of the west. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), in my judgment, is entitled to the grateful thanks of the people of the west and of this House as well, for the very clear and correct view he gave of the operations of those who control the elevators to the detriment of the farmers. The hon. gentleman gave valuable information, clear, and, in my judgment, convincing information. But I was rather amused and surprised to find that almost the first man who followed him amongst the government supporters in the west was the member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), who declared that ultimately it may be necessary to have government ownership, but that that fact has not been demonstrated either to the satisfaction of the House or to his satisfaction. The farmers who came here from the west on a deputation presented their views clearly and pointedly upon this question and gave the most unmistakable evidence that government ownership is the only possible means that can be adopted to remedy the wrongs which exist at the present time. I thought it was not very respectful to his own constituents from the west, and particularly to the great farmers' delegation, to say that all the information they presented to the government failed to convince either the member for Humboldt or the government that they really needed what they were demanding. I may say that the same tenor is evident throughout the remarks of every western member who has spoken as a government supporter on this question. It seems to me that they are treating their friends from the west with scant courtesy, indeed, when they pay so little heed to their declarations, and practically take the ground that they know better than the western farmers themselves what is good for them.

Mr. PATERSON. Did they convince the hon. gentleman himself?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, they convinced me that this was the only sure remedy that was available, they convinced me that even though we may not like the remedy, no other is likely to be effectual, and that it must be tried, even though it be what the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) calls it, government socialism. Now, the hon. member for Humboldt said that our clear duty at this time was to oppose the resolution of my hon. friend from Souris, and to wait for the government's Bill. Therefore he disagrees with this statement of the resolution:

That in the opinion of this House the present system of operating terminal and transfer elevators is detrimental to the interests of the western grain producer——

Do hon. gentlemen opposite disagree with that declaration? Is it correct or incorrect? If they vote against the resolution, they declare that it is incorrect.

—and that the government should take immediate steps to operate transfer elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and transfer elevators between the terminals and the Atlantic sea-board.

So the hon. member for Humboldt disagrees with that entirely. Well, he is not very complimentary to his friends in the west, or to the government either, because the government have asked this House to wait for a Bill they have introduced, one clause of which, as read by the hon. member for Humboldt, provides that they be empowered to do, what this resolution asks them to do. This resolution only provides for getting the sense of the House upon that question, and the member for Humboldt, the member for Red Deer and the member for Saskatoon are all opposed to it. And the member for Red Deer is opposed to it because it is government socialism, as he says; he calls government ownership government socialism. Well, I do not see anything wrong in the resolution, or anything inconsistent with the Bill, and I should think the government would gladly welcome an expression of opinion from the House upon that very question.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). As an Ontario representative, I wish to offer my congratulation to my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) on his very clear presentation of the case from the western standpoint. He has given a great deal of study to the matter, and has shown how important it is to the western farmers. I wish to remind my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) and my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), that whenever a proposition to assist the farmers in the west comes up for discussion in this House, if it is introduced from this side, these hon. gentlemen always oppose it. The hon. member for Red Deer was not on his feet one minute until he had launched out into a discussion, not of the resolution of the hon. member for Souris but of the proposed reciprocity arrangement, and asked us on this side of the House what we proposed to do about it.

Mr. CLARK. Will the hon. gentleman give me his definition of politics? I have always understood that it was the science of government.

Mr. BLAIN. If I were to give a definition of politics, it would put my hon. friend where he rightly belongs, and show that he is not an independent member of this House, but a radical supporter of the government. I would expect better things from an hon. gentleman representing a western constituency. When the hon. member for Red Deer posed as a farmer from the west, I looked up his record to see what stand he took on a proposition introduced by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in respect to bettering the condition of western farmers with regard to the meat industry. My hon. friend must know that the farmers in the west are not well treated in respect to the meat industry, that the prices to the western consumer, as to the eastern consumer, are very high. The consumers in the city of Winnipeg and other large centres of Canada are paying at this moment high prices for meat; but when we make an investigation, we find the farmers of western Canada are receiving very small prices for their meat.

My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) introduces a resolution to better that condition. What does the hon. member for Red Deer do?—on his feet, as he always is, in opposition to it, and records his vote against that proposition in the interests of the farmers of the west. My hon. friend from Souris has made out a very clear case with respect to the large wheat industry of western Canada, pointing out that the farmers are engaged extensively in the production of wheat, producing the best wheat that is to be found in the world, that when they send that wheat on its road to the English market they are confronted with the mixing of grain, the result of which is the cheapening of their product, and the farmers are not getting a proper price for their grain as they otherwise would if the condition with regard to elevators were correct. When this proposition was introduced to correct it, to direct the government's attention to a better condition of things, asking the government, who are responsible for legislation in the interest of the people, to turn their attention to this very important question the first man on his feet almost in the House is the hon. member for Red Deer, saying: Oh, no, and not declaring himself in the interest of the western farmers, but in opposition to the proposition of my hon. friend from Souris. Therefore, I think that the hon. gentleman had better have a little searching of himself rather than that he should be directing attention so much to this side of the House and on every question giving a lecture to this side as if the members of the opposition were not able to discuss these questions or to take any interest in the affairs of western Canada at all. I am not going to discuss it farther only to say that in future I hope hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will not bring politics into discussions of this kind. The people of western Canada will be very much surprised that when a proposition was put forth in the interest of the west, as this was by my hon. friend from Souris, these hon. gentlemen, instead of facing it as it is and discussing it on its merits, introduce party politics into the discussion and declare themselves to be the saviours of the western farmers. I am only going to make these few remarks. I shall not enter into the discussion. The question has been very fully discussed by my hon. friend from Souris, and other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, representing western constituencies will discuss it more fully as the debate goes on. I only wish to express my sympathy with the western farmers as they have to face grievances, and as this dilatory government are not taking care of their interests, in order to show the government and to show the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his supporters, that whenever any proposition to help the people in the west to better their condition is presented to this House they can always rest assured that from this side of the House they will receive a ready and willing support.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up the time of the House. This question was before the House two years ago, and at that time I placed myself on record with regard to it. I want to congratulate my hon. friend the mover of this resolution (Mr. Schaffner), and to say that I think the House is indebted to him for the facts which he has placed before it. I am not surprised at the attitude of some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—representing constituencies in the west. They took the same attitude two years ago practically saying that the policy of the government was the proper policy, and that it should at least be given a fair trial. That policy has been in operation for two years, and while elevators have been operated under government supervision we find by the facts laid before the House by the hon. member for Souris to-day that the owners or operators of these elevators have been caught practically robbing the farmers of the west. Some of these men have been punished, as the hon. member for Souris has pointed out, but not sufficiently. There is no punishment under the present Grain Act sufficiently severe to stop the outrageous conduct of these men. With regard to

the attitude which the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has taken regarding the question of reciprocity, I would just like to say to that hon. gentleman and to some other hon. members from the west that when the time comes to speak on this question we will be able to answer them. Perhaps the attitude of the hon. gentleman and other hon. gentlemen from the west regarding this measure that is before the House can be explained in this way. The hon. gentleman realizes that if the reciprocity arrangements, as proposed by the government, are adopted there will be very little need perhaps for terminal elevators in Port Arthur. They realize that a great deal of the wheat trade will be diverted to Duluth and that it will not matter so much who operate the elevators at Port Arthur. As far as I am personally concerned I believe that the motion moved by my hon. friend from Souris is one to command the support of every man from the west. There is no question that in so far as the handling of the wheat is concerned, as has been pointed out by the farmers year after year, after the wheat leaves the farms it does not reach the markets of the world in the condition in which it left the farms. The identity of the wheat has been lost entirely. There is no question that the wheat has been mixed at different points and that the farmers and the country have been the losers to a great extent by the lowering of the grade. I did not rise for the purpose of taking any lengthy part in this discussion, but I do wish to place myself again on record as intending to support the motion of my hon. friend from Souris as I had hoped that every hon. member from the west would have done. In face of the many complaints that have come from the farming associations and the Grain Growers' Association I cannot very well understand the attitude of these men on questions of this kind when they come before the House. We had a question up here not very long ago regarding cold storage, a matter of vital importance to the cattle raisers of the west. As has been pointed out every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House coming from a western constituency opposed the resolution that was moved by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Every man on this side of the House coming from the west supported that resolution strongly as we have supported every motion I know of that has been brought up in this House from either side that contained any proposition to better the condition of the western farmer. I regret exceedingly that it seems impossible for any motion to be moved from this side of the House in the interest of the western farmers that will elicit the support of members on the other side of the House from the west.

Mr. BRADBURY

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Macleod). Mr. Speaker, I take a good deal of pride in having my name coupled as seconder with this resolution which has been introduced by my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner). When this question was before the House two or three years ago I spoke in favour of a resolution along similar lines. I have not changed my mind from that time to the present; in fact, from the evidence that has been presented to me, from what I have seen and from what I understand about the way things have been going from that time to the present, I am more strongly of the opinion to-day than I ever was that there is only one way of remedying this evil that has been robbing the western farmers of their just dues and that is the proposition which has been presented in the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Souris this afternoon.

I understand that the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Schaffner), is precisely in line with the views of the western farmers who waited on the government in December, and surely the farmers who have made a practical study of this question for years and who are men of great intelligence, best know what their needs are. I was rather surprised to hear this afternoon some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House complimenting the government wheat inspectors for discovering that fraud and swindling had been going on in the elevators. Why, the very idea that 75 or 90 inspectors in 12 or 13 elevators permitted this fraud and swindling to go on to the extent it did before they discovered it, is proof positive of the failure of the system, and very strong evidence that these men were either incapable or were negligent in the performance of their duty. That circumstance does not give us much reason to hope for relief from the system of government inspection. We were told by the hon. member (Mr. Schaffner), that nearly half a million bushels of one grade of wheat were sold from the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William at a higher grade than it entered, and as there is no means of knowing what was done with respect to other grades, this shows that the swindling was of enormous magnitude. Again, it was proved that the elevators had actually sold hundreds of thousands of bushels of wheat for delivery in Europe, when it was reported to be in the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William, and all this remember, under the eyes of the inspectors. What stronger proof is required of the incapacity of these men and the failure of the system of government inspection. I understand also that when some of those people were brought up for wrong-doing, the local magistrate held the trial behind closed doors,

that the defendants pleaded guilty and were fined $500 for each offence, or $5,000 in all, and that in this way the evidence was precluded which would have afforded us some information as to the extent and duration of this fraud. That, I think, was not as it should be in the interests of justice. One of the strong reasons advanced by members on the other side for opposing government ownership, is the cost of acquiring these elevators. My idea is, and I submit it for what it is worth, that if the government experimented by acquiring in some way, the terminal elevators to the extent of 25 per cent of their capacity, we would be able to test by experience, whether government ownership would prove successful or not. I believe the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur have a capacity of 30,000,000 bushels, but that the greatest quantity ever in storage at any one time was about 19,000,000 bushels, and this season only 10,000,000 bushels. Now, suppose the government acquired by leasing, or expropriation, or otherwise, a capacity of 8,000,000 or about 25 per cent of the total, the expense of the undertaking would not be great and we would know in a few years whether it would be wise for the government to take over the elevators or not. Of course, if the farmers in the west could get justice through private ownership of the elevators, it probably would be the better system, but so far, we have not been getting fair play in this matter, and it would seem to be incumbent on the government to own and operate them. Certainly, if any advantage is to accrue to the farmers of the west from government ownership, then government ownership should be undertaken at once. That is my view of the situation, and I think that probably it would prove a solution of the difficulty without entailing great expense. I am strongly in favour of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), which, as I say, is in line with the demands of the farmers of the west.

Mr. WM. H. WHITE (Victoria, Alberta). As a western member, I do not wish to go on record as being opposed to this resolution, which, in its opening paragraph reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the present system of operating terminal and transfer elevators is detrimental to the interests of the western grain producers.

I think every one in the west will agree with that. But, in my view of the explanation given this afternoon by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), as to the Bill presented by the government in the Senate, I am rather inclined to the belief that while there is nothing wrong with the resolution, the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Neely), is perhaps at the present time, more in the interests of the farmers of Alberta. In my district we are not at present, growing grain very extensively, although no doubt in the future the industry will be engaged in, to a very large extent. When the time comes, what we will be interested in is a western outlet for the product. If the government is going to take over and control the elevators referred to in this resolution, we, of course, would urge that they should control the elevators on the Pacific coast, at Prince Rupert, Vancouver and elsewhere, and, when the Hudson Bay railway is built, we would desire them to also take charge of the elevators there. On the whole, as I understand it, there is not much difference between the Bill presented by the government and the proposition in the resolution, and, for the present, I think the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Humboldt, is possibly the more desirable.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Have you seen the Bill?

Mr. WHITE (Victoria, Alberta). No. I take my knowledge of its provisions from the statement made by the hon. member for Humboldt.

Mr. GLEN L. CAMPBELL (Dauphin). Mr. Speaker, there is not very much left to discuss in connection with this resolution; but as a representative of farmers, and a farmer myself, I feel it my duty and my pleasure to say a few words congratulatory to my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) on his presentation of this case. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), in dealing with the steal at Fort William and Port Arthur last spring, and the prosecutions in connection with it, congratulated the government on their system of supervision at those points, under which they employed from sixty to ninety men at a cost of some $60,000 of the people's money. I think his argument was very weak when he said that to employ high-salaried commissioners would be beneficial to the farmers of the west, in view of the fact that the government had paid out $60,000 to sixty or seventy officials to watch those wheat thieves who own elevators at those points, and the fact that in the neighbourhood of half a million bushels of wheat was raised one and two grades from the time it went into the elevators till the time it went out, thus enhancing the value of that wheat to the extent of a little over $20,000. When it takes seventy officials at a cost of $60,000 to the people, to rob the farmers to that extent in one season, it would be adding insult to injury to them to appoint any more officials for that work. It is perhaps somewhat irregular to discuss

the Bill now before the Senate; but if this House saw its way to pass the resolution which has been brought before us so ably by my hon. friend from Souris, it would give a pointer to the Senate that it was the feeling of this House that some plan for the conservation of the people's wheat and money ought to be effected, and that a clause should be inserted in the Bill providing for the ownership and operation of the elevators by and for the people. For years the farmers have been agitating for the protection proposed in this resolution; for years they have been laughed at by this government, and only within the last year or two have the government offered their sympathy in words to the farmers of the west, and for a very good reason, namely, that the farmers are beginning to organize and will be an important factor in the next election. There are two principal reasons why the farmers have been agitating in this matter. One is for their self-protection from the stealing of their wheat by low grading and mixing, which has been shown to-night to have amounted in one season to $24,000. A further reason is their great desire that the quality of their grain may be properly taken care of, and that is a more than sufficient reason, because northern Canada is the only place in the world where No. 1 hard wheat can be produced. The fact is that under the conditions that have prevailed, even in years when the government has had this very costly system of supervision in operation, no man who saw the wheat go into the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William and saw it afterwards in the market in Liverpool would recognize it as the same wheat, so mixed was it with inferior wheat. Therefore, I think it is incumbent on every member of this House who represents a western constituency to loyally support this resolution. I intend to vote against the amendment moved by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) because, like all amendments brought on that side of the House against anything good proposed on this side, it is merely in the nature of a quibble and evasion.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). Mr. Speaker, while this question appeals more directly to the members from the west, anything that affects the western provinces necessarily affects the eastern portion of Canada as well, and anything that can be done to cement the provinces together should be done. There is undoubtedly a very strong feeling amongst the western farmers on this elevator question. When the deputation of farmers was here some time ago, I had the privilege of conversing with some of the gentlemen from the west, and I found that this question of elevators appealed to them more strongly than any other presented to the government. There does not seem to be very strong opposition to this resolution on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite except for the reason that it has been introduced by a member on this side of the House. The hon. member for Victoria, Alberta (Mr. White), seemed to agree with the spirit of the resolution, but found fault with it because it made no provision for elevators on Hudson Bay or on the Pacific coast. It seemed to me that if the principle of the resolution was right, we might very well wait until we have the long-promised railway to Hudson Bay before we put an elevator there. I was under the impression that the hon. gentleman and other hon. gentlemen opposite were very much concerned at present with the probable shipment of grain south of the line rather than east and west; and I just want to give one reason to them as coming from a source which I know will appeal very strongly to every member on the government side and with special force to the right hon. the Prime Minister. The reason I am about to give is the opinion of no less a personage than President Taft. Speaking at Columbus a few days ago, referring to the shipments and the prices of wheat he said that wheat on the American side of the line was 9 or 10 cents higher than in Winnipeg and the reason he gave was this:

> The difference does not arise from a difference in the cost of production in favour of the Canadian farmer but from the disadvantageous conditions under which he is compelled to market his wheat, due to the high cost of transportation, the expensive elevator charges, and the absence of those carrying and warehouse facilities which the American farmer enjoys.

I commend that statement of a very near and dear friend of this administration to their careful consideration, because in it President Taft clearly puts upon the shoulders of the government the blame for not having provided those elevators and transportation facilities which the farmers of western as well as eastern Canada have been clamouring for.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). It will be admitted by every one that there is probably no question of greater importance to the western country generally than that of the handling of its great wheat crops, so that no time spent in intelligent discussion of this subject is by any means wasted. I do not think that any fault can be found with anything that has been said to-day on either side of the House. I wish, however, to draw attention to one feature of the question which appears to me not to have been touched. The resolution calls for government operation both of the terminal and transfer elevators, and the amendment asks the House to support the measure which the government is bringing forward in the

Senate. That measure has been described by some speakers as providing for government operation in the last resort, when operation by ordinary commercial methods with government inspection has proved a failure. But there is another way of putting the case and it is this: If the government should undertake without consideration or preparation to take control of the operation of both terminal and transfer elevators, it would assume a responsibility which I think it would not be justified in undertaking. It is an easy matter to sit down and figure out that certain results will follow certain actions; but in a question which concerns the whole product of the western country and the handling of that product, which involves interference with the ordinary channels of trade and investment, it behooves any sane government to move carefully and only after the fullest possible consideration. No government would be wise to assume, without further preparation, the tremendous responsibility of the ownership and operation of elevators, through which the grain trade of the west passes. What the Bill introduced in the Senate provides for, is a commission which will have full control of the grain trade from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and this commission will have power, when the funds are supplied by parliament, to acquire and operate such elevators as in its judgment should be so operated in the public interest. It seems to me that such a proposition is eminently reasonable. It is not necessarily an experiment in socialism, nor is it a rejection of the principles of socialism. It is a businesslike way of dealing with a matter which is of great business interest not only to the west but to every part of Canada. In my opinion the government would be ill-advised to rush unwittingly and lightly into such a responsibility as this resolution demands. Instead a measure has been prepared which will be first considered in the Senate and then by this House, which will provide for the appointment of a commission that will have the power of informing itself as to possibilities and requirements, and in due course have the fullest authority asked for by the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) to deal with any difficulties that cannot be settled otherwise than by absolute government ownership and operation. It has already been pointed out that the system of government inspection which has been followed so far, had not proved a failure, but rather a success. The fact that improprieties have been located and those guilty punished, is evidence that inspection does inspect and that the law is being enforced; and I have no doubt that that inspection and enforcement of the law will have due effect in the future management of elevators. However, the government is fully aware of the importance of the question and of the necessity to deal with it thoroughly; and the fact that legislation is in the course of preparation which will embody, as far as possible, every means for settling this question, is surely evidence that the government is willing and able to deal with it to the satisfaction of all interests concerned. The government, therefore, ask the support of the House to the policy which is embodied in the measure brought down.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). I have listened carefully and with great interest to this debate. I am interested in the subject as an eastern member because there is a great elevator being erected in our county town, Goderich, and we are very much interested in having the wheat trade of the west continue to flow eastward through its present channel. Consequently, I look upon this debate as of great importance to me as a representative of the county of Huron. I congratulate the hon. member for Souris (Mr.Schaffner) on having brought forward this resolution. And it is hard for me to understand how hon. gentlemen on the other side who represent western constituencies can reconcile their attitude on this subject with the best interests of their constituents. They say that this resolution is exactly in accord with some Bill which is to be brought in shortly but which we have not yet seen. If this resolution and the Bill are in accord, then certainly the resolution is simply an endorsement of the Bill. Are we being deceived or are our friends opposite prepared to vote down the very principle of the Bill that the government is to bring before us? I would like to know how our western friends on the other side will maintain their position when they meet their constituents. The grain growers of the west came to this Chamber and asked of the government sternly and firmly, that the government should own and operate terminal railways at Fort William and Port Arthur. The hon. member for Souris has had this resolution on the order paper for a long time ; it was on the paper before we heard anything of this Bill that is coming from the Senate, and for weeks before the western farmers came here to ask for government ownership and operation of terminal elevators. Why, then, should we vote the resolution down. I fear that hon. members from the west who vote against this resolution will have some very awkward questions to answer when they come before their constituents.

Now, there is no doubt there is a grievance. The grain growers when they were here stated distinctly that wheat was bringing from 8 cents to 10 cents a bushel more

on the United States side of the line than on the Canadian side—exactly the same grade of wheat. Hon. members will recollect that when the grain growers were here I got up at that very point in their argument and said I would consider their argument was irrefutable if they would give us some positive proof of their statement. And they said they would leave that proof with the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If they left that proof with the Prime Minister, then it is established that wheat is bringing 10 cents more a bushel on the United States than on the Canadian side. As I happened to ask the question, some of these gentlemen came to me after the meeting was over and showed me affidavits made by three men who had sent samples of wheat to be graded and priced in Minneapolis and in Winnipeg. That sent to Winnipeg graded No. 2 Northern, and that sent to Minneapolis graded No. 1 Northern. These affidavits satisfied me, and no doubt the Prime Minister was satisfied if they submitted to him the proofs which they offered to submit. Now, if the Canadian farmers are losing 10 cents a bushel on their wheat, there is a grievance, and that grievance should be remedied this year. A loss of 10 cents a bushel means an aggregae loss of $10,000,000 to the farmers of the west this year. Is it right that there should be any delay or any humbugging about this thing? I think that, of course, a part of this is due to grading. The term 'Red Fyfe' is not in the Minnesota Act; they use the term 'hard varieties.' We have other hard varieties of wheat besides Red Fyfe, the Marquis and others that are almost as good as Red Fyfe. But they cannot be graded as 'hard' because 'Red Fyfe' is named in our Act. It would appear that those who grade the wheat in the west, and those who manage the terminal elevators are in combination; and they have been taking $10,000,000 a year out of the pockets of the western farmers by manipulations carried on. We may talk of socialism or anything else, but what we want is justice. That is what our western farmers want; that is what they came down here eight hundred strong to ask for; and that is what we are going to vote for tonight, for this resolution of the hon. member for Souris is in favour of granting them the justice that they ask. And it is against that that hon. members on the other side will vote. I would like to see the names of these hon. gentlemen lined up and see the excuses they will make to their constituents. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) spoke of what happened in 1909, as if that year had been the last one in which the farmers were robbed. He seemed to think there was no evidence in regard to 1910. I have here the report of the Elevator Commission of the province of Saskatchewan, issued by the Liberal government from the very province from which the hon. gentleman comes, and I propose to read a few items out of this report. I would like to put them on 'Hansard' to show how things were in 1910 in the province whose representatives are going to vote against this resolution. Hon. members on this side will not vote against the Bill if it is in accord with the resolution, and if it is not in accord with the resolution they will be perfectly right in voting against it. I wish to trace the wheat from the time it leaves the farmer until it leaves the terminal elevator:

CHARGES AGAINST THE PRESENT SYSTEM.

Against the initial elevators.

1. *Weights.* That they give lower weights than the farmer is entitled to.

2. *Dockage.* That they take too large a percentage as against cleaning the grain to grade and too large an amount to protect the elevator against shrinkage in handling the grain.

3. *Grades.* That in buying the grain they give lower grades than the grain is entitled to.

4. *Prices.* That they give too low prices even for the grade allowed.

5. *Cleaning.* That in many cases they have no cleaning apparatus, that in other cases they refuse to clean the grain, and that the farmers not only lose the screenings, but are also forced to pay freight upon them from the shipping point to the terminals.

6. *Special binning.* That they refuse to special bin grain on the ground that they have no vacant bins.

7. *Substituting Grain.* That they often give the farmer inferior grain, taking his superior lot instead.

8. *Mixng.* That they mix the grain in the bins so that the grades are skimmed, that is, that the grain shipped in any one grade is, on the lowest line of that grade, good enough to receive that grade at the hands of the inspector, but not a good average of that grade.

9. *Shipping.* That they try to ship stored grain to their own firms even when the owner desires to ship it elsewhere.

It is not charged by many that the elvator operators receive explicit instructions from their superiors to do these things, though this charge is made by some, but that the operators are under pressure to make the elevators pay, and that such practices are almost inevitable results of the system. And it is pointed out that the farmers who suffer most from such practices are the homesteaders, the small producers, and in general those whose financial conditions constrain them to sell in wagon loads to the elevators, and more especially, such of these classes as live ten miles and upwards from the nearest shipping point.

AGAINST THE BANKS.

1. That by restricting or refusing credit to many farmers, they force these to put their grain upon the market as soon as it is threshed. depriving them of the opportunity to hold it for a rise in price, and compelling them to sell when the market is glutted and

the price tends to be lowest. To get the best price the farmer should be in position to market his grain leisurely, offering it step by step with the milling and export demands. The banks make it impossible for the farmers to do this at present.

2. That in giving lines of credit for moving the crops they favour the larger companies, and at times favour a few such companies, thus giving these a virtual monopoly of bank credit, and assisting them in monopolizing the grain business.

AGAINST THE RAILWAY COMPANIES.

1. That through leaky cars and other conditions, grain is lost or damaged in transit, and the loss is too frequently put upon the shipper.

2. That they construct loading platforms as if the object was to render the use of them by the farmers as difficult as possible.

3. That in the past they helped to create elevator monopolies and assisted them, and that at present they favour the large milling and elevator companies as against the farmer whenever they can, and especially at points where there is no competition between the railways themselves.

AGAINST THE TERMINAL ELEVATORS.

1. That they take too much dockage as against the shrinkage of the grain in handling.

2. That they do not pay the farmer for the screenings which they take out of the grain when cleaning.

3. That they do not clean the grain as the inspection requires, but sell it dirty, thus increasing their surplus.

4. That they mix the different grades of grain, selling grain of lower grade at the price of the higher grade, and that, the grain being dirty and lowered in grade by mixing, export prices are lowered and the prices paid to the farmers are also lowered.

5. That at times they loan stored grain to themselves as dealers or to others, while the owner believes he is holding his grain for an advance in price.

AGAINST THE GRADING SYSTEM.

What I say is that these charges made by a commission named by the Liberal government of the province of Saskatchewan appear clearly to indicate a combination with the elevator system to rob the farmers of their just rights.

1. That the grades do not represent the different values of the grain for milling purposes.

2. That good grain in any one grade gets the grade price only, and that selling by grade enables the millers and elevator companies to lower the quality of each grade, and so to fix the export and home prices upon the basis of the lowest level of each grade.

3. That the existing grading system is unfair to grain which though slightly bleached, smutted or frosted, is nevertheless of good quality for milling purposes.

4. That mistakes are made in sampling and grading.

AGAINST THE LARGE WESTERN MILLING COMPANY.

1. That they cull the best of the grain for their own mills:

(a) By buying through their own elevators, especially in the districts which produce the best milling grade, as shown them by their experiments.

(b) By somehow selecting the best car lots in Winnipeg, or by having cars stopped at their mills or terminals, which they can buy or not as they choose.

(c) By selecting from all the grain they buy the best lots, and selling the remainder.

2. That the defects of the grading system, and the absence of a central market, enabled them to buy grain which though slightly bleached, smutted or frosted, is of superior quality, and to buy it at a price far below its value.

3. That because of their culling, the grades of grain exported are lowered, with the result that export and home prices are lowered, and that it is at these lowered prices they secure the very best of the grain, except where they pay a small premium.

4. That besides lowering the prices by lowering the grades, they artificially depress prices:

(a) By spreading false reports about the crops.

(b) By juggling in options, and especially by selling market value early in the season in the Liverpool market, quantities of grain for future delivery.

One illustration of this bearing of the market is seen in the fact that wheat sells for less on the Canadian than on the American side of the line, though the Canadian wheat is the superior article.

I draw attention to that last paragraph. Here is a report published and printed by the Liberal government of the province of Saskatchewan, stating distinctly that the same class of wheat brings a better price on the American side than it does on the Canadian side. Now, I cannot see possibly how that can result from anything but a system of fraud on the Canadian side. We know that the Liverpool market fixes the price, both for Canadian and American grain ; because both countries export grain and we know that grain grown on the American side of the boundary line goes through Baltimore and New York to Europe, while that raised on the Canadian side goes from Port Arthur and Fort William to Montreal, and arriving in Liverpool they are sold in competition with each other. Therefore, this eight or ten cents per bushel must be lost on the way. The farmers are robbed on the road. They lose ten million dollars every year, that is taken from them on the way to the market; this happens between the grading and the elevators. The farmers know that this is taking place; they know they are losing all this money. They paid their way down here, and in a very careful manner they laid their cause before this government. and the government promised to listen to them. One of those farmers told the government on the floor of this House that they were losing ten cents a bushel on their wheat. Now, are you going to ask the farmers of the west

to lose another ten million dollars? I say that is the position, if we reject this resolution of the hon. member for Souris; but I hope there are enough men on the other side of the House to back us up and to pass it. I would not consider it a vote of want of confidence at all, but an endorsement of the Bill which they are shortly to bring down, and which will, if they speak truly, be exactly in accord with this resolution. Now, why is there an amendment moved to this resolution? I would ask the hon. gentleman who moved that amendment to withdraw it. I think, in the face of what has been said here to-day, he would be doing a kindness to Canada, and particularly to the western farmers, and more particularly to his own constituents in Humboldt, if he withdrew that amendment. Let us lay aside party spirit as much as possible; there is too much of it here, and let us try to do the best we can for the people. That is what they sent us here for. I was pleased with the speech of the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin). I thought he made a very careful and temperate speech, and he gave us a great deal of useful information. I wonder he is not here to stand up and support the hon. member for Souris, who has been juggled out of the benefit of the resolution he brought forward. Let me remind you that the member for Souris put his resolution on the Order Paper long ago, long before this Bill was ever mentioned by the government. And now, when he is allowed to bring it forward an endeavour is made to sidetrack it by this amendment of the hon. member for Humboldt. This is not the way for the government to carry out the desires of the grain growers of the west. It is simply a block game.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I do not wish to be the only western member who has failed to raise his voice in support of the resolution of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner). Having spoken some time ago on the resolution of the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin), I will curtail my remarks on this occasion. The House will remember that when that large delegation from the west came down to interview the government in the session of 1907-8, composed of farmers, a representation of the elevator men, and all the various interests connected with the transportation, the marketing and storage of grain it was then stated by the farmers present that they were convinced there was mixing going on in those terminal elevators. They were asked to produce the evidence. The owners of those elevators took exception to that statement, and while the farmers had no specific proof to offer at that date, they knew they were not getting sufficient prices for their grain in the old country; they were suspicious that the grain was being mixed, and the experience of the past year goes to prove that to a certainty.

A Bill was prepared by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that session. It was prepared largely under the influence of a report presented by a royal commission that had been appointed by this government to inquire into the grain trade. It is true that the royal commission did not report in favour of government ownership and operation of the terminal elevators. They did claim, however, that this government should control by supervision the weighing of the grain into the elevators and the weighing out of the elevators. It is now admitted by everybody that after giving this system a considerable trial the mixing of grain has gone on notwithstanding all those officials, who have been appointed by this government and that it has gone on under their very eyes. That was admitted by the hon. member for Ded Deer (Mr. Clark), and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), this afternoon, and they took great credit to the government, by reason of the fact that those who were convicted of mixing were convicted by these government officials and that, therefore, a great deal of credit was attached to the action taken by these officials. But, Mr. Speaker, if it is a fact that more of No. 1 or No. 2 Hard was shipped out of the elevator than came in, by reason of lower grades being mixed with No. 1 quality, it did not require any expert to discover that fact; almost anybody could have detected that, and could have laid a charge against these men of having mixed the grain. But, it did not prevent the mixing. The mixing went on right under the eyes of these supervisors, and it went on by reason of the fact that those elevators are owned and operated by gentlemen who are intimately connected with the grain trade, who are the owners of the line elevators, and by reason of the fact that they are vitally, financially interested in the manipulation of grain at the terminal elevators. Even under this new Bill, I believe that the ownership and operation of those elevators will not differ practically from what it is at the present time. The Act, as I have said, that was presented to this parliament in 1907-8, was prepared in accordance with the recommendation of the Royal Commission, and when it came to this House, those of us on this side of the House who engaged in a criticism of the measure, asserted that it would not give the satisfaction that the government claimed it would. Last year when my hon. friend from Souris introduced a resolution, much on the same lines as the resolution moved here to-night, it was claimed by some hon. gentlemen op-

posite, as a reason for opposing it, and in support of the amendment which the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin), moved that the Act now in force, was carrying out the wishes of the Royal Grain Commission and, secondly, that sufficient time had not been given for the operation of the Act to prove that it was not going to be satisfactory. The hon. member for Regina went rather farther than that, and I will just read a short paragraph from the remarks which he made on that occasion. On the 5th of April, 1909, that hon. gentleman said:

I claim that government control if properly carried out should be as efficient as government ownership, if not more so. Under the present system you have two sets of officials, the government official and the employees of the terminal elevators, who act as a check upon each other. But if the elevators were owned and operated by the government there would be only one set of officials to weigh in the grain and to weigh it out, so that the present system if properly carried out ought to give us more efficient control than the system of government ownership.

Further on he said:

I have referred to the legislation passed last year. I claim that if this legislation is properly enforced under the system of government control, it must remove the difficulties of mixing grades which are alleged to exist at these terminal elevators.

Mark you, he says, that if the Act is properly enforced, it will do away with all mixing. Well, we had the hon. gentleman admitting last week, or the week before, that mixing has been going on under this Act. Is it true that the Act has not been properly enforced? If it has not been properly enforced, whose fault is it? Is it not the fault of this government who appointed over seventy officials for the purpose of enforcing the Act right under whose eyes the mixing has gone on? The hon. member for Regina was either right when he stated that government control would be sufficient, if properly enforced, or he had a mistaken idea of the benefits that would accrue from government ownership and operation. Now, the Act of 1907-8 was not approved by the grain growers. They claimed that nothing but complete government ownership would put an end to mixing, that so long as those who had the manipulation of the grain in the terminal elevators were intimately connected with the grain trade and the owners of the line elevators it was impossible to check the mixing that was going on right under the eyes of the officials. The hon. member for Red Deer, who, I am sorry to say is not present, accused the members on this side of the House of socialism, by reason of their advocacy of the government ownership of terminal elevators. We had a resolution passed unanimously by the Saskatchewan legislature last year, which every Grit and Tory voted in favour of, demanding government ownership of terminal elevators. Is it that the Liberals and Conservative members in the Saskatchewan legislature are so tinged with socialism as to advocate that which has led to such strong objection here to-night? The hon. member for Regina and the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt), have stated that a change has taken place and that they have come to the conclusion at last, by gradual process, that government ownership is the only remedy for the existing state of affairs.

Reference has been made here to-night to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, and it has been stated by the Prime Minister that the terminal of this road was going to be owned by the government. If it is right and proper for the government to own the terminal of the Hudson Bay railway, what objection can there be to owning the terminal at Fort William and Port Arthur. A minister of the Crown has stated that it is the intention of the government to have a terminal elevator, owned by the government, on the Pacific coast. To-day we find the government owning elevators at Port Colborne, St. John, Halifax and, I think, at Montreal. I do not think that they can be rightly charged with socialism by reason of owning and operating these elevators. If they can be operated successfully why cannot the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur be operated just as successfully? When the right hon. Prime Minister was in the west he was met by delegation after delegation, urging the government to take over and operate the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William. The Prime Minister went to the extent that while he was personally not in favour of government ownership, still, if no other means could be devised, he could see no objection to the government taking over these elevators and operating them.

Well, I believe a Bill has been prepared and we have seen a short synopsis of it in the press. We had a short explanation of it by the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) here to-day and he stated as an objection to the adoption of this resolution proposed by my hon. friend from Souris that the government desired to study the question, that they did not wish to rush into this thing. They want time to study a question that has been before the country and the government for several years past. It has been studied by the farmers. Parliament has been petitioned session after session and I do not think that by adopting it this session there would be any undue haste exhibited by

this government. It has been said that the new Act is going to provide greater penalties for the mixing of grain. I believe that last year the total amount of the fines collected in the three cases was $5,500, while under the proposed new Act the minimum fine is $5,000 and the maximum $20,000. It will, therefore, have a certain deterrent effect, but it does not do away with the real ownership of the elevators and take them out of the hands of those who are intimately connected with the grain trade in other portions of the country. The hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) said that the delegation that came down here to interview the Prime Minister seemed to be perfectly satisfied with the interview they had had with the government and with the assurances that they had received as to the new Bill to be introduced on this subject. Well, I have a little proof here rather to the contrary. Last week the farmers of Saskatchewan met in convention, several hundreds of them being in attendance representing several thousands of the farmers of that province, and they evidently are aware of the nature of this government Bill introduced in the Senate, because this is how they commented upon it:

Whereas the Dominion government has so far conceded to our demands *re* the government ownership and operation of the terminal elevators as to bring down a Bill appointing a commission with drastic powers, therefore, be it resolved, that while acknowledging this forward step, the Dominion Council of Agriculture reiterate the request that provision be made for the necessary funds to purchase or lease the necessary terminals and reaffirm the former position that nothing short of government operation will remedy the existing evils.

That does not look as if the government Bill is going to meet with any greater favour from the western grain growers than does the legislation now on the statute-books. The question was asked to-day of the hon. member for Souris, if many of the farmers of Manitoba had availed themselves of the provincial elevators taken over by the government of the province this year, and, the hon. gentleman gave his reply. If you read the report of the chairman of the provincial commission you will see the hard proposition they were up against in the year 1910, which was a year of short crops and consequently a bad year to inaugurate a system of that kind. But notwithstanding that the grain buyers at points where the government had purchased an elevator did their best to squeeze out and discourage the farmers from patronizing that elevator, they gave higher prices for the grain at these points than they would have paid under other circumstances. They have also built new elevators and equipped them in a modern manner, they have done away with the heavy dockage that formerly existed, they now merely make deduction for shrinkage, they have special bins provided and there is every reason to hope that these modern elevators will give satisfaction. So much is this the case that the chairman of the commission having explained the operations of the Act—and remember it is less than a year since the provincial government took over the elevators—the Grain Growers' Association of Brandon passed a resolution unanimously endorsing the principle of provincial government ownership of the elevators in that province. This, of course, is the very best reason that can be given to show that provincial ownership is in their opinion likely to prove a success. It is, of course, claimed that the provincial system of ownership will not be a success either in Manitoba or Saskatchewan unless the Dominion government acts in concert with these provinces and takes over and operates the terminal elevators. The amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Neely) is much the same excuse for shelving this motion as that resorted to last year when the member for Regina (Mr. Martin) moved his amendment. At that time the delay was asked to allow more time to see if the legislation introduced by the government would prove satisfactory, and to-day it is to allow further legislation being introduced. At present we have upwards of 70 Dominion inspectors overseeing the weighing in and out of the grain at these elevators, and about all that the Bill does is to appoint three supervisors to supervise the present inspectors, in addition to which it provides for additional penalties. The government Bill is not based on the principle that the farmers have been advocating and that we on this side of the House have been urging on the government, and for that reason I submit that the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) should be adopted and not sidetracked by the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Humboldt.

House divided on the amendment (Mr. Neely).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allard,	McMillan,
Allen,	Major,
Aylesworth,	Marcile (Bagot),
Beauparlant,	Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Béland,	Martin (Regina),
Black,	Mayrand,
Boyer,	Meigs,
Brown,	Michaud,
Carvell,	Miller,
Cash,	Molloy,
Chew,	Murphy,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Nesbitt,
Clark (Red Deer),	Neely,
Clarke (Essex),	Oliver,
Congdon,	

Currie	Papineau,
(Prince Edward),	Pardee,
Delisle,	Parent,
Demers,	Paterson,
Douglas,	Pickup,
Dubeau,	Proulx,
Ethier,	Rankin,
Fielding,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Richards,
Fowke,	Rivet,
Gauvreau,	Robb,
Geoffrion,	Ross (Middlesex),
Girard,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gladu,	Roy (Dorchester),
Graham,	Roy (Montmagny),
Harty,	Rutan,
Hodgins,	Savoie,
Hunt,	Schell,
King,	Sealey,
Kyte,	Seguin,
Lafortune,	Sinclair,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Smith (Middlesex),
	Smith (Stormont),
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Sperry,
Lapointe,	Talbot,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Templeman,
Law,	Todd,
Lemieux,	Tolmie,
Lovell,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Low,	Turcotte (Quebec
Macdonald,	County),
McColl,	Verville,
McCraney,	White (Victoria,
McKenzie,	Alta.), and
McLean (Huron),	Wilson (Laval.)—96.
McLean (Sunbury),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Maddin,
Arthurs,	Meighen,
Barnard,	Middlebro,
Best,	Monk,
Blain,	Nantel,
Borden (Halifax),	Owen,
Bradbury,	Perley,
Broder,	Reid (Grenville),
Burrell,	Roche,
Campbell,	Schaffner,
Chisholm (Huron),	Sexsmith,
Crothers,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Currie (Simcoe),	Sharpe (Ontario),
Doherty,	Smyth,
Edwards,	Sproule,
Fraser,	Stanfield,
Goodeve,	Staples,
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Stewart,
Henderson,	Taylor (Leeds),
Herron,	Taylor
Hughes,	(New Westminster),
Kidd,	Thoburn,
Lake,	Thornton,
Lennox,	Wallace,
Lewis,	White (Renfrew),
Lortie,	Wilson (Lennox and
McCall,	Addington) and
McCarthy,	Wright.—54.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
Borden (Sir F.),	Foster,
Harris,	Beattie,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
McAllister,	Rhodes,
McGiverin,	Boyce,
Warburton,	Jameson,
Loggie,	Daniel,
Fisher,	Osler,
Pugsley,	Price,
Bureau,	Porter,
Bickerdike,	Ames,
Carrier,	Blondin,
Conmee,	Bristol,
Chisholm (Antigonish)	Crosby,
Emmerson,	Forget,
German,	Lancaster,
Gorden (Kent),	Lalor,
Guthrie,	Barker,
Knowles,	Magrath,
LeBlanc,	Paquet,
McCoig,	Donnelly,
McIntyre,	Russell,
Martin (Wellington),	Marshall,
Prowse,	Crockett,
Smith (Nanaimo),	Cowan,
Turriff,	Worthington,
MacNutt,	Northrup,
Champagne,	Elson,
Devlin,	Clare.
Gervais,	Macdonell,
Lachance.	Wilcox.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Verville for third reading of Bill (No. 3) respecting the hours of labour on public works.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I opposed the second reading of this Bill, and I have since heard nothing to induce me to change my mind. True, if the Bill, as first introduced, was intended to help the labouring classes it is less valuable to them in its amended form now before us, but be that as it may, my opinion is because I disapprove on principle of a measure of this character. I opposed it in the first place because it interferes with personal liberty. I hold that we should not by legislation here prevent a man from labouring any number of hours that his physical strength allows him to, and his actual requirements necessitate. In so far as this Bill interferes with personal liberty in that respect I oppose it. Again, I am opposed to it, because, if we are to judge by the petitions that have come to this House from working people in many lines of occupation, the aim of this legislation is in time to prevent every line of labour from working more than eight hours a day. One of the reasons given as a defence of this Bill is that it applies only to public works under control of the federal government, and if that were so it would be less objectionable to me than it is at present, but, without doubt it is designed to extend beyond public works. One reason that I

gave for my opposition on the second reading of the Bill was, and I repeat it, that if we legislate here to compel an employer of labour to pay 10 hours' wages for 8 hours' work the product of that labour must be sold at an increased price, and in that way we are perpetrating a great injustice on those who must toil longer hours to pay for the product of the labour of those who work shorter hours. In the great city of Toronto public works are going on all the time, and if you legislate that those employed on them are only to work 8 hours a day, it is an incitement to other men to agitate for equally short hours. If, for instance, the men in the Massey Harris establishment would only work 8 hours a day producing agricultural machinery, the price of that product must be enhanced beyond the very high price charged at the present time, and so the farmers who buy that product will be obliged to work longer hours to pay for it. Although the agriculturists of this country are now working much longer hours than the men who produce these articles, if they are obliged to work one or two hours a day longer to pay for the enhanced price because of the shorter hours of labour, then you are doing a great injustice to the farmers of this country. If you compel a farmer, who now works 10, 12 or 14 hours a day, to work 15 or 16 hours a day to pay the enhanced price for an implement turned out by a man working 8 hours a day surely you are doing the agricultural classes a great injustice I represent an agricultural community, and I feel I would be doing less than my duty if I did not oppose the proposal made in this Bill. For this reason, as well as for others which I shall not delay the House to explain at present, I am opposed to this legislation.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). It is not my intention to occupy more than a few moments of the time of the House discussing this Bill, nor would I rise were it not that since the Bill was read a second time the agricultural society of the township in which I live and the horticultural society of the city of Kingston have both passed resolutions against the principle of this Bill, and have requested me to express their disapproval. I reiterate the protest I made when the legislation was first introduced. My constituents are largely farmers, and I believe the adoption of this principle works great injustice to them. One of the great difficulties of the Ontario farmers to-day is the securing of labour on the farm, and if you once adopt this principle on government works you insert the thin end of the wedge, and it becomes an encouragement to labouring men of all classes to demand an eight hour day. That must undoubtedly militate against the farmer by increasing the difficulty he now experiences in obtaining labour. Any one who knows anything about agriculture knows that a farmer cannot possibly limit his working day to eight hours. When this matter was under discussion some time ago, an hon. gentleman on this side who was supporting the Bill said that the farmers had very little to do in the winter. After they had collected a good pile of wood and laid in a good stock of tobacco, all they had to do was to sit by the fire and enjoy themselves. But while it may be true that the farmer in the winter season, has not to spend the same long hours at work as he does in the summer, it is still utterly impossible for him to have an eight hour day because, if he is going to get the best out of his cattle, they must be fed at regular intervals, and his cows must be milked at regular intervals. To allow sixteen hours between the feeding at night and the feeding in the morning would prevent his getting the best results out of them, so that an eight hour day is an impossibility for him, even in the winter. Another objection to this Bill, is the vast increase in the cost of all kinds of government work to which this would apply. For instance, you are going to construct a building, and the men who formerly would work on that building 10 hours a day will, when this Bill becomes law, work only eight hours per day. That will certainly make a great increase in the cost, an increase of from 20 to 25 per cent. Another objection I see is this. Why should a man employed by the government in erecting a building work only eight hours a day when other government employees have to work 10 or 15 hours a day. For instance on our canals, such as the Rideau canal, the lockmen are actually employed the whole 24 hours. That is, in the whole 24 hours they have no time which they can call their own, because they must be ready to go out and do their work at any hour of the day or night. It seems very unfair, therefore, that a man engaged in building a post office should work only eight hours a day while a man employed in another department should be obliged to work 10 or 15 hours per day.

But the strongest objection to this Bill is that it must undoubtedly increase the difficulty which the farmer now experiences in obtaining the necessary labour. An instance was cited to me by a farmer in my own county the other day of this difficulty. He had an Englishman in his employ who had come out from the old country. This farmer sold his milk in Kingston, and his hired man had to get up early to milk the cows, and then take the milk into the city. He would get into the city just about the time, or perhaps a little before, other labouring men were going to work, and the result was that in a short time he threw up his job. He said : I am not going to work on the farm for an hour or two in

the morning, before men working in the city start their day's labour. I feel that in justice to the people I represent, I must protest against the passing of such a measure.

Mr. HODGINS (Pontiac). Before this motion is adopted I wish to say a few words on the question. It is not often I agree with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) but on this occasion my sentiments are heartily in accord with his as I represent a farming community, and I feel that this Bill if it became law would be against their best interests. The successful men of the day, either in the workshop, the office, the factory, or the farm, are men who have given up more than eight hours per day to labour, and as my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), have said that if this measure be adopted it will increase the cost of living 20 per cent as well as the cost of all public works. The object no doubt is to insert the thin edge of the wedge and in the end, have an eight hour day established throughout the country. No doubt it is urged by the labour organizations, but I do not think that this government should enact any such legislation, as these organizations are very capable of looking after themselves.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 14, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FRUIT AND VEGETABLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

Mr. MONK. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the government if it intends placing before the House, as it did in the case of the farmers' delegation, all the papers and statements presented by the important delegation of fruit growers and vegetable growers which came here the other day. I have had several demands for a report of the proceedings, and I see that the government has placed a similar report of the farmers' delegation before the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I see no objection at all, and will move accordingly.

THE DECLARATION OF LONDON.

Mr. MONK. I would also like to ask my right hon. friend if he has come to a conclusion with respect to an order of the House, made the other day, regarding the declaration of London. At that time he said he would see whether the communication from the imperial government on that subject was confidential, but I see since then that the declaration of London has been communicated to Australia, and that the Australians have sent a protest to the English government against the adoption of the declaration. I presume we will have the same advantage.

THE LONG SAULT DAM.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask whether it would be possible to have the communications between this government and the British ambassador at Washington, which would naturally form part of the return moved for some time ago, brought down at an early date. I appreciate what my right hon. friend has said, that, as regards the whole return, the preparation must take some time, but I see no reason why a partial return of those communications that are easily accessible should not be brought down at once.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. About the Long Sault?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly. I have no objection.

PORK PACKING INDUSTRY.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask whether there would be any objection to having the views of the pork packing industry, a delegation from which interviewed the government yesterday, submitted to the House, so that we may have full knowledge of their statements?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No objection whatever. Everything will be brought down.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FOSTER. The most important factor in the development and progress of any country is its productions in kind and variety. The twin factors which aid in producing are capital and labour, and I propose, for a few moments, to consider what will be the effect of the proposal before us in respect of the productions of Canada and their co-operative factors, capital and labour. As I have already said, we are disposed to pay too much attention to the figures of trade, which, after

all, are but indexes of something which is basic and far more important. In all the foreign trade of Canada there are two productions, as far as geographical distribution is concerned—one of them in Canada and one outside Canada—and the one production is exchanged for the other. But the interprovincial trade is infinitely more important than foreign trade, as indexed by the foreign trade figures, because in the former all the products are made in Canada and the elements necessary to production are furnished and operated in Canada itself. The aim and object of this country for the last 40 years has been, as far as possible, to stimulate the number of productions in Canada itself, which usually form the article of exchange between the different parts of the country and to diminish as far as possible—and it is only possible relatively to diminish them—the productions of outside countries required in exchange for the productions of Canada. That is to transfer, as far as possible, all the elements of labour and capital and profit which go towards making up foreign productions, to transfer these to some section, province, or part of Canada where they shall be sent out and shipped for other productions in Canada made in some other province, section or part of Canada. To-day, when I read the American papers and scan the American speeches, and look at the American arguments, I do not find that they are saying very much as to the employment of American capital in the establishing of American industries in Canada. In the past and present condition of things we have noticed that as a factor, and a very important one, in the development of this country. It is stated, and I think without doubt, that at least $226,000,000 have been transferred in equipment and plant from factories in the United States towards the establishment of branch factories in the Dominion. Senator Beveridge, deploring that fact, substantiates it, but wonders whether it would not be much better for the United States, instead of transferring branch factories to the Dominion, to bring about a condition of tariffs, in which it would not be necessary for these American industries to transfer branches beyond the line. And Governor Foss, another very strong advocate of this reciprocity arrangement, deplores the same fact, and says that if it goes on hundreds of millions more will be so transferred, and he thinks the time has come for the United States of America to accept Canada's offer, make the way easy and clear between the two countries and thereby keep the production, the capital, the labour and profits, the homebuilding and wealthmaking in the United States, instead of transferring it to Canada.

Why are they solicitous for this trade treaty with Canada? It looks out upon every page of their argument ; it slips off the tongue of every advocate of the proposal. It is that the United States of America covets the rich natural resources of the Dominion of Canada—covets these resources not with a view to coming where the resources are, bringing labour and capital, and working them up where they exist; not that, but covets them to draw them away to their own manufacturing industries, to the centres of their own country, to make them up with their own labour to their own profit, directly and with all the subsidiary gain which accrues to manufacturing in the United States. 'How will they get these raw resources'? you say. Well, Sir, outside of what they already own in this country—and they own, probably, more than any one who has not looked into quite understands—this arrangement will not have been in operation for five years before the big trusts and moneyed interests of the United States will own everything that is loose in this Dominion in the way of great natural resources. What they do not wish to buy from the man in Canada who raises it or digs it from the mine, they will raise and dig on their own properties under their own direction in this country. They will have these natural resources, they will command them. And, as I have said, I want the people of Canada to keep this in mind—that the object in all this is not to work up the raw materials in Canada but to work them up in the United States of America. They will allow the cheaper and less skilled and less concentrated operations of labour to be performed in Canada, but the better paid, the more skilled, the more aggregated, are to be carried on in the United States. They will let Canadians take out the ore, catch the fish, fell the trees, raise the cattle and other stock, do the mechanical and exhausting farming work and—all the rougher processes of industry ; but all the progressive processes of perfecting the raw material with all that pertains to those processes, and the distribution of them with all the profits that pertain thereto, these they covet for themselves. And the tendency of this arrangement is to put it within their power to carry out this purpose.

What I want to ask is this : Of what particular benefit will that be to the Dominion of Canada? You say : It is not possible for them to take away all the raw material. I do not press the argument that far ; but I do say that the tendency is and will be to draw, as far as possible, the rawer resources of Canada to their centres and work them up there. And that they will do more and more, and in larger proportion as the years go by. I say that the broad effect of this agreement if it is to be as suc-

cessful as these advocates argue, will be to leave the rawer rougher processes of the work, the digging, the mining, the felling, the collecting, all the processes of common labour at lesser wages, to the people of Canada, and as few as possible of the perfecting, more highly-paid and better-conditioned processes to the United States of America.

If that be true, what is the first effect? The first effect is to exhaust, in proportion to what they draw from us, the natural resources of the Dominion of Canada and to husband what they have left of their own resources as far as they possibly can for future generations; to take away from Canadians the higher and better processes of development in their own country, and to transfer these to the United States. Here is a general tendency, which, in its beginnings, has already been carried out with all the intense vigour, the enterprise, the skill, the money power which lies in the United States of America. I ask any one to settle with himself whether this is for the future good of this country as an independent nation or whether it is not. I appeal to every man who is not so thoroughly impregnated with the commercial spirit that he would say, as the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) did the other day: Wherever we see a raw resource in this country, for Heaven's sake let it loose and send it to the United States, and let them work it up there, so long as we get the money for the raw material itself—I appeal to every man who is not so impregnated with commercial spirit, but who believes somewhat in the idea of the trusteeship of the present generation for future generations, whether it is not worth while to think, and think deeply, before we set ourselves irrevocably on the stream which leads us down with resistless current to the future which I have but dimly and poorly pictured.

How is capital to be affected by this? And how is labour to be affected by this? For forty years we have had a fairly stable policy in this country. The national idea came to birth in 1867 and it has ruled in this country from 1867 to this day. The national spirit carried with it the National Policy. And the national spirit and the National Policy appealed to the capital of the old country and of other countries, on the ground that this was to be a national development under a settled policy. And capital, which is eminently sensitive, which looks long before it invests itself, has gradually invested itself in the great public works and important national enterprises of Canada, until to-day $1,800,000,000 of British capital lies in our great routes of transport and the public undertakings of this country. Under what conditions was that placed there? Take the capital invested in your east and west lines of communication, was it ever dreamed in Britain, Sir, that the time would come when a change of policy would be inaugurated by the men who petitioned for the money, who plead for the investment of capital and got it at long last, was it ever dreamed that when this capital was securely fixed and invested, the long lateral lines of railway should be tapped every few miles by communication to draw off the trade intended for them to southern routes and do away with the long haul of the east-and-west lines?

So this proposition of the Finance Minister absolutely changes the conditions of all capital that has been invested in that way, invested from Great Britain in our great national concerns. In those times we wanted money, and our credit, though good, was based more upon hope than fulfilment; it was what we expected to happen in this country upon which we made our appeal for finances, to bring what we expected to birth and to fruitage. But, Sir, as the years went on, and expectations began to be fulfilled, that stream of money widened and deepened, and to-day it is coming into this country from Great Britain at the rate of $150,000,000 a year, and increasing from year to year. The men who have their money fixed in it have to stand the new conditions, they cannot get their investments out. Canadians have not been simply trying to get investments in the past, but they have, as we know, been endeavouring to make the flow deeper and more plentiful into this country for the ever ripening and recurring development which it is necessary for us to make in a new country like ours. How will this instrument affect capital that has not come, that is ready to come, but which, under doubt and uncertainty, will hesitate to come and invest itself in this country? I do not follow that out any further, it is not necessary.

Let me state another thing: That just as the flag follows trade, just so labour follows capital, and capital is going to be sensitive and careful of investing itself in this country on account of the unstable conditions which are imported by this arrangement, and will go to the side where there is the largest population, where there is the greatest market, where there is the greatest fixity and stability of financial conditions. For you find no intimation amongst the powers that be, or the powers that are to be, in the United States, that while they are quite willing, for purposes which I shall hereafter disclose, to open the barriers and to make free trade between Canada and the United States, they are at all disposed to throw any barriers down against the rest of the world. They do not intend to do it. Then, Sir, the invest-

or, under this precious document which the Minister of Finance has laid upon the table for our approval, the investor says: Here is an instrument which works in a certain direction, how long is it to be valid ? The Finance Minister says he does not know. It can be made invalid any day that this legislature or that legislature chooses to make it so. What money will invest itself then in enterprises which run in the lines of trade which are established between the United States and ourselves? If they have money to invest, what will they say? We think we had better go to the other side of the line and invest it. Then, if this thing bursts up we will be, with our investment, with our establishment, with our labour, with our product, where the ninety-three millions are, and where we will be protected against the rest of the world. Suppose that you persuade capital that this thing, although it is upon such tenure as that, will, from the very nature of circumstances, as they develop, tend to become permanent and remain permanent, will the man who has money to invest, invest it in the United States or Canada ? Should I invest it in Canada, he says, in manufactures? Caution whispers into his ear: Be careful, don't you see that in Canada, don't you see that in the United States, in Canada by the grain growers, in Canada by the free traders, in the United States by Democrats and Republicans in power and authority—don't you see that all these, in the two countries, simply look upon this as the entering wedge for full and complete free trade between Canada and the United States ? Not that it should come all at once—divide and destroy, that is the maxim. First, one industry will be attacked, and it will go by the board, then another industry will be attacked and it will go by the board. Do you mean to tell me that sensitive, long-sighted capital, looking for investment, will, under these considerations, invest itself in industrial establishments and enterprises on this side of the line ? No Sir, It will make capitalists doubly sure to plant themselves and plant their enterprises on the side where the big population, the big market and the greatest chances for themselves exist. Therefore, I say that in this matter, production, labour, capital, that trinity of influences and of factors which go to make up the prosperity of every great country, are all assailed by this instrument, threatened by this instrument, menaced by this instrument; and that the tendency will be to throw one production outside of Canada instead of Canadians having the two, to draw capital outside of Canada and invest it in the United States; and, as an inevitable consequence, to draw the labour around that capital and in that direction from Canada to the United States.

For, Sir, let there be no mistake in this matter. I am not going to read you quotations to any large extent. I am going to make the statement that every prominent advocate of this measure on the United States side of the line is overjoyed at it, and is an earnest advocate and supporter of it, and when he gives voice to the sentiment that is within him, he says that they are marching up, not to partial reciprocial free trade between Canada and the United States, but that it is the entering wedge and that the successful conclusion of the matter, not far off, in sight, will be when a circle is formed from the frozen sea on the north to the Rio Grande on the south, within which circle there shall be free trade unimpeded, and outside of which shall be the world with a tariff wall against it.

I sat the other day and saw the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) sitting there with his Finance Minister beside him listening to a delegation of 1,200 or 1,500 men, any one of whom knew more in five minutes about the business in which he had been brought up and which he was carrying on than these two gentlemen. I saw the right hon. gentleman, bereft of every power that a Canadian legislator ought to have, listening to the grievance, hearing a tale of gross and rank injustice, according to the statements that were made, and he was not able, Sir, to look his fellow Canadians in the face and say: As your Prime Minister I will take your grievance into account and if it is just I will right the grievance. The Finance Minister sat there, Sir, and when he was asked to speak, he declared that it was near two o'clock, and that he had no time to speak to-day. If he had told what was in his mind he would have said he was not able to say anything to them. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had to speak and he did speak. What did he say? I heard him before the Manufacturers' Association, I heard him before the Grain Growers' Association. To each of these he said: Gentlemen, I have been very glad to have your representations, I have gained a great deal of knowledge from what you have told me, I shall report the matter to my ministers, we will take it under advisement and we will do the best we can. Now and hereafter, as long as that instrument holds, no section, no interest, no man can come here with a tariff grievance based upon an article within the four corners of that agreement and can find a legislature, or a government, which is able to say to him: Yes, we will inquire into your grievance, and if it is properly founded we will have that griev-

ance removed. Why did the Prime Minister allow 1,500 men to journey to Washington—I should say to Ottawa. It was a slip, but as in the cases of some slips, it was mightily true. Why did he allow 1,500 men to spend $10,000 or $15,000 of their hard earned money to come down and make a show representation to him when he knew in his heart that he could do nothing, and when it would have been a mercy for him to have told those men beforehand: Your case is already decided, I am bound up in a contract with Mr. Taft, and no matter what kind of a grievance you have I am not able to redress a Canadian grievance. If you want to get it redressed, take it to Washington, that is the forum now. So I say that my slip of the tongue was the tongue verging off towards the great truth, the fundamental truth in this matter, that Canada has given up her fiscal freedom to the extent which I have shown to you this afternoon. When the great fruit and dairy industries of this country, believing that they have a grievance, coming before the men who ought to have the power to right it, with an immense expenditure of money already in the business and their fortunes based upon it, with tremendous possibilities in the future, put their plea and are told by a Finance Minister who is careful to keep his own coal scuttle undamaged by a Minister of Customs, who sits tight upon his own biscuit box, that they must sacrifice themselves for the good of Canada, which, being interpreted, is for the good of that old coal scuttle and that box of biscuits, they are apt to ask whether they alone are to do the sacrificing. If you say to these men: No protection for you, those men will say: Then, by the Great One above us, no protection to any other industry in this country; if we are not to be considered in the scheme of protection, then we will fight, and we will vote against any other person being considered in the scheme of protection. It is conceded in the United States of America, by those who want to see free trade between the United States and Canada that they are perfectly satisfied now with things as they are going, and that they will have the whole farming interest of the United States when deprived of protection ready to strike off the duty from every other industry so far as it affects the United States and Canada, and to a certain extent you have it the same way here. Let no mistake be made, that sense of injustice cannot be wiped out, it will rankle and grow, the sense of fair play runs even beside it, and the step now advised once taken will not be retraced, unless this government is speedily overthrown, until there be free trade between the United States and Canada. So it is not simply the men who do the market gardening and the men who do the fruit raising, and the men who do the milling, and the men who do the meat packing, and others who are threatened and hurt in this matter, but one by one the sound sense and the fair play instinct of the people will say: This must be an all-round square deal in protection or we shall not have any protection at all.

Now as to its trade features. The Finance Minister, I think, will be quite willing to acknowledge that up to the present time I have not been waving the British flag. I have no doubt he is sadly disappointed. Almost the first word he uttered in this House when this measure was brought down was that the first thing that would be heard would be loud shrieks, and the waving of the British flag. I have so far confined myself absolutely to the economic side of the question, but I am not afraid, thank God, to wave the British flag, and I do not propose to be frightened by the jeer of any Finance Minister or the quip of any newspaper from loving that flag and waving it when I please. But I am confining myself absolutely to the economic side of the question. I wish to ask a few more questions on the trade side of the question. In the first place, I want to ask what is the effect of this upon our trade with other countries. The first effect that we have is a singular one—no I am not quite right in saying that, under this government it is not singular, but it is one of which we have had repeated instances. There is again in this case, as there has been in other cases, the gift of free trade privileges, or lower duty privileges, to foreign countries who give us no compensation of any kind.

By what right in this stage of commercial competition and warfare so to speak does the government of Canada give to countries already upon a good basis of trade with Canada further concessions upon entering into our markets when Canada gets no single thing in return for the same. At least it is questionable as to whether we should carry out that operation too far and repeat it too often. What is done in this case? I find that most favoured nations receive a benefit of $165,254 of trade made free to them on the basis of their dealings with Canada last year, and $580,317 of trade in which the duty has been lowered to them under this treaty, taking the goods they sent to Canada in 1910. That is to say, a total trade of $745,671 has been effected favourably to certain countries of the world and for this no single thing in the way of compensation has been given to us in return. So much for that. There is also, however, this to be noted, that in some of the articles which we have made free to the United States of America, these favoured countries

come in not only theoretically but practically with the ability to send large exportations into the Dominion, free, or at a modified rate of duty. Animals, grains, vegetables, fruits, butter, cheese, fish, salt and other articles can come in from Argentine, Austro-Hungary, France and Algeria, Norway, Russia, Switzerland and some other countries. With that superior smile which more frequently graces the face of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister when he labours for lack of information than otherwise, the Prime Minister rather smiles now at I suppose the silliness of my argument; nevertheless each man has to make his argument according to his light, and each man has a perfect right to judge of it as he wishes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And to smile also.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend can smile and take a smile for all I care; I won't quarrel with that. But what is more important—and now perhaps my right hon. friend will rather want to take a smile than to smile—what does happen is this, and it is rather an important point it seems to me. I want to remind my right hon. friend of a statement made in cold blood by the Prime Minister of Canada; a statement which he is supposed to have known the meaning of, and which no honourable statesman would fail to carry out. Sitting in that chair the other day, he said to the 1,500 that were interviewing him: Gentlemen, I am sorry you come too late; if you had come a few weeks before, why, we could have interchanged opinions and you could have had your questions taken up. Afterwards, hearing some of these gentlemen talk, one said to the other: Oh, well you see, this is the misery of the thing, we did not come early enough; did'nt you hear what the Prime Minister said; if we had come earlier we would have got all we wanted maybe. Yes—said the other, did'nt we have the Prime Minister's pledge as a public man and a gentleman that he did'nt propose to make any adjustment and revision of the tariff until he had appointed a tariff commission? I thought the answer was a good one. I make the same answer to my right hon. friend here to-day. Why did he make that promise and why did he fail to fulfil it? Why did he pledge himself in the west and pledge himself here in this House of Commons in the early part of the session unless he honestly intended to abide by the pledge? In reply to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, he said:

I stated that we would have a commission of investigation before we undertook a revision of the tariff. Does any member on the other side of the House take issue with the promise I make. Would any of them advocate rushing into a revision of the tariff without previous investigation. Hon. members may laugh at that but they will dare not to say that they would favour such a course.

Mr. HUGHES. Who said that?

Mr. FOSTER. This was said by the right hon. gentleman who sits opposite to us now, and who as Prime Minister, made that statement in the west and made it here. And, he will get up after me, and he will try to crawl out of that by saying that this is not technically a revision of the tariff. Now, will he? It will be the smallest hole that any large sized man ever tried to get through. When you transfer the immense number of products which have been transferred from the dutiable to the free list, and when you affect the dutiable list in others, what is it but de facto a revision of the tariff, and a good big revision, and a revision upon which most important consequences hang. I say that never in the history of Canada, has a more fateful and more important revision of the tariff taken place than has been brought about by this agreement with the United States, and the legislation which is to call it into force. I charge the right hon. gentleman with bad faith with the people of the west, with bad faith with this parliament of Canada, with bad faith with this whole people of Canada, when he lulled every interest to sleep by saying to the wide Dominion: Don't fear, gentlemen, there will be no revision of the tariff until a tariff commission has been put to work and you shall have an opportunity to make your representations before that tariff commission. My right hon. friend made this other statement:

There is in the Fielding tariff a cardinal principle. It is the principle of British preference, and that preference will not be interfered with by anything we do with the United States.

I ask the right hon. gentleman if he has implemented that promise? I charge him to his face that he has broken it. Right under my hand here, are the proofs that he has broken it. He made that statement not once, or twice, but over and over again, and, Sir, I noticed that the Finance Minister took the unusual course of sending a reasoned argument by cable to the High Commissioner at London to be used by the Prime Minister of the empire, filled with many half statements that would have been clearer had they been made whole statements, and with many presentations which would have been nearer the truth if they had been whole instead of partial presentations. But, Sir, on the basis of it, Mr. Asquith rose in the House of Commons and in the debate which took place there he said:

The American-Canadian agreement had been carefully watched by the British Ambassador at Washington on behalf of British interests, and he had been assured that so far as British importations into Canada were concerned, British preference would be scrupulously maintained.

Now, that is a succinct sentence; it is inclusive; no one can fail to take in its meaning. Negotiations were going on at Washington. The British Ambassador was cognizant of them and privy to them. The British Ambassador was advised that whatever took place there would be no interference with the preference to Great Britain. He had advised his government of the fact, and his government, through Mr. Asquith, on that information and the information given to the Finance Minister, stood up and pledged his understanding of the case to the British people and to the empire, which is interested therein. In the face of that I challenge the statement that imperial preference has been scrupulously maintained. I have here only a partial table which will show what I mean. Counting up the items, I find that there are 102 in which there has been a lowering of tariff without going so far as perfect freedom from impost. Of those, 28 involve importations from Great Britain which have not had the preference impaired; 74 involve importations from Great Britain in every one of which the preference has been impaired and lowered. In the list of goods made free there are 69 items. On 39 of those British preference has not been touched; on 30 of them it has been absolutely wiped out, for the goods have been placed on the free list. There is involved altogether $6,387,336 worth of British goods imported under the preference in 1910, on every dollar's worth of which the imperial preference has been either absolutely wiped out or has been materially diminished. Now, it is no excuse to say: But that six millions, compared with our whole foreign trade, is but a trifle, and therefore we have scrupulously maintained the preference. That would be quibbling unworthy of even any member of the present government.

Now, Sir, the Finance Minister, when questioned the other day, wobbled, and wobbled pitifully, on this matter. First, he declared that the British preference would be kept intact; then when questioned he said, there will be other legislation, and it will be within the power of this parliament to make good the British preference. How will he make good a British preference which was 5 or 10 per cent on goods which have been now placed on the free list? Give a bounty to the exporter from Great Britain to make up his loss? Where the preference was 12 per cent or 10 per cent, and it has been reduced to 8 or 7½ per cent, how are you going to make up that loss by adding to the British preference at the expense of industry in Canada, on a production which already has been reduced to the lowest or nearly the lowest figure which it is possible to have, and still maintain itself? Now, Sir, these gentlemen sitting opposite you have pledged themselves, and have led the British government to pledge itself, and the British people and the people of the empire to believe, that they have not touched or impaired the British preference when they have stricken it its death blow. It was not their own infant, much as the Finance Minister would sometimes like to father it. The infant brought into being by the Finance Minister was a reciprocity with the whole world. The child that was forced upon him in the end was reciprocity with Great Britain alone, which was afterwards extended to the British dominions. They immediately went to work to render it as ineffective as possible—first, by raising the duties on the list of articles before they made the preference to Great Britain; later, by the French Treaty, which in some respects scaled down the preference to nothing, and in other respects materially reduced the influence of the preference. Then, in 1910, after parliament had closed, these gentlemen, true to the great Liberal principles which they professed, reduced by order in council the duties to Belgium, to Holland and to Italy, and so brought in further competition with the preference to Great Britain; and to-day, what have they done? They have done what I have told you in the way of reduction of the preference, but they have gone leagues further, they have reduced the incentives for Canada to look for, to ask for and to work for preference. They brought back in their hand a free market, they say, for butter, for cheese, for wheat, for dairy products of all kinds, for grains of all kinds, and for sundry other products.

Where is the argument for the men who advocate the imperial preference arrangement with Great Britain? On this side of the water, they will say it would have been a boon to us then, but we have got free entrance into a market of 93,000,000, we have got all we want, do not talk to us about British preference. On the other hand, they have struck a fatal blow on this side, in this way. They have included all the articles on which the British people would be willing to give a preference in the free list to the United States, and every one of them could be sluiced through Canada into the empire under a preferential arrangement with Canada. And you could not help yourself. Preference then will not be with Canada alone in these articles, but with Canada plus the United States. These considerations justify me in saying that a fatal blow had been struck

at British preference, and I want no better corroborative argument than this, namely, the joy that broke out in the British House of Commons among the anti-tariff reformers when this news came to them, which, it was declared, dished tariff reform in Great Britain forever and aye. This is how imperial preference has been treated.

The preference being destroyed, the hopes of preference with the United Kingdom being dished, we shall be more and more impelled to join our fortunes in trade with the United States. That is the way the argument and the circumstances work. I notice that my hon. friend, the Finance Minister, in the closing part of his speech the other day, dilated upon what good this would be to the United States, and also to the people of Canada, but he was significantly silent as to any good it would work out to the empire. That part of the argument evidently appeared to his mind as not in keeping with the proposition he was laying before the House.

I lay on the table a list of the rates, the importations, the preference reduction that has been made, not of all the articles, but I have picked out a number of them :

RATES AND IMPORTS SHOWING PREFERENCE REDUCTION.

Articles.	Present Preference.	General Rate.	Proposed Rate.	Value of Imports from		Preference Reduction.
				Great Britain.	United States.	
				$	$	
Beans	15 cts.	25 cts.	Free.	64,384	55,806	10 p.c.
Oats	7 "	10 "	Free.	13,449	13,833	3 cts.
Barley, pot and pearled	20 p.c.	30 p.c.	½ cts.	15,772	1,399	10 p.c.
Pease	10 "	15 "	½ "	9,615	35,406	5 "
Paving blocks	12½ "	22½ "	17½ "	65,057	73,706	5 "
Antiseptics	12½ "	20 "	17½ "	40,060	69,785	2½ "
Bath tubs, &c.	20 "	35 "	32½ "	31,611	198,567	2½ "
Vegetables	15 "	30 "	25 "	93,385	863,715	5 "
Sweet biscuits	17½ "	27½ "	25 "	96,029	7,905	2½ "
Biscuits unsweetened	15 "	25 "	20 "	18,912	18,686	5 "
Biscuits and confectionery	22½ "	35 "	32½ "	426,505	130,623	2½ "
Portland cement	8 cts.	12½ cts.	11 cts.	99,291	48,977	1 c.
Coal	35 "	53 "	45 "	91,212	1,144,129	8 cts.
Cotton Seed Oil	5 p.c.	10 p.c.	Free.	14,705	895,693	5 p.c.
Preserved fish	17½ "	30 "	Free.	75,523	532,998	12½ "
Grapes	1½ "	2 cts.	Free.	104,679	114,218	1½ cts.
Canned fruits	1½ "	2¼ "	2 cts.	36,002	55,012	¼ "
Plate glass	15 "	27½ p.c.	25 p.c.	114,604	2,615	2½ p.c.
Motor vehicles	15 "	25 "	22½ "	106,126	1,569,227	2½ "
Clocks and watches	20 "	30 "	27½ "	43,376	310,063	2½ "
Cutlery	20 "	30 "	27½ "	223,854	32,403	2½ "
Cheese	2 cts.	3 cts.	Free.	22,487	45,319	2 cts.
Musical instruments, cases, pocket books.	22½ p.c.	35 p.c.	32½ p.c.	118,398	349,339	2½ p.c
Brass band instruments	15 p.c.	25 "	22½ "	11,000	15,934	2½ "
Feathers	10 "	15 "	12½ "	43,431	41,723	2½ "
Pickles, &c	25 "	35 "	32½ "	292,039	80,818	2½ "
Lard and compounds	1½ cts.	2 cts.	1¼ cts.	26,468	1,410,806	¼ ct.
Rolled iron sheets	Free.	5 p.c.	Free.	3,490,612	2,751,211	5 p.c.
Salt	Frec.	5 cts.	Free.	256,558	141,003	5 "
Meats—fresh and salted	1½ cts.	2 "	1¼ cts.	69,933	2,163,746	½ ct.
" canned and extracts	17½ "	27½ p.c.	20 p.c.			10 p.c.

I think these figures bear out my assertion, which may have seemed somewhat harsh that the Prime Minister forgot his pledges that he solemnly made here and elsewhere, and that the information which was given to Prime Minister Asquith and the British ambassador is not reliable information, but that the British preference has been in part lessened and in part wiped out. This is proven by the figures I have taken from their own little blue-book, which figures I have accepted without revision or examination as being absolutely correct. What are the distinctive features of this treaty, and how far do they conform to the conditions of reciprocity? Suppose that I am a maker of jack-knives of a certain quality, and my hon. friend opposite is a maker of jack-knives of the same quality. I could send over to him and buy a dozen jack-knives, and he could send over to me and buy a dozen jack-knives, and this might be called trade; but there would be no reciprocity about

it. Reciprocity, I think, has this as a prime condition—that it shall be between two countries, each producing a surplus, but a surplus in a different line of articles, and each wanting articles of which the other's surplus is made up. More than that, for ideal reciprocity, this should not be a mere occasional surplus, but should be the result of fixed conditions of climate, soil, and so on, that will make the surplus permanent. Two countries that show ideal conditions of reciprocity in trade would be the West India islands and Canada. The West Indies produce a surplus of tropical fruits, of which we produce none. But they produce absolutely no dairy products, none of the food products of the temperate zone, of which we produce a great surplus. These are examples of two countries between which a reciprocity trade arrangement could be made with great profit. In the same way, reciprocity between us and Great Britain is possible in lines or articles which will readily suggest themselves to the minds of hon. members. But in the case of the arrangement we are now discussing, you are trying to establish reciprocity between two countries, each of which has a surplus, and a surplus of exactly the same products. With the exception of cheese and fish, the United States of America has a surplus of every article which goes from Canada, under this arrangement, into the United States. And not a slim surplus, but in every respect a substantial surplus, and in some respects a very large surplus. I do not wish to weary the House with figures. But let me take a few instances. I find that the United States of America exported last year $68,000,000 worth of wheat, and $51,000,000 worth of wheat flour. Of this combined export, 58·57 per cent was of wheat, and 41·43 of wheat flour, and the total export represented an aggregate of 114,000,000 bushels of wheat. There is a large and substantial surplus. Nor is there any probability that, within a reasonable time, the United States will cease to be a grower of wheat in excess of the wants of the people. In the case of animals, the excess of exports from the United States over imports is $20,000,000. In breadstuffs, the excess is $150,000,000; meats and dairy products, $157,000,000. Of beef products they export $21,000,000, of hog products $114,000,000. What is most noticeable in the trade history of the United States is their persistent encouragement and nurture of manufacturing industries. At first, the United States of America was an exporter of food and natural products but of few or no manufactures. In 1899, her exports of manufactures were only $123,000,000. But in 1910 her exports of manufactures were $440,000,000, an increase of 250 per cent. And President Taft, in his message to the United States Congress, says that what the United States must set itself to do is to increase its exports on the line of manufactured goods. That is its future. It cannot expect to make large exportations of food and other products. What we want, he says, is raw material close at hand, what we want is cheap foodstuffs, so far as we can get them from the northern country in order that we may be better provided and furnished for this increased product and increased export of the industries of this country, in which our future lies in respect of the world trade. That is the policy shining out in every statement, shining out in every line and article of this proposed agreement. The United States knows what it is after, with a tariff wall against the world, desiring to preserve its own unused natural resources so far as it can, dipping into the virgin resources of Canada so far as it may be able, fortifying itself by the conservation of its own and by the destruction of ours, making itself the great manufacturing country of the world, and increasing its wealth and its power in that way.

So I say that the elements of real reciprocity are not found in the conditions of the two countries. The reciprocity that you will have between this country and the United States will be largely a sectional, fitful, occasional reciprocity. If the hay crop is poor in the United States, and we have a good crop, that will be our opportunity to a certain extent; although if the hay crop is very poor in the United States, and the existence of their cattle depended upon hay being got, no matter what the duty was in reason, they would have to pay for the hay and pay the duty. But the Finance Minister laid little stress on this part of the arrangement, that whilst the United States gave us a market we gave the United States a market as well. If we can turn our products into their country in certain sections where drouth or frost has made a shortage at certain seasons, when, from any circumstance, there is a failure of any particular crop in whole or in part, the very same thing can be done by the United States when these adverse circumstances visit the Canadian crops, and the Canadian farmers. There is a market given to us, but there is also a market given by us. As I said before, the reciprocity between the two will be largely a fitful, sectional reciprocity.

Now, we hear a farmer living on the border of the United States, say: If there was no duty I could take my wheat free to the other side and sell it for ten cents a bushel more than I can now. Do you mean to say that it is not the tariff that does that? well, Sir, I will let Mr. J. J. Hill answer that. Mr. Hill is a man of great experience, of wide knowledge in everything

that pertains to the production, the carriage and the transport of the business of the west. On the 10th inst., Mr. Hill spoke in Minneapolis, and let me tell you what he said, in commenting on wheat prices to the farmers of the United States: Are you afraid to take off the 25 cents per bushel, and let the Canadian farmers in free? Will it decrease the price of your wheat? You say wheat in Winnipeg is so much, and is less than the price paid in Minneapolis. Are you afraid, then, that if the tariff is taken off, wheat will be put into your market at a lower rate? Is it the tariff that does it? Then he quotes from averages of the year with reference to wheat prices in different states of the United States, and he says:

For the year ending December last the average price in California was 84 cents a bushel, 12 cents a bushel higher than the price in Oregon.

There, he says, are two states of the United States, Oregon and California, no tariff between them, and yet in one wheat was selling at 12 cents more than in the other. How do you explain it? Evidently not by a tariff.

The average price for wheat per bushel, in 1909, in the North Atlantic states, was $1 12; in the South Atlantic states it was $1.17½. What made the difference between the two? Was it the tariff? But there is no tariff whatever, so you have to seek for some other cause to account for the difference. The average value per bushel on the farm, in 1910, for Iowa, was 72 cents; for Missouri, 78 cents; for Tennessee, 90 cents; for Alabama, $1.02; for Oklahama, 73 cents; for Arkansas, 85 cents; for Oregon, 72 cents; for California, 84 cents; for North Carolina, $1.01; for South Carolina, $1.14. Now will some one explain that great difference in price? It is not due to the tariff.

So, said Mr. Hill, and Mr. Hill is evidently right. So what I say is that if this thing goes into operation under the glare, and glitter, and glamour of a promised fabulous rise in prices for the products of which the United States exports its surplus, there will be disappointment keen and bitter. I hope our farmers will never be subjected to the risk of that disappointment. The Finance Minister came back and he said to the farmer in the west: See here, look at the gift I have brought you; your wheat goes free into the United States, I have given you a second market for your wheat. The Northwest farmer already had two markets for his wheat, he had the miller and he had the British market, and the British market absolutely fixes the price for the surplus wheat of the world. Mr. Hill takes great pains, in his argument at Minneapolis, to show that in the general trend of commerce the surplus wheat of the world, coming from all countries, has its price fixed in Liverpool and London, by the circumstances and relations of supply and demand; and he says it make no difference whether wheat comes from the Canadian west and filters through American lines of communication to Liverpool, or whether wheat comes from the Canadian west and reaches Liverpool direct; it makes no difference in the price that each must take for his grain in the Liverpool market. All that varies the price is the cost of transportation and incidental charges.

Now the great argument of the Finance Minister, and the argument that is used throughout the country, is this: We have given you another market for your wheat. As I said before, there are two markets for wheat now. The Canadian northwest farmer need not sell his wheat to the miller if the miller does not give him the fair ruling price; he can export it to London and Liverpool and get the price that the world gets, which fixes the price that the miller gives, outside of certain incidental circumstances of location and the like of that. Thus he has two markets now. But the Finance Minister forgot to go any farther, forgot to trace out just what he was doing when he presented the gift of free entry of Canadian wheat into the United States market. He forgot to point out that the miller of the Canadian west, and the miller of the west United States, has in the end, after the local supply is satisfied, to find the same market in London and Liverpool. He forgot to point out that he made it possible for the United States miller to get Canada's No. 1 hard wheat, to mill it in the United States mills and satisfy the people in the United States who ask for high grade flours and pay fancy prices for them and then take the less strong flours and export them to the European market, which is largely, as I am informed, for those grades not the strongest and not the best. So that what happens is this: The Canadian miller will be at a disadvantage in competition in the export market in flour with the United States miller, who draws on his best, who has the offal to supplement his gains, and to diminish his charges, and has at least shorter and possibly cheaper routes of exit to the old country markets. The milling industry is an important industry in this country. It is important because of the by-products and the absolute necessity for those by-products if we are going to have improved and intensive farming in that great northwestern country. Did you notice that President Taft and Mr. Hill in their arguments, lay great stress on this? They say that the people of the United States should now turn their attention more and more to improved and intensive farming. Is not that as good advice for Canadians as it is

for the people of the United States ? and if that impetus is given to the export of raw wheat because you have got a more facile market, and may be at times a better market, although it is certain at other times to be a less good market, you make a set and tendency in that great northwestern country to shear off the wheat and sell it with less trouble of farming and by doing that, neglect the improved and intensive and mixed farming which alone can restore your impoverished soil, bring it to its natural state as productive and as valuable as it was at first. The more milling you have in the west, and the more offal for feeding the better you will attain this end.

Take again, the pork packing industry. The Minister of Finance comes back and says to the hog raisers and the cattle raisers in Ontario: I have brought you a gift, I have got a free entrance into the United States for your hogs and your cattle. We had representatives here from the west. What did they say ? They said that the cattle industry in the west could be made a splendid industry, but in order to do it, they must do something other than raise and export stock cattle, they must carry out the refining processes and perfecting processes in the west in order to cultivate their farms, to feed back what they have taken from the soil and make sure and steady the occupations of the farmer and the cattle grower. That was true. You will hear no more about that, if this arrangement goes into operation; every stocker that can be raised will be cleaned off the ranches and farms in the west and carried down to the perfecting and manufacturing processes in the United States of America. There they will have the advantage of the by-products for the enrichments of their land and can carry out in that way the advice of Mr. Taft and Mr. Hill, to turn their attention to mixed farming, to intensive farming, that kind which yields best and keeps the soil up to its quality and its standard. The Finance Minister came back and said to the farmers: We have got a market for your hogs and your cattle, another market for you. They already had a market, the packers of Ontario and Quebec. The market that you give to them in the United States at times is higher and at times is lower than the market in Canada. The absolute condition, I am informed, of good, straight, honest packing and preservation of the market for the product of the packers, is that delivery shall be steady and constant and shall be made directly, the product not being stored for any length of time. But if you take the prices of hogs in the United States and the prices of hogs in Ontario and Quebec, year in and year out, the average price is higher in the province of Quebec and Ontario, than in the United States of America. Just at this present time the prices of hogs are higher at Buffalo and Detroit, than they are in Ontario. What would happen if the market were opened ? Every hog that could be got away, would be taken to the Buffalo and the Detroit market, and a supply would not be possible for the packers of Ontario and Quebec and the packers' establishments would close. The Finance Minister is trying to give to the farmer another market for his hogs, but in the process, he runs the risk of destroying the stable market he now has, destroying that stable market and leaving the Ontario hog raiser to the United States market. To-day that market is away up, and he gets a good price; to-morrow it may be away down, and he gets no price, and so, discouraged and disheartened, by the rises and falls of the American market, the Ontario farmer finds less inducement to carry on his business and hog raising goes out of its present stage in Ontario and Quebec. What else have you done? You have reduced the preserved and cured meats duties. Into the northwest provinces, millions of dollars worth of these cured products have been going and a large trade has been carried on during the last seven years. Under this arrangement, if it comes into force, the northwest provinces will be supplied absolutely from the packing establishments of Chicago, Milwaukee and the nearby places in the United States of America. You take away from the packing industry of this country, a part, and a valuable part, of its local market, the domestic market in the northwest, and you transfer it to the United States market. What else do you do ? By making the supply fitful, now up, now down, now plentiful, now nothing, you destroy his chance for export to Great Britain, and the $7,000,000 of products which to-day are exported to the British market, run the risk of being diminished and ultimately of coming down to the vanishing point. There is more in it than simply the selling of raw material, more in it to the man who sells the raw material, and more in it to the man who does the finishing processes, and more in it to the country in which both are carried on.

So much with reference to reciprocity. The next point I wish to make is, that this instrument restricts and may ultimately destroy our fiscal freedom. Has this people of Canada lost its sense of what is due to it as a responsibly governed people. I do not believe it. But it is hard not to believe it just at this particular time. I put the matter in this way before, and I put it again, because it is vitally important : Here are two men,

members of the government that have absolutely had no mandate from the people of any kind or sort ; no mandate because they declared to the people that they had done with reciprocity and were cultivating now the British market. These two men with no extraordinary business ability or experience go down to Washington, make a pact with the administration there, sign it with their hand and seal, come back here and present it to the free parliament of Canada, to the free people of Canada. And when the people get their breath they say : What does this thing mean ; why, this goes the wide length of the Dominion ; it enters into productions of every sort and kind, it makes an absolute change in our fiscal relations, it may go further and affect the productions of our country immensely, it may go further still and affect our national ideals and our imperial relations. And, yet Sir, these two men with their limited knowledge, consulting with nobody but 14 other men of equally limited knowledge—and I give them credit for all they are worth ; I was there myself once and I know how limited really the knowledge of a minister of the Crown is with reference to these things—these two men bring back an instrument and without asking leave of the people, without giving to parliament a free hand they impose that as a pact, and backed up by the whole party force and power they put it into operation no matter whose back is broken, no matter what interest is invaded, no matter what great national consequences hang upon it, and what interests may be injured thereby. I say, Sir, that if such a thing had happened 30 years ago in any province of the Dominion of Canada there would have been a revolt in that province. It amazes me to think that men could dare to assume such rights ; it amazes me still more to think that they dare to assume such responsibility. Why, when this pact was made I can imagine the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, two good men, two simple-minded men, two men of fair but limited knowledge, with two clerks with them, facing the trained men of business at Washington, going down there with fear and trembling, wondering if they could get a little bit of a slice so as to justify their going, creeping into Washington, and when they meet, the United States representatives suddenly hand out to them a proposition which in their wildest imaginings they did not suspect would be offered to them. Overwhelmed, overpowered, they pick it up and telegraph back to Ottawa : Goodness gracious, Sir Wilfrid, see what they have given us, shall we take it. And Sir Wilfrid looks at it, and he says it is the whole thing, and he telegraphs back : Take it, take it, take it. And the pact is signed. Sir, the gift is brought back but the mortgage has to be met. And if this is passed the future of this country economically and nationally will pay that mortgage to the last cent and curse the men who made that mortgage possible.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That wakes them up.

Mr. FOSTER. So, as I have said, from this time out, if this holds, Canada's interests cannot be met and satisfied by the Canadian parliament in the Canadian forum. Our hands are tied. Ninety-three millions of people plus eight millions have to give their assent. The predominant partner has to be seen and has to give his consent, and to every grievance brought by the individual interest the government must answer ;—we know we are wrong, we see you are going to be destroyed but it is the whole pact or none, we cannot let you off or the whole business goes by. Now, let me put this to my right hon. friend : You started out on the right track in 1910 just before the big stick was lifted ; you told us in parliament that you were brave and that you would continue to be brave ; you said you would do what was best for Canada and let the United States do as it liked, and you carried through the French Treaty in that fit of bravery and courage. But the February of 1910 came when a surtax of 25 per cent was possible within a month of going on, when the big stick was raised, and then Sir, you wilted ; you forgot your brave words and your brave sayings even in parliament, and you came here with the excuse : Well, it was unjust, we knew it was, we should not have asked to do it, it was not neighbourly treatment, we had treated them splendidly and they have treated us in niggardly fashion ; they had no right to do it, but see here, we cannot face a disturbance and dislocation of the $300,000,000 worth of trade between the United States and Canada, and, therefore, we give in. And if this pact should increase your trade between Canada and the United States to $600,000,000 as you say it will, then let a demand come from the other side equally as unjust as that, and you will again say : It is unjust, it should not have been, we should not be asked to make a sacrifice like that but here is $600,000,000 of trade involved and we cannot disturb and dislocate it. Don't you see the fetters you have put about you ; don't you see the bonds in which you have wrapped yourselves up, the more this is successful in stimulating trade between the two countries the more we are in the power of the predominant partner. Let a man with $8,000 go into business with a man with $100,000, and who manages that business? It makes no difference that the man with small capital is wiser than the man with large capital,

the man with small capital sees his interests are not being well cared for and sees he is subjected to injustice, and he goes to the predominant partner and says : I want this thing changed, and the other says : You do, do you, well I don't want it changed ; what are you going to do about it? So the United States can say to Canada.

I am the predominant partner; I have a hundred millions in this, and you have only eight millions; do you want to sell out, or are you prepared to grin and bear it, and take the injustice? One or the other ; and it is not an alternative for a young nation to have placed before it. It does not square with that spirit which has been cultivated for the last forty years, and you know it does not. Then, why don't you simply say so, and say as patriots and good citizens have said before, in every crisis of their country's history: Sacrifices, if necessary, we will make that our country may be saved and our flag may be preserved. I say, therefore, that we have given up our fiscal freedom to a large extent, and we have endangered it absolutely. This country is young; it develops rapidly. Who is wise enough to say to-day that five years from this we ought not to have a totally different alignment of our tariff? But under this you bind yourselves; you are not free to make it. Suppose that, five years from this, this country came to the conclusion that with regard to one of these products Canada's duty to herself, and her people was to prohibit the export of it, or to put restrictions upon it that it should be manufactured in this country with our own capital, with our own labour, and for our own first uses. You come up against the fact that the predominant partner says: You cannot do that without disturbing the whole arrangement; are you going to imperil $400,000,000 worth of trade? The argument is not irresistible, but it is almost irresistible practically. Theoretically you are free; practically you are bound; your strength and your power and your sovereign right of first service to your own citizens in your own country has been bartered away, and bartered away, in my opinion, for a petty mess of pottage.

Mr. PATERSON. We are in bad shape, aren't we?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the Minister of Customs has his biscuit box yet; he is not in bad shape.

Mr. CARVELL. Two-and-a-half per cent on it.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, his previous profits will keep him chewing quite a while Of course, the market gardeners, poor fellows, are in a hard way ; but they don't make biscuits, and they don't smile about it. The minister smiles sitting on his biscuit box when he surveys the troubles of the market gardeners.

Mr. PATERSON. Don't you think you would be better of a biscuit now. You must be tired?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, if you send over one of your best, I will send back a cent for it, and will not charge you anything for the advertisement. Another feature of this proposal is that it clashes with the new sentiment and, I hope, policy of conservation in this country. I am not able to give very much time to that, but I think it is well worth mentioning, even though the Prime Minister smiles at my taking up so petty a matter as conservation.

Mr. PATERSON. Only at the three hours.

Mr. FOSTER. These hours which I take up will not be grudged by the country, and if they have any effect in restraining the madness of these two estimable gentlemen who constitute themselves the judges for the whole people——

Mr. TALBOT. We have heard that story before.

Mr. FOSTER. And there are some stories which my hon. friend might hear very often and much to his improvement. The Ten Commandments and the moral law and all the maxims of business and of social refinement and of civilization never can be repeated too often to any of us in this world of struggle and temptation. So I am willing to take a little more time, and repeat it again for my hon. friend if I thought it would do any good. I think it will do good; I think he is appreciative of it. Are we simply playing with this matter of conservation, or are we in earnest? Is it merely something to display to the people, something nice to talk about on the platforms and in great meetings with people of other countries, that we are alive to the conservation of the natural resources of this country and are doing something towards it? If it is not simply display, the government is in earnest in this matter of conservation. It is an important question. The government have become seized of the facts if it is important, and they are going to set themselves towards a line of policy, and a line of conduct which shall aid in the conservation of our natural resources. Now, Sir, there is no meaning in conservation unless we approach it from this point of view, that we in this generation are the trustees for the generations that come after us. If we divest ourselves of that feeling, there is nothing for us to think about, but this present generation and day—take, eat, drink and be merry; you may die to-mor-

row, but you will have all you want whilst you live. Trusteeship is the foundation of conservation in principle as well as in method. If that be the government's idea, the point I wish to raise, and the only point in this, is: Is an agreement like this, which aims at an invasion of all the rich natural resources of this country, with added yearly incentives to their destruction and extinguishment, a matter which affects this country at all or which may affect it in respect of its conservation? If it is, we ought to be careful before we enter into it; for if we enter into this pact, we have practically made an agreement with the United States that so long as it continues, they shall have free access to our natural resources. Unless that is an underlying part of this agreement, then there is no underlying principle in it at all. Now, Sir, the whole bent and force of this arrangement, so far as I have seen, is that this is wanted in the United States on economic grounds for the purposes of supply out of our raw materials. This goes into force; a year from now, this government may find and the Conservation Commission may advise this government, that certain of our resources should not be exported except under certain conditions, or that they should not be exported at all, or that such of them as are used should be made up under regulations, and made in this country alone. As we are now, you have a perfect right to pass that legislation; you have given bonds to nobody.

You have given bonds to nobody, but if this passes you have not a perfect right to enact such legislation. Before you can adopt any such enactments you have to go to the United States and ask their leave. Otherwise you would be violating the conditions of the pact. But they say the pact was made for the very purpose of getting free access, and we do not wish to accede to your request. There is the difference; how is it to be settled? $600,000,000 of trade is involved, and the government say: There is enough for our time; we will tell the Conservation Commission that we are under a contract with the United States and that we cannot now carry out its recommendations. That is a sample of what is liable to happen in every department. The fish foods of this country are a most important article of our consumption now, and if conserved will be a most important article of our consumption for all generations. We therefore establish our close season, and prohibit export. We do that now with game and fish, and may have to extend that policy to other things. That is our national right if our national interests require it; but we can only do that fully and properly when we keep our full rights to legislate unimpaired.

Mr. FOSTER.

I venture, now, with some timidity and in all humility to approach this question from a national standpoint. I make no apology for doing it. The economic side of this question is important, but no good citizen will satisfy himself by keeping his mind fixed simply on the economic side, if he believes that there is in the thing itself a peril to the nation and his country. Unless you admit that, you deny that countries can exist, you deny that there is anything like patriotism, you deny the right of the people to keep up their own national home for themselves and make sacrifices for that object. If a foreign army threatened us on the border every Canadian would rise and take up arms to defend his country, but have we no duty, no service to perform in defending our country in times of peace? Battalions of armed men are not the greatest menace to the country. Oft times the peaceful warfare of trade and pact is more fatal than open arms. You cannot get away from the proposition that there comes a time in the examination of this subject, when you have to look at the national as well as the economic side. If it be for the better preservation and maintenance of your national ideas and your national life, well and good. But what is the American view? My hon. friend the Finance Minister appealed to history. I am also going to appeal to history. What has been the American view since the American republic came into existence with reference to this British North American country? At the first they tried to persuade this country by every art to rebel against the mother country and join in the revolution and become a part of the United States. They failed in that. They next sent their armed detachments to conquer us into submission and annex us forcibly. In that also they failed. Afterwards they took a long, tedious and annoying course of trade restrictions, prohibitions and harassment of our fishery grounds, the negation of our fishery rights, the assumption of privileges which they did not possess under the treaty, and for long years they worried and harassed us on these lines. For what purpose? For the avowed purpose of tiring us out and inducing us to throw in our destinies with them. Is there any doubt about that? But they found a people, sturdy, independent and strong, who did not urge unreasonable pretensions, but at the same time did not give away its well-known rights, and I make this assertion, that to-day the United States have a respect for us, a hundred times greater, than they would have had if, like poltroons, we had given way to their influence and menaces. Consequently there is absolutely the best of friendly feeling between us and our neighbours. It is of no use for hon. gentlemen opposite conjuring up the exist-

ence of some dangerous feeling between us and the United States, which it requires sacrifices on our part to assuage. There is nothing of the kind. The American people respect and admire us, and they do so for one thing. They respect and admire us because we have clung to our rights, our nationality and our own standards. Well, after this long course, Senator Sherman, speaking in 1888 in the United States Senate, pointed out to his countrymen a change of method. He said:

Now, Mr. President, taking a broader view of the question, I submit if the time has not come when the people of the United States and Canada should take a broader view of their relations to each other than has heretofore seemed practicable.

Since the conquest of Canada by Great Britain in 1763, she has been a continuous warning that we cannot be at peace with each other except by political as well as commercial union. Canada should have followed the fortunes of the colonies in the American revolution. The way to union with Canada is not by hostile legislation, not by acts of retaliation, but by friendly overtures. This union is one of events that must inevitably come in the future. The true policy of this government then is to tender freedom in trade and intercourse, and to make this tender in such a friendly way that it shall be an overture to the people of Canada to become a part of this nation.

That was the advice given by a far-seeing man, and a senator of the United States. Years go by, and in 1903 the Chamberlain idea was to the fore, and we find a representative New York paper, the 'Post,' in combating the Chamberlain idea, saying this:

Instead of any such mad course as retaliation, the path really open to us is one that will quietly, peaceably and forcibly defeat the whole project of discrimination against our goods. Canadian reciprocity is, in our judgment, the only road of safety and profit now open to us.

Mr. Blaine was at that time trying to make a treaty with Newfoundland.

The Boston 'Herald' says:

The underlying motive of Blaine's Newfoundland treaty was to draw the British colonies into the net of annexation.

And the Springfield 'Republican'. a very representative American paper said:

There need not be any hesitation in saying that the Newfoundland treaty should be regarded as a stepping-stone to a similar one with all Canada, and that the great end in view which should appeal to any American statesman with imagination and foresight is the ultimate peaceful combination of Canada's destiny with our own.

That is explict. But the objective is still there, just as strongly as it was in 1775, or in 1812, or in all the years since then. But here was a change of methods suggested. And now we come to President Taft's message to Congress. He carries out the very same idea:

They are coming to the parting of the ways.

Who? Canada. What ways? One the broad highway that we began to construct in 1867 running transversely across this continent with its east-and-west lines and ending, for our market, in the grand old mother country, the emporium of the markets of the world. And what is the other way? It is the way brushed out and trailed by Messrs. Paterson and Fielding, leading off this old and well-beaten highway down amongst unknown obscurities and hazards, but ending in the United States of America. These are the two ways; and we are at the parting of the ways, says President Taft, and something must be done.

They must soon decide whether they are to regard themselves as isolated permanently from our markets by a perpetual wall or whether we are to be commercial friends.

Is that a threat? If we are to think of a perpetual wall, who put up the wall?—42 per cent high on their side while our neighbourly wall was only 26 per cent; a wall that gave us a paltry $33,000,000 of free entry into the United States, while we gave $104,000,000 of free entry into Canada for the goods of that country. Is it a threat that, while we are looking nationwards, forces us to a path looking United States-ward? Does it mean?—Come down this path at the peril of isolation and commercial war between your country and ours.

Should we not now, therefore, before their policy is too crystallized and too fixed for change, meet them in a spirit of real concession, facilitate commerce between the two countries and thus increase the natural resources available to our people.

President Taft is, I believe, a very far-seeing man. He knew the history of these men—knew it well. He knew that in the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) he was dealing with a man who, not so many years ago, declared that the maritime provinces could not live and endure as part of this Canadian confederation; who headed a campaign in his own province to take Nova Scotia, and, if possible, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island along with Nova Scotia, out of this union. President Taft knew the Finance Minister's history and felt that there was reasonable ground for working upon a man with such a record. He knew that the Finance Minister, in 1891, pledged his party to, and fought tooth and nail for, commercial union with the United States as against closer trade relations with Great Britain; and he thought he had good

hopes when working upon a man with such a history. And the Finance Minister had with him the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) behind whom was the towering figure of the old knight of Ontario, Sir Richard Cartwright, who had declared in the halls of Boston that Boston, New York and Portland ought to be the metropoli of the maritime provinces, that nature had so made it and the decrees of nature ought to be carried out; who declared that there was no market in the world which would compensate us for failure to acquire free access to the United States of America; and who, when asked the question: Would you go into a scheme like that and discriminate against the mother country? Answered promptly: Yes I would discriminate. And Mr. Taft had some very fair idea that he could work upon a government which had members such as these. Then he had the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). President Taft knows the right hon. gentleman's history from A to Z. It has been tortuous work following it, but President Taft is a very active minded man, and he has good men to help him. I have not the least doubt that there is not a political path that the right hon. gentleman has trod, in which he has turned and twisted, but President Taft has followed his course, either himself or through some of his advisers. And he knew well that the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier stood in the market-place of Boston and declared that trade should not follow sentiment, that the time would come when Canada's interest would differ from the interest of the mother country, and when that time came he would look to Canada's interest; that the right hon. gentleman had declared that the interest of Canada lay with the United States rather than with Great Britain. President Taft knew all that. So, knowing the history of these men, knowing that they were guided by no principle save political opportunism President Taft thought that this thing should be clamped now before the 'policy became too crystallized' as it might very well be if these gentlemen happened to go out of office and another government came in. Can there be anything more clear than President Taft's opinion? He did not say: You have to come into this country, and this is the first step. But he said what was equivalent to it, absolutely equivalent to it; and it is in the lines I quoted.

But I not only take President Taft then, I take President Taft since. He is now stumping the United States in favour of reciprocity, and as he goes he grows a little more and a little more decided. At Columbus, Ohio, he declared:

> The greatest reason for adopting this agreement is the fact that it is going to unite two countries with kindred people and lying together across a wide continent, in a commercial and social union to the great advantage of both.

What says Mr. Hill, the railway magnate?

> I want to say to you that we cannot afford to let this opportunity pass. It is said that 'opportunity calls once at every man's door,' but that if you leave the door open it will come again. Let me say to you that the conditions in the British Empire are such that if we let it pass it will never come again. If we neglect the opportunity that is now manifesting itself, if that is refused, it is almost a certainty that imperial federation will follow, and if it does, where is your independence, where is your market?

What says Senator Beveridge? What says Governor Foss? What say the newspapers from one end of the country to the other? What is the allusion, what is the call to the United States for viewing this question, not simply from the low business standpoint, but from far-sighted reasons of statesmanship and National Policy? What does it mean? It means that the old objective is there, it means that the methods have changed, they propose to have the Trojan horse with its big gifts introduced into the fortress. Sir, 'I fear the Greeks when they are bearing gifts.'

I could go on quoting from one and another ; these are but samples of what I could quote, and therefore, are indicative of the general trend in the United States. All their methods of the past we have withstood and met, and we are on terms of absolute good friendship with the United States. I want to repeat what I said before, that to-day they have more respect for us in Canada, and more admiration for our enterprise and our work, than at any other period in the history of these two countries ; and we on this side have just as high an appreciation of them as they on their side have of us. There is absolutely to-day no cause of dissatisfaction or ill will between us and the United States. But it does not follow that, because you are friendly with your neighbour and are doing each other good turns, you should give him half or three-quarters of your house and install him in it. Neither does it follow that because we want to be on good terms with the United States we are to hand over the rich possessions we have hewn out and made for ourselves, and go into a dangerous partnership with them. Nor does it agree with our policy, our instincts and our ideals. It was the conquest of Canada aimed at in 1775 ; it was the conquest of Canada aimed at in the years around 1812, and since ; it was the conquest of Canada and its incorporation with the United States aimed at by the methods I have spoken of in respect to our trade and fisheries ; and the dominant spirit in the United States that is pushing recipro-

city through to a successful enactment today is not economic, it is political. It is still the conquest of Canada. But it is conquest of Canada by peaceful means and large gifts, to bring about the time when, from the frozen north to the Mexican gulf, there shall be but one power predominant, and that the United States of America, and when British and European influence shall be banished forever from this North American continent.

This being the ideal of the United States let me in conclusion—and I know you will all breathe a sigh of relief, and myself as sincerely as my hon. friends opposite—let me say a few words on the national aspect of this question, and just now, by the national aspect, I mean the Canadian aspect. I yield to none in my devotion to the British flag and empire ; but it is not necessary, in order to view the national interest properly in connection with this subject, to go outside the bounds of Canada itself, our own country, our own nation within the empire. Patriotism is to the soul and conscience of a nation what religion is to the soul and conscience of the man. Religion soothes the soul, gives it peace, assures security, it strengthens the conscience, and rounds out the man for better and nobler work. Patriotism does the same for a country. It purifies the soul of a nation, it reinforces the conscience of the nation. And I tell you, Sir, that a nation has a soul and has a conscience ; and when the soul is not aflame with high purpose, and that conscience not reinforced and righteous, healthy patriotism cannot exist within it, and the nation is robbed of one of its strongest bulwarks. So I make no excuse in appealing to the patriotic feeling of Canada in a discussion of this subject, limiting it just for the present to our own Dominion of Canada. Fifty years ago we began pursuing the quest of reciprocity, at first a reality, later a phantom. In 1891, and in 1897 we abandoned the quest, the Liberal-Conservative party first, the Liberal party afterwards; and from 1891 and 1897 the quest was absolutely abandoned in this country from one end of it to the other. If we had abandoned the quest of reciprocity 25 years before we did, we would have been 25 years further advanced on the road of progress. Uncertain and doubtful, now hoping and now despairing, with a narrow horizon, capital and enterprise alike timid, what could we do in the way of nation building and in the way of settled endeavour and enterprise? No fixed purpose, no ideal, and a country that has no fixed political purpose and no fixed political ideal, has but a wobbling and uncertain gait, it cannot make progress.

Then, Sir, we suffered what seemed a stroke of adversity, but what, under God's Providence, was the best kick that Canada ever had administered, that was the abrogation of the treaty of 1854 in 1866. Then our ideal began slowly to evolve, then gradually a purpose was developed, then a policy was established of Canadian nationality within the empire. That was our ideal, Canadian resources for Canadian developments, Canadian and British capital for Canadian industry, Canadian workmen for Canadian production and Canadian routes for Canadian trade. That sums up the economic and political ideal of Canada as it gradually evolved itself from the doubt and uncertainty of 1866 and 1869, and first formulated itself and next found its place in the hearts and affections of the people. Then, Sir, new blood pulsed in our veins, new hopes fired our hearts, new horizons lifted and widened, new visions came to us in the night watches. We faced geography and distance and fought them to a standstill. We shamed the croaker and the pessimist and the coward into silence, and then recreated him into a good citizen at the glowing fires of optimism and of hope. The plains were belted with steel, the mountained tamed and tunnelled, our national arteries were well filled with the rich blood of commerce, our industries grew, our workmen multiplied, our villages became towns and our towns became cities with astonishing rapidity. Across the seas, we clasped hands with our sister nations within the empire, and surrounded with a cordon of love and defence the old empire that gave birth to us all.

And with all this we have made great material progress. Can any one doubt it? In all this struggle and toil, when was the hand of the United States extended to us with helpful aid? Not in one single case. This land is ours, we have made it, we and our fathers—please God we will keep it for our children and our children's children, to the remotest generation. We have not wrought so in order to bestow a great gift upon a rich nation, we have wrought to build ourselves a national home with a fireside and altars for ourselves and for those who come after us in this great far-flung country that God has given to us for our own.

This proposal cuts square across that national ideal, challenges it at every point, will endanger it undoubtedly, may destroy it entirely. Should we not think before we enter into it? Ninety-three millions to the south of us mean it in the way of absorption and hegemony and mean it in no other way, hence these gifts. This proposal cuts our country into sections and at every section bleeds the life blood from it. The well-filled arteries of interprovincial trade will be drained until the whole system grows aenemic and flabby. Do not treat it lightly. The sustained pressure of

ninety-three millions to eight millions, the far-reaching effect of business affiliation, the close proximity and constant efflux and influx, the seductions of commercialism, the constant intercourse of business, social and official life, will inevitably weaken the ties of empire and wean the thoughts of our newer generations, if not of ourselves, towards the predominant power, and create new attachments, until like Samson we would arise and would shake ourselves and find that our strength is gone.

I utter the most solemn words I have ever uttered in my life, and I believe them to the very bottom of my heart, that there is danger, and deep danger ahead. This path entered upon leads us away from home to a strange country. I pray, Sir, that the full meaning of this first step may sink into the hearts of members of parliament and into the hearts of the people of this country until there shall burst forth a protest of such strength that the steps contemplated will be recalled to the old paths, leading east and west, in and out amongst our own people, converging on the great metropolis of the mother land, and which we may follow without uncertainty and without menace to our national existence.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 115) to incorporate the Guardian Accident and Guarantee Company.—Mr. Doherty.

RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

The House resumed in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt). Mr. Chairman, the remarks that I shall address to the House on the resolution before us for consideration will be as brief as I can make them consistent with what I conceive to be the very great importance of the question. The House listened with very great patience for some two hours and a half this afternoon, and for an hour or so last week to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) discanting, according to his viewpoint, on what he conceived to be the great disadvantages of Canada entering into reciprocal trade relations with the United States. It would appear to me, Sir, that the position taken by the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on this question is possibly the most astounding ever taken by a public man in Canada since confederation, when a question of trade and commerce was before the people for their consideration. The whole history of this reciprocity question must be familiar to every member of this House. One of the strong points that the hon. member (Mr. Foster) endeavoured to make against this agreement was the fact that the government undertook to negotiate it, as he said, without a mandate from the people. Why, Sir, as far back as I can remember—and history tells me the question was a live one in the minds of Canadians long before that—the question of better trade relations with the great republic of the south occupied the attention of all our leading public men. We have only to turn to the history of bygone days, the days when Sir John A. Macdonald formed his administration in 1879, and propounded his famous National Policy, on which he was elected to lead the government of this country, to find that in the tariff provisions of that very policy there was incorporated a statutory enactment which provided for practically the same reciprocal trade relations between the United States and Canada as that announced to the House a few days ago by the Minister of Finance. It is not news to any member of this House, although it may be to some of our newer citizens, that the very government that established the National Policy, a policy of protection, incorporated in it a provision for reciprocal trade between Canada and the United States. Now, strange to say, that provision deals with practically the very same articles as are dealt with in the measure now submitted to us and for the benefit of those who may not be familiar with it I shall place on 'Hansard' a list of the articles dealt with in that section of the Tariff Act of 1879. The clause reads:

> Any or all of the following articles, that is to say: animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables, including potatoes and other roots, plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grains, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oat meal and flour meal of any other grain, butter, tallow, meats, fresh salt or smoked, and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada.

As I read this list I am borne out in the statement that it covers to a very large extent the list of articles that are placed on the free list in the proposed trade agreement now before parliament for its

ratification. I might just mention en passant, what I am sure will be very good news to the people of this country who are interested in seeing this trade agreement rushed to a speedy conclusion, that word has come over the telegraph wire that the first step has been taken by the Congress of the United States towards ratification as the Bill has to-day passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. LENNOX. That was dead sure.

Mr. NEELY. That is the telegraphic report, and I assume it is reliable. Now, Sir, to show that better trade relations with the United States has been the traditional policy of both great political parties in this country since confederation, at least until 1897, I have only to quote from the manifesto issued by Sir John A. Macdonald to the electors prior to the general elections in 1891. Here is his statement of the position that he and his government took in reference to this question:

> We said to the Americans: We are perfectly willing to trade with you on equal terms; we are desirous of having a fair reciprocity treaty; but we will not consent to open our markets to you while yours remain closed to us.

That, Sir, was the position taken by Sir John A. Macdonald, in the year 1891, and we know, as a matter of fact, that following that election, his government sent representatives to Washington in order, if possible, to negotiate a reciprocity treaty. Their efforts were unsuccessful, for what reason, we at this time are not prepared to state. Suffice it to say that it would appear that from the time of the confederation of the provinces of Canada into a Dominion, the people of the United States had determined to follow a fiscal policy of their own, a policy of protection, and because of that fact, the various advances made by the delegates of different Canadian governments, were not favourably received by the government of the United States. The Liberal party were equally strong in their belief, that this country would prosper very much better if we had better trade relations with the United States, and, as a result of that conviction, when this government was elected in 1896, one of the first duties that it carried out was to endeavour to put into effect the promises they had made preceding the election to bring about better trade relations with the United States. I regret to say that the efforts of this government were apparently no more successful than the efforts of the government that had preceded them, and the leaders of state affairs in this country were compelled to take the position that in future we would have to look elsewhere for our market. Now, whether wittingly or not, the hon. member for North Toronto, laboured to leave the impression on this House, and to convey it to the country, that the Premier of Canada, and the government of the day, took the position, when their advances to Washington in 1897 were not favourably received, that henceforth there should be nothing done by way of improving conditions of trade between Canada and the United States; in other words, that Canada took the position—to my mind a most absurd and ridiculous position—that even if the United States made offers of reciprocity, they would not be listened to by the public men of this country. So far as I know, no such statement has ever been made by the leader of the government, or by any member of the government. I quite agree with the position taken by the public men of this country, that until the United States came to see for themselves the advisability of better trade relations with Canada, the necessity for some trade agreement, by which at least the natural products of each country might be interchanged for those of the other, the only position in dignity which the leader of this government could take was, that no more pilgrimages should be made to Washington. But my hon. friend from North Toronto, failed to notice the fact—indeed, he gave the opposite impression—that the present trade agreement is not the result of this government going on any pilgrimage to Washington, but is rather the result of the authorities at Washington coming on a pilgrimage to Ottawa. That is the essential feature of the present situation. In that respect Canada has been true to the position she took some years ago; and, therefore, the statement of the hon. member for North Toronto that this government had no mandate from the people of Canada to enter into these negotiations and to bring them to a successful issue, is the most absurd statement that has probably ever been made in this House or in this country by a public man with a knowledge of public affairs, such as has the hon. member for North Toronto. I would like to know if the government of a country have not always a mandate from the people of the country to provide them with better markets. It seems to me that is one of the essential duties of government, and no government would be carrying out its functions which did not make every effort at all times to improve our trade relations, not only with a country situated alongside of us, as the United States is, but with every country in the world with which Canada might profitably trade. We are not responsible, Sir, for the fact that Canada is geographically situated where she is. This government is not responsible for the fact that lying all along our southern border, there is a republic which possesses some ninety millions of people; and

it does appear to me to be a most remarkable position for any public man to take; especially a public man of the experience of the hon. member for North Toronto, in dealing with great affairs of state, that it is not possible for Canada to trade profitably with the United States of America. This trade agreement, as I understand it, opens the United States market to the natural products of Canadian farms, Canadian forests, Canadian mines, Canadian fisheries and to all the resources of this great Dominion. It also provides a market for some of the manufactured products of the United States, notably some manufactured food products; and so, as a result of the agreement, Canada, with a population of some eight million people, is to have thrown open to its natural products, a market of some ninety million people, while, on the other hand, as a return for that privilege, the ninety million people are to have thrown open to them a market of some eight million people. It seems to me a remarkable position for any man to take, to say that we shall not profit by this arrangement. I do not say that Canada will profit more largely than the United States. We have not had the fullest opportunity to investigate this subject in its details, but it would certainly appear, from even a casual observation that the provisions of the agreement are provisions that must appeal to the people of Canada, and the United States, as being as fair as it is possible to have them in a trade arrangement of this kind.

In the three or four hours' speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) we heard a great deal about the necessity of conserving our resources. One of the great evils in this trade agreement, he argued, consists in the fact that in some way or other we are not going to conserve those resources; and ever since that subject has been mentioned, I have been puzzling my mind to find out what my hon. friend actually meant. I live in a farming community in the west, and I know that when a farmer harvests his crop and it is ready for the market, he is not content until he has taken it to market and exchanged it for money and turned that money to some good purpose. The same holds true of everything he raises. The object of all his exertions is to bring those products to the highest perfection and when they have reached that maturity to put them on the market as quickly as possible. He does not want to conserve his wheat in his granary, or to keep his live stock to a greater extent than is necessary. Just as soon as any of his products is ready for the market, his ambition is to get it to market as rapidly as possible. That surely holds true of the other natural resources of this country. I do not see of what use are our fisheries, if the fish in them are never caught. I do not see what good the gold or iron is down in the bowels of the earth, if you are going to leave it there. Our forests do not last forever, but trees have been known to grow on the ground where they have grown before. If we cut our timber and sell it to advantage, and if the proper care is taken by the provincial and federal authorities to regulate the cutting I do not see what danger there will be in our having a larger market open to us in the United States for the lumber taken from our woods. This conservation of our natural resources seems to be something that oppresses the brain of my hon. friend, so many times did he refer to it in the four hours' speech he delivered a few hours ago. I am just as much opposed to a wanton waste of our natural resources as any member of this House, but I fail to see how this argument for the conservation of these resources applies in any sense to this trade agreement with the United States. If there is one thing the people of Canada desire, it is freedom to sell their produce in whatever market will give them the largest prices. If there is anything which Canadian citizens consider their heritage, it is that privilege. But under the tariff conditions which have existed in the United States and this country for many years, the consumers of Canada have had neither the opportunity to buy nor the opportunity to sell where they listed. Our own tariff prevents them from buying where they list, and the tariff of the United States prevents them from using the same liberty in selling. This reciprocity agreement, however, will go a long way towards lightening the burdens complained of by the producer of this great country.

I listened with the greatest attention to the speech of the leader of the opposition the other day, and I was particularly anxious to hear what his remarks might be when he came to discuss the economic side of the agreement. But to my very great regret and disappointment, as I am sure it must have been to many other members on both sides, he passed by this feature of the situation—which to my mind is the essential feature, namely, its economic side—with the most casual remarks. He said that there were those who saw in this trade agreement some immediate future advantage. Well, we are thankful for at least that prospect. And I would like to know if this immediate future advantage is not just exactly what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) had in mind when they went to Washington to negotiate this arrangement. This very immediate future advantage, to be continued as long as the pact will last between the two

countries, is the strongest argument in its favour.

Possibly there are some people too optimistic, but on the other hand I am confident that those who are prophesying ruin to any industries as the result of this trade agreement, are guilty of excess in the opposite direction. There may be some who are too optimistic; but my own staunch conviction is that if this trade agreement be carried through it will open up a new era of prosperity in the history of both countries such as neither has ever experienced before. There is no value in having a fertile soil, there is no value in having the very richest iron ore or other minerals, there is no value in having our waters teeming with fish, if we have no markets for the products of our soil and mines and fisheries, after we have exploited them. The great drawback in the past to the development and prosperity of Canada was the difficulty of finding profitable markets. As a result of the British preference established by this government, we have found markets across the sea for much of our products. But is it any evidence of disloyalty on the part of a member of this government, a member of this House, or a citizen of this country, to say: We are doing a large business with the mother country, but if we look to the south we may obtain markets that are more easily accessible than the markets of the old world?

I wish to speak of some of the different items mentioned in this trade agreement, not dealing exhaustively with any individual item, to show wherein, as I believe, this trade agreement will be beneficial to the producers of Canada. We in the prairie provinces are more largely interested in the production of wheat than in the production of any other single article. Wheat is the great staple article of the western plains, and I believe will continue so to be for many years to come. We are told that many evils are going to befall our grain trade as a result of this reciprocity agreement should it go into effect. As to increase in price, we are told that there cannot be such a thing because the prices of our wheat are governed by the prices in Liverpool and other world markets. There is no doubt that, so far as the better grades of western wheat are concerned, Liverpool prices govern. But I am sure that any man who is familiar with farming in the west is aware of the fact that a great deal of the grain in the west, in certain seasons, does not classify in the grades that are listed for export. You may have a very fine sample of wheat, which, in milling quality, will be equal to No. 2 or even No. 1, yet there may be some falling off in shade or something of that kind which makes it impossible to place that wheat in any particular grade. As a result, we have what we call a rejected grade—wheat that is practically as good as that exported, but, because it is not listed in the classified grades, is not suitable for export. Wheat of these rejected grades is manufactured by the millers of western Canada, and of Ontario. Here has been one of the great sources of loss to the western grain producer. These rejected grades have not been exported to the United States because of the duty, and so the producer has been compelled to take for this wheat whatever price the western or the Ontario miller wishes to give. I conceive that, in this connection, there will be one very great advantage to the producer of wheat in western Canada; in fact that, as a result of this agreement coming into force, a sample market will be established in Winnipeg, and probably in other leading points in the west, and buyers will come from Minneapolis and St. Paul, and will buy this grain on sample, and the miller of western Canada and Ontario will be compelled to compete with the United States millers in the purchase of this product, and so the producer will get the actual value of his wheat. I am convinced that some of the strong objections taken by certain representative millers of this country against the trade agreement are probably founded on this very situation in the grain trade.

I am told by those who ought to know that, so far as the cattle trade of Alberta is concerned, this trade agreement is going to be of the very greatest possible value. As we know, the agriculturists of Alberta who have an organization known as the United Farmers of Alberta, have been urging upon the government the necessity of establishing some system of cold storage in the province for the benefit of the meat trade. I have here a copy of the Grain Growers' Guide,' the official organ of the Grain Growers' Association of western Canada, and in this journal appears an interview with Mr. James Bower, president of the United Farmers of Alberta, on the question of the effect of this reciprocity agreement on the cattle trade of Alberta. Mr. Bower says:

> The placing of cattle on the free list will revolutionize the trade in our province. If we could get cattle free into the Chicago market we will be more than satisfied with the result of the negotiations. It will practically mean a solution of the rate question in Canada, for it will force down the freight rates which now exist and which we have been endeavouring to reduce for so many years.

Two features are there spoken of. One is the better price the stock raiser is going to get for his cattle from the Chicago market, and the second is the beneficial effect upon freight rates that the President of the United Farmers of Alberta sees in this reciprocity agreement. Our Canadian railways will be brought more or less into com-

petition with the railroads of the United States and will be compelled to govern themselves accordingly in regard to freight rates.

Now, these are two of the staple and important items of the western prairies that are dealt with in this agreement. I might speak also of oats and barley. As hon. members know, oats are very largely produced on our western plains. Barley is not produced to any extent for the simple reason that the price in Canada does not warrant the farmer in growing barley. I am told that to-day barley sells in Toronto at 60 cents a bushel while across the line in Buffalo it sells at 90 cents, the difference being practically the duty into the United States. We have not the extensive requirement in this country for barley that they have across the line. They need our barley, and, with this duty off, the farmers of Ontario as well as the farmers of the west will be able to go into barley growing and will make very considerable profits from this feature of their farming operations.

I am willing to discuss this matter in this practical way with any one who will discuss it with me. Take these items all down the list such as flax, potatoes, hay, dairy products and so on, and I think we shall find that putting these things on the free list of the United States will be a great benefit to the farming class of this great country. And I quite agree with the statement made by my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) when in speaking on another subject, he took the position that the agricultural classes are, after all, the foundation of our prosperity, because Canada is primarily, an agricultural country.

We are told that certain features of this agreement will work great harm to certain other interests in this country, interests that, I am sure, we are all anxious should not be injured.

In the first place, I will remark that so far as the reduction of the duties on manufactured products is concerned, particularly agricultural implements, if I were to voice my own personal views, I would have been glad to see a somewhat greater reduction in the duty than is proposed in this trade arrangement. But I have this also to say, that the farmers of Canada are reasonable men, they do not expect revolutions in a day, and I am sure they will be satisfied with the fact that they are being provided with free markets for their produce; and while the reduction on agricultural implements is not as great as probably many of the western grain growers have expected, yet they are sufficiently material to afford satisfaction to those who do not hold too radical views on this point. I should not be at all surprised, in view of the remarks that were addressed to this House some days ago by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), and which were spoken of in complimentary terms by the leader of the opposition in discussing this trade agreement a day or two ago, I say I should not be surprised if the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, and those who support him in the resolution he brought before the House the other day, and that still stands on the Order paper, do not express some dissent at the small reduction that has been made on farm implements. Well, Sir, this great Conservative party has always been a conundrum to me, in so far as its trade policy is concerned. We know that in the eastern provinces, where the manufacturing interests are strongest, the policy of protection is the only thing that is ever breathed by the apostles of the Conservative party. But when we get west of Lake Superior, where we find a different sentiment among the grain growers, the Conservative newspapers and the Conservative public men, are very generally in favour of a low tariff. The Winnipeg 'Telegram,' the leading Conservative organ west of Lake Superior, has been giving lectures for some twelve months back on the necessity of the government listening to the complaints of the farmers, and reducing the duty on agricultural implements. Now, I am glad to see this change of heart on the part of at least a small section of our friends opposite, and the only thing I regret is, that the conversion is not thorough and complete enough. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie must be an admirable political chef when he is able to serve up sufficiently savoury proposals to the electorate of his constituency, to secure their consent to represent them in this House. But, Sir, there is in this dish that he furnished to this House, some days ago, a seasoning that I do not think will be at all palatable to the electorate of Portage la Prairie, or indeed to the electors of any other constituency west of Lake Superior. In that resolution which calls for a substantial reduction of the tariff on agricultural implements, my hon. friend asks the government to admit that a ten per cent reduction will be in just accord with the principle of a protective tariff. Now if my hon. friend can explain to the people of western Canada that a reduction on agricultural implements, or anything else, is in just accord with a protective tariff, he will perform a feat of mental gymnastics that is beyond my comprehension.

Why did my hon. friend select this particular item of agricultural implements? Is it not true that practically everything the farmer wears or uses in his family, their shoes, their clothing, their furniture,

their kitchen utensils, are all subject to taxation, if they are imported from foreign countries, and by a taxation I mean a protective tariff. Yet my hon. friend is very careful to single out agricultural implements, he goes even farther than that, and he narrows his view to mowers and binders. Why does he do that ? I wonder if my hon. friend possessed the information I possess, when he brought that motion before the House, that there is a certain plough manufacturer in the province of Ontario who, for the last few years has been shipping his manufactured product to certain points in the United States for sale among his American customers. Yet my hon. friend has nothing to say about ploughs. I would like to say to my hon. friend, that while I admire the distance he has gone on this question I regret that he did not see his way clear to go much farther ; I regret that he has to take his steps forward in such a halting and limping manner. The people of the west are not to be deceived on this question. They are not protectionists. My hon. friend cannot make protection acceptable to them in any way, shape or form in which he presents it to them. While, as I said, he must have some abilities as a political chef, because the dish he served to his constituents when he appealed to them for support in the election of 1908 was evidently acceptable to them, I very much fear that the proposition he places before them in this resolution will not meet with hearty support.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, and though a discussion of the subject referred to in the resolution on the Order Paper by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, on a cognate subject is clearly in order, I do not think he need direct the attention of the House to the resolution itself.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, I have no wish at all to depart from the subject before us. I am dealing with one particular item of the agreement which refers to the reduction of the duties on farm implements, and I was simply saying that I should suppose my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie would be hardly satisfied with the small reduction that is being made along those lines. Now, Sir, there is a story in the good old Book about a certain younger son who sought to obtain his blind father's blessing by disguising himself so that he resembled his elder brother. But the old blind patriarch was not altogether deceived, for he said, as the son attempted to obtain his blessing: The hands are the hands of Esau but the voice is the voice of Jacob. The position taken by a great many of our western friends reminds me very much of that story from ancient Bible history. They go to the people seeking to obtain their blessing by offering to them a greater tariff reduction on farm implements, but alas, Sir, the voice is the voice of Jacob because they are protectionists and they cannot get away from it. While I am quite agreed that, in reference to the features of this argument as bearing on manufactured articles, probably many of our western farmers will not be wholly content nevertheless it is an old adage and a true one that half a loaf is very much better than no bread.

We have heard a great deal from the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as to the great damage that this agreement is going to do to the transportation systems of this country running east and west. I am sure that our sympathies go out very strongly to the transportation systems of this country, especially to the Canadian Pacific railway, because it is such a weak, delicate institution that it is entitled to a lot of sympathy. But there are those people in this country, who they are I do not know, who appeal to the public in a very striking way sometimes, and one of these appeals we find distributed very assiduously through the country, published and printed in the Montreal 'Star', of Saturday, February 4, and copied into many other papers of this country. It is published on the front page of the 'Star.' I am quite sure, as some of my hon. friends suggest, that it is a paid advertisement, nothing more or less. I would like to know who are the parties interested in publishing such an hysterical appeal to the people of Canada, as this appeal to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the one man who can save Canada. There is, as some of my friends suggest, a very important admission in that. We on this side of the House are quite agreed that Sir Wilfrid Laurier is the one man who can save Canada. Our hon. friends admit it, they are talking all the time about the great strides forward in Canada's progress in the last few years. What has done it? Surely it has not been the carrying into effect of any policy which they bequeathed to this government, for in the declining years of the late administration it is a well known fact that our trade and commerce was falling off as rapidly as it possibly could, and yet, ever since the advent of this administration, Canada's trade has been increasing by leaps and bounds. We find transportation systems extending east and west all over the country where formerly they did not exist. We find our prairies populated by many who to-day are fairly prosperous people, not all of them perhaps, but many of them. To whom, Sir, shall we give the credit? Our hon. friends say: Give it to Providence. Well, Providence does not build railways, Providence does not conduct

an immigration policy, at least not the kind that gets the people from some other country to ours. These are matters to be dealt with by a progressive administration, and in passing I want to give credit to this government, the credit which to them is due for having instigated an immigration policy on their advent to power that is quite as progressive, as, if not more progressive than that adopted by any other country under similar conditions in the history of the world. We are getting the people almost as rapidly as we can assimilate them. In this connection let me say that I believe farming in the west will become so much more advantageous to the farmer, so much more profitable, that in the next four or five years we will see such an influx of immigration from the United States of America that not only will our Canadian railways running east and west have all the business they can handle, but they will be compelled to have the assistance of the Jim Hill roads to the south to carry some of the surplus products in that direction. We hear talk going around that if this thing goes through we will not need to deepen the Welland canal or to build the Georgian bay canal, and that the Hudson Bay railroad will be money absolutely wasted. If my faith in the results of this agreement is anywhere near the mark, not only will we need the Hudson Bay railway and the deepening of the Welland canal and the building of the Georgian Bay canal, but it will not be many years before we will need another transcontinental railway running from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I might mention in passing, one very remarkable thing about these prophecies of despair that we find in this appeal that has been sent broadcast throughout this country : that while on the front page of the 'Star' there is pictured for our consideration the blue ruin that will result to the transportation system of Canada if this trade agreement goes through, on the back of the very same sheet at the head of the stock department in large bold type you will find the querry: Will the Canadian Pacific railway go to $300? That would not appear to indicate any very serious loss of faith in the transportation systems of the country on the part of the financial interests who are behind these transportation companies, when even after this trade agreement has been announced, after it is fully expected it will pass this House and the legislative bodies of the United States, these financial interests are still willing to stand behind these transportation schemes. If there is one thing in connection with our transportation companies in which this agreement will work more beneficially to the people of Canada it will be to my mind in the competition that will be brought about with the railways of the United States and in the consequent reduction of the rates for which the people throughout Canada are clamouring.

I am sure that my hon. friend from South York will cheerily hail with acclaim this reciprocity agreement, being convinced, as everybody must be convinced, that it will tend very largely to lower freight rates in western Canada and bring about that condition that he has pleaded so often for on the floor of this parliament. Sir, this reciprocity agreement will not change the transportation routes of this country from east to west to north and south, but it will multiply the routes by which the products of Canada will be carried east and west and north and south to the markets of the world. The feature of the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Foster) that most pleased me was the modesty he showed in waving the old flag. I expected that the hon. gentleman would have given us quite an exhibition in this line because we all know of his ability in that direction, and I was more or less disappointed that he refrained. He did, however, refer to the possible danger to imperial connection if this trade arrangement went through, but that question I shall not discuss at any length because on the face of it it is so entirely absurd that it seems to me the intelligent citizens of Canada will take no stock in it. It does not appear that the people across the water are worrying about it, and I have here a short quotation from the London ' Spectator,' one of the leading Unionist weeklies of Great Britain which says :

> We do not wonder that the agreement has been received in a noticeably lukewarm spirit by tariff reformers in Great Britain. Great Britain obviously cannot give a preference to Canadian corn if the American and Canadian markets are thrown into one. We should, of course, have no regrets on this subject ourselves, for we believe that the best policy for Canada is to trade where trade is easiest. Only about three and a-half per cent of British exports go to Canada. It is only those who accept the fallacy that trade is dependent on political relations who urge the policy of linking up the empire by artificial bonds. Our great trade with Germany proves that commerce is independent of political intimacy. If Canada gradually approaches something like free trade with the United States all round, so much the better.

When such a view is held across the water, I do not think that we in Canada need worry much. My hon. friend from North Toronto has found great fault with this agreement because, as he says, it interferes with the British preference, and he expressed his amazement that this government dared to carry through the negotiations without a mandate from the people. Well, Sir, it has always been a matter of very great surprise to me that the hon.

member (Mr. Foster) could ever muster courage to discuss on the floor of this House any injury to the British preference because it is a matter of record that the hon. gentleman has always been opposed to Canada giving a preference to British manufactured goods. In 1892 when the hon. gentleman and his friends occupied the treasury benches, one of their supporters brought in a resolution to the effect that Canada should give a preference to Great Britain if Great Britain would undertake to change her whole fiscal policy and give a preference to the products of Canada in the British market. That was the kind of preference that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) advocated when he was in power, and the Liberals then in opposition moved an amendment which introduced the principle of the British preference such as we have it to-day. Why, Sir, for many years in this country the Conservative party claimed a monopoly of the flag and all the flag waving there was to be done, and tried to make believe on every possible public occasion that they possessed all the loyalty that was possessed by all the political parties in this country, yet when it came to the practical question of establishing a preference for British manufactured goods coming into Canada, these loyal gentlemen took a position of absolute opposition to it unless Great Britain would agree to give in return a preference in her markets for the products of Canada. I say to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster)—and I am sorry he is not in his place that I might say it to him directly —I say to him that the people of this country have fairly good memories, and it would appear to me to be first-class politics if nothing else, if the hon. member for North Toronto said just as little about the British preference as he can possibly get along with. As was truly said by the Minister of Finance the other day, the people of Canada feel that the British preference is perfectly safe in the hands of the men who created it. I have expressed some sentiments which possibly the manufacturing industries in this country are not very much in accord with, and I think I would not be doing justice to myself or to the people I represent, if I did not say a word or two to the manufacturers of Canada. That deputation which came from the west some time ago to place their views before the government on trade questions did not come here for the purpose of injuring the manufacturers of the east. We realize that in a young country like Canada when these industries are first established probably it is necessary that the state should throw around them to some extent the arm of protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. NEELY. But we have come to the conclusion that that privilege has been exercised to altogether too large an extent, and I would advise my hon. friends opposite not to say 'oh, oh,' until I get through. The farmers of the west have come to the conclusion that their burdens have been too heavy, that the protection has been too great, and that while the Canadian tariff may not be as high as the United States tariff or possibly the tariff of some other countries, all the same our manufacturers have flourished under that tariff, and the farmers think the day has come when there ought to be still greater reduction in the customs duties on manufactured articles. I am free to say that I heartily agree with those views in every particular. I do not think that any man in this House can argue for one moment that the ideal condition of trade is not freedom of trade—freedom to buy and freedom to sell wherever we list. But we have had our difficulties in the past in establishing manufacturing industries in this country. Those difficulties have been largely overcome, and it would appear to me that the manufacturers of eastern Canada might very well concede that the requests of the western Canadian farmers were not by any means premature ; and, while the reductions on these manufactured articles are not as great as we might hope to see, yet we are glad that the government took those views into consideration, and made substantial reductions on many important lines of agricultural implements.

Now, Sir, I have just one word more to say on this question : So far as I have been able to ascertain the sentiment of the people of western Canada since the announcement of this trade agreement was made, has been one of entire approval of the agreement. We are an optimistic people in western Canada. There may be those in eastern Canada who conceive that their interests have been injured by this agreement; and I am free to say that the large deputation that visited this chamber some days ago for the purpose of interviewing the government with respect to the apprehended injury which it would bring to the fruit-growing industry of Canada, had a large measure of my sympathy. But I cannot see for the life of me wherein the contention of that deputation can possibly be true when they come to prove the agreement after it is put into effect. If our soil and climate are adapted to fruit growing, I cannot see why the Canadian fruit-grower cannot compete with the fruit-growers of any other country. So far as the home markets are concerned, they have the benefit of a less cost for transportation. If there be anything in the argument that fruit is grown cheaper in the southern states because of the cheapness of coloured labour, that surely is made up for by the lesser cost of transportation from our

orchards to our home markets; and I am satisfied that the opinion expressed by many fruit-growers in the Niagara peninsula and in other fruit districts of Ontario, that the best thing that has ever happened to our fruit industry has been the placing of fruit on the free list, will eventually prove to be a true prophecy.

There was one other point in the argument advanced by the hon. member for North Toronto which I think is worthy of a moment's consideration. He said that if this agreement went through, it would tend to discourage the investment of foreign capital in Canadian enterprise and Canadian securities. Well, Sir, I wonder what is the consideration that attracts the British or other capitalist when he comes to invest his money. Is it a question of what flag the country flies, or is it a question of what interest he can get on his money? I think that is the answer to the hon. gentleman's argument. To my mind, instead of capital being frightened away from investment in Canadian industries and Canadian securities as a result of this agreement, there will be such rapid development and prosperity in this country that we shall find an ever-increasing stream of population coming from other countries, bringing with it more and more capital for investment in this country and for the development of our national enterprises.

Sir, I have only to say in conclusion that while conscious of my inability to do justice to the many important features of this agreement, I believe that, if it is ratified by this parliament and by the Congress of the United States, as we have every reason to believe it will be, it will prove to be a measure of the greatest possible relief to the producers and the consumers of both these great countries; and the public man who undertakes to stand in the way of an arrangement which opens up the markets to the south of us for the product of our Canadian farms, so that the tillers of the soil in this country will get the opportunity for which they have been longing for years, will assume a most serious responsibility, and one for which sooner or later he will have to give an account at the bar of public opinion.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Chairman, no member of this parliament, either on this side of the House or the other, will venture to express a deliberate opinion on the question now before the House without feeling the heavy responsibility resting on him as a representative of the Canadian people. It is no idle statement to say that these proposals are more revolutionary in character than any put forward by the responsible government of Canada since 1878. They are proposals so radical and so far-reaching as to profoundly disturb the present economic conditions of the country—proposals, which, if carried into effect, will lead us into entirely new paths; which will undoubtedly deeply affect, not only the economic, but the political future of the country, and which, if consummated, will take us no man knows whither. When submitting the proposition to the House the Minister of Finance, in a carefully worded introduction, endeavoured to prove that reciprocity with the United States was the historic policy of the country, long and continually advocated by both political parties. The argument was based on a half-truth, and in many respects was entirely misleading. It is true that in 1878 the government, while inaugurating a new policy for the nation, had some measure of reciprocity still in mind as a desirable aim. But as year after year passed, each witnessing the constructive and successful efforts of the people in their determination to make this a self-sustaining country the desire for closer commercial union with the United States weakened, its necessity vanished. Even the Minister of Finance hardly cared to intimate that the Conservative party was associated with the doctrine later than 1891, and we know what one of the ablest and sanest Liberals of the day thought of these matters at that time. I refer, of course to the Hon. Mr. Blake. But, Sir, since 1891 there have been vast developments and changes in this country along all lines of industrial and national life. There has been no lessening of the desire to live on friendly and self-respecting terms with the people to the south, but there has unquestionably been a strengthening and hardening of the conviction that Canada is amply able to stand alone, that she is able and willing to work out her own salvation, economic and otherwise. In that unalterable conviction she has built up, especially during the past 20 years, a commercial and industrial structure which is the pride of every Canadian to-day. And in no respect is that pride more justified than in the reflection that our industrial life is of that varied character that it ministers to the needs and promotes the happiness of all classes of the nation and especially that it has crowned the efforts of statesmen dead and gone by binding far east and far west by bonds not only of kinship but of mutually successful national commerce.

No one has borne more frequent testimony to this than the supporters of the present government. In season and out of season, the constant refrain of government speakers at every election has been, what? Nothing but the marvellous prosperity of the country, the soundness of her fiscal policy—the unwisdom of ousting a government which was standing by all

the principles which had made this prosperity possible. If these things are true, if the triumphant shoutings of this government for the past 10 years are to be taken seriously how can they ask us to jeopardise everything which they have acclaimed as good, by a change so fundamental as the one they are now asking the House to endorse?

I say the House, because the government, as is their custom, are not pretending to consult the country. Theoretically we are enjoying representative government. In actual practice this is government by a small handful of men who use their power to absolutely change the whole fiscal system of Canada without the smallest reference to the people who placed them in power. The minister speaks of ratification by this parliament as if the act of ratification were an act of the people. No one knows better than he that such is not the case in this and other instances. By our system the government stands or falls by the result of the vote in parliament and not a man in this House but knows full well that under such conditions, whatever may be the private opinions of the individual members, the party will save the government. In what measure, to what degree have the people themselves been consulted on this far-reaching and revolutionary programme? Not a man on this side of the House or the other, not a business interest in the country had the faintest idea of the sweeping character of the proposed changes. Vague talk of reciprocity there may have been, but so vague that the country could only discuss it in equally vague terms. Even the minister himself couldn't recall what protests or suggestions had been made. Sir, there is something inherently and radically wrong in the working out of our constitution theories when it is possible for a small group of men to bind the country hand and foot to so gigantic a proposition as this without the opportunity to anybody of saying yea or nay or of offering a single word of protest or advice on a question of such transcendent importance to the whole of the Canadian people. The Minister of Finance expressed a pious hope that we would all be satisfied with the results of his work and that of his colleague, the Minister of Customs. Let me quote his words page 2495 'Hansard':

> I am persuaded, and my colleagues are persuaded, that those who have formed a hasty judgment against reciprocity and against the reciprocity negotiations have not spoken over their own deliberate judgment, and now that the time has come when we are able to disclose the results of our negotiations, we are most hopeful that not only the negotiations themselves will be approved but that the results of these negotiations will be approved not only by the country at large but by a great number of gentlemen who have hitherto taken up a different position.

But how could we form hasty judgments, or any judgment when we were in complete darkness as to the essential facts? By virtue of what right, in the name of what political principle can a government calmly deal a smashing blow at a great national industry, such for instance as that of Canadian horticulture, without giving that industry a chance to speak a word? Mr. Speaker, instead of a pious hope that we should approve their efforts it would have been infinitely fairer and more honest to have in some measure consulted those whom they were about to injure, and to have given them that full measure of consideration which any large section of the Canadian people are entitled to, from the government who, after all, are the sworn servants and not the masters of those whose affairs they are trustees for. It may be retorted that parliament, at any time, as the minister says, is absolutely free to change the arrangement if on reasonable trial it is found to be unfavourable. But all men know the friction, the difficulties, of hasty readjustments, and alterations of matters which have been placed definitely on a new basis, and, although I should have been bitterly opposed to these measures if they had been made binding for a long term of years, conceiving, I think rightly, that the injustice involved would have been still more glaring, yet there is also a grave and peculiar danger arising from the very want of permanence in the whole arrangement. It is a policy eminently calculated to create a divided Canada instead of making for the greater growth of unity. It will bring not peace, but a sword. What will happen after a year's trial? It is not unreasonable to believe that some alteration will be urged by certain powerful interests in the United States. Such alterations may also be in the interest of some one section of the Canadian people. The powerful forces exerted by self interest on that side of the line, reinforced by sectional interests on this, will make the appeal irresistible. For years we have struggled, not without some measure of success, to make a united Canada. It is the frequent boast of the Prime Minister that this lofty ideal was the cherished object of his public life. No policy could be devised so likely to frustrate that ideal. East and west, and central Canada, gradually drawn together by increasing ties of sentiment and commerce, will find those ties rudely sundered; sundered not only by self interest, but by the wedge driven in by great vested interests entrenched in power on the other side of the international line. It is small wonder that daily throughout Canada her citizens are voicing their

protests against the policy to which this government has pledged itself.

There is another great aspect of this question besides the purely Canadian one to which I have not referred, and which to thoughtful people presents great dangers and gives cause for much anxiety. I allude to the diversion of trade from that great country which is the mother of our free institutions and the source and inspiration of much that is best in our national life. With Great Britain and with other British dominions across the seas it is the earnest wish of the Canadian people to form closer ties, commercial and other. It may be true that Britain has been slow to take what some may conceive to have been the necessary steps, it may be true that Australia has regrettably delayed in her efforts to foster closer commercial ties with this country; but at least this government may well have waited to discuss these high matters at the imperial conference next May. The Prime Minister knew well that such matters would be discussed; knew that it was the earnest desire of all the dominions to strengthen the bonds commercial and national between our scattered peoples. Why could he not, in fairness, wait before plunging the country into a step which makes, not for unity, but for disintegration in the empire. We were doing well enough —the hour had struck for the republic to the south to move in new directions—it had not struck for us. This, too, will be counted heavily against the men who to-day are assuming to guide us into paths when the instructions for so guiding us have not been given to them. Government speakers deride the suggestion that there is any national danger in the drift and final tendency of this new policy. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) in a speech which was characterised by time-worn platitudes and many extraordinary omissions, closed by regretting that there was any opposition to this proposal. He added: 'I regret it for the sake of hon. gentlemen opposite.' Sir, is the minister fatuous enough, misguided enough, to dream that British Columbia members can fall down and worship the golden calf he has set up?

Mining is one of our foremost interests, and the particular section of that enormous industry which might have been helped by free, or easier entry of its ores into the United States is the zinc industry. Did the minister lift a hand to help it in this way? Not he. This is something for the Minister of Mines (Mr. Templeman) to explain to the people of his province. Did the Minister of Customs, after dealing a knock-out blow to the fruit industry of British Columbia expect us not to oppose this measure? Sir, all through his speech there was not a single word which even acknowledged the existence of the fruit industry. Whether he was ashamed to touch it, or afraid to, I cannot say. And then, Sir, the Minister of Customs closes by saying:

> Well, I am sorry to say they appear unwilling to join in this last patriotic movement for the benefit of the people of this country.

We do not join because we do not believe that it makes for the permanent benefit of this country. We do not join because we believe it is not patriotic, that in the last analysis it will be found to undermine and destroy Canadian and imperial patriotism. Thoughtful men on both sides of the water are to-day feeling this. Prominent statesmen in Great Britain have voiced their fears. And, Sir, what did this government immediately do? The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) sent a cablegram to Lord Strathcona, and conveyed the impression that Canada was, or ought to be, a unit in the matter. His precise words were:

> It is evident that some British journalists and public men have received erroneous impressions concerning the reciprocity agreement. Reciprocal trade relations with the United States have been the policy of all parties in Canada for generations.

Sir, I may not very well understand political ethics, but this is a strange message to place before the people of Great Britain. If the end justifies the means, if all is fair in political war, there is nothing to say. But there are many people in Canada who will condemn so singular a use of official power as this. The policy of all parties in Canada for generations!—I need not labour this point. In the powerful speech which has been delivered by the member for North Toronto he has dealt with this whole matter in a way which will make a tremendous appeal to the thinking men of this country. So far from the Conservative party being tied up to this policy we have long cut loose from it. The trend of events in Canada for the past score of years has been in other directions. Years ago Mr. James G. Blaine said 'We will give you reciprocity if you will discriminate against Great Britain in our favour.' We know that when that famous proposition of commercial union was made by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in 1891, he was unable even to retain within his party Mr. Blake who saw then, as he would see now, whither such a step would lead. Let me give the Prime Minister a few extracts from Mr. Blake's letters which are singularly applicable to the present hour. Speaking of commercial union he said:

> No manufacturer, looking to the continental market, would fix or even enlarge his capital or business in the country of five millions at the risk of being cut off from the country of sixty-five millions. Our neighbours, instead of engaging in manufactures here, would

take our markets with goods manufactured there. And our raw material, instead of being finished on the ground, would be exported to be finished abroad. Uncertainty would alarm capital and paralyze enterprise.

Could there be any statements more absolutely apropos to the present proposals before the House? But Mr. Blake went further, and sounded a note of alarm which the people of this country should heed at the present hour:

Assuming that absolute free trade with the States thus described as commercial union, may and ought to come, I believe that it can and should come only as an incident, or at any rate, as a well understood precursor of political union, for which indeed we should be able to make better terms before than after the surrender of our commercial independence.

Now those were the words of a man whose intellectual force carried enormous weight in this country, and he would have nothing of such a proposition. The proposals now before the House are leading in the same fatal direction as they led in 1891. The advocates of reciprocity on the other side of the line are speaking of annexation as a logical result. Let me point out what President Taft said the other day in speaking to the Illinois legislature:

It will give to the United States much greater control of the wheat market than it ever had before. It will enable its milling plants to turn Canadian wheat into flour and send abroad its finished product, and it will stimulate the sale of manufactures and other things that we have to sell to Canada.

Chairman McCall, of the Ways and Means Committee, in his report, says significantly:

And the benefit to us would be enormous if we could sweep away all tariffs between the two countries, it would have the effect upon our trade of another Louisiana purchase.

And still more significant is the closing paragraph of his report:

The Bill takes a long step towards establishing for the continent of North America a policy of unrestricted trade and commerec.

If that is not commercial union, what is the meaning of the English language? Now there are other proofs of the certainty with which we are drifting along this road. Senator Beveridge, one of the ardent and able expounders of reciprocity, said the other day:

There must be reciprocity with Canada. Our tariff with the rest of the world does not apply to our northern neighbour. That policy already has driven American manufacturers to cross the Canadian borders, build vast plants with American capital on Canadian soil, employing Canadian workingmen to supply trade. That capital should be kept at home to employ American workingmen to supply Canadian demands.

Now Sir George W. Ross, a good friend of this government, and one of our foremost public men, said last November:

The United States now supplies us with $80,000,000 annually of manufactured goods. Even that is too much, but to increase it, as Senator Beveridge proposes, would be treason to Canadian industries, the very thought of which makes one shrink from the consequences.

And speaking further of this design of the United States, and of the design in 1866 which was to compel us into annexation, Sir George Ross said:

Coercion having failed, annexation through commercial privileges is now announced.

And Mr. W. R. Hearst says:

Let us have commercial union first, and political union afterwards.

Now surely no man can avoid seeing where the Canadian people are drifting in this matter. Canada is literally to be the hewer of wood, the drawer of water, the purveyor of food to the powerful nation which aims by such an arrangement to be the great workshop of the continent. The Prime Minister, willing to go one step, will soon be willing, or be forced, to take the other. Great as is his facility for swallowing his own words, he can hardly forget the passion with which, on the platforms of this country in 1896, he vowed that he would not be satisfied until he had wiped out every vestige of protection. Sir, it is in vain that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) thunders forth about the patriotism and the benefits of this measure. In the long run it will be neither patriotic nor beneficial, but subversive of both.

Now it was not my intention so much to indicate the national dangers in connection with these proposals, as to point out to the House and the country, one dark blot in particular on the pages of this agreement, and to protest in the most vigorous manner possible against a grievous wrong that is being done to a great national industry, the fruit industry of Canada. What has been the animating principle governing my hon. friends the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance in making their arrangements with the negotiators at Washington? Certainly the desire, the oft confessed and repeated desire, on their part to find for the producer of Canada a freer and a wider market. I noticed that when the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) was speaking just now, he practically agreed to the soundness of this argument. I took down his words: 'The agricultural classes are the foundation of this country'. Well, we can all

agree to that, and I presume he will include the fruit growers of this country as forming part of the agriculturists. He touched on the very small reduction in the duty on agricultural implements, but he thought it was helpful, and added: 'The farmers are reasonable people, they do not expect a revolution', that is, they do not expect to sweep away protective duties. 'They are satisfied for the present to get free markets for their products'. That was his argument, and it was the argument that had all along been put forward by the government. Let me remark to my hon. friend that although he did not believe in the revolutionary process of sweeping away the duties on agricultural implements, the government is now proposing to sweep away the duties on the fruit industry, and my hon. friend does not object. Now this is the plain and open defence put up by the government, the producer and not the consumer of Canada is primarily considered by the government. If I wanted to prove my point, I need only to allude to the remarks of the Minister of Finance on the coal industry. He has made in these proposals an insignificant cut of eight cents a ton, certainly no help to the consumer, yet so anxious is he that the producer of his own province shall not be hurt that he says: 'I hope, as one who has warm sympathy for the coal trade, that they will be able to stand it'. Turn to his remarks about the trifling reduction of duties on agricultural implements, a reduction so small as to little affect either consumer or producer. I quote the whole passage and ask the House to note the extraordinary significance of the words and their logical application to the case of the fruit-growing industry of Canada:

With regard to agricultural implements, the House need not be reminded of the strong desire on the part of our western farmers to have better terms on these articles. They would be glad to have them free of duty, but anxious as I am to meet their views I must frankly say to them that we do not think that is fair. Like all others they must be prepared to give and take, they must be prepared to bear their share in the burdens of the country, and I believe that when the matter is fairly put to the farmers, they will recognize that principle. We do not propose to make agricultural implements free but to make some reductions, and we trust that, while these may not be all the farmers want, they will be evidence of the desire of the government to meet their views as far as possible without doing any injustice to the industries of Canada.

Without doing any injustice to the industries of Canada? Mr. Chairman, in wiping off every vestige of protection which the Canadian producer of fruit has hitherto been afforded, the minister has violated the very principles laid down by himself. He has singled out one large class of producers, and one only, and has dealt that great industry a blow, the effect of which, will be a shrinkage in value of all the great orchard areas of Canada and especially of Ontario and British Columbia, and the discouragement of thousands who have invested their all in slowly building up what has come to be recognized as one of our great national assets.

Mr. Chairman, I shall make no apology for dealing with this matter with some degree of fulness. I am persuaded that few men in this House appreciate the nature of the blow which has been struck. I am equally persuaded that members of this House will recognize the injustice of the blow, when they are more fully apprised of the facts. I may not know any more or as much of political economy as many of my hon. friends opposite, but they will admit that 28 consecutive years spent in the practical work of fruit growing ought at least to enable a man to speak with some little authority as to what will help, or what will hurt, the special business in which he has been so long engaged. I have stated that the case of the fruit-growers stands out as a glaring instance of one large body of producers who are unquestionably going to be injuriously affected by this arrangement. The government's own action in the past warrants the statement. In 1896 the House will remember that great uneasiness was manifested as to the trade policy of the present government. The country had been led to believe that widespread reductions of the tariff would follow and the rapidly growing fruit industry shared the general alarm. It fell to my lot to assist in the preparation and presentation of the fruit-growers' case to the Tariff Commissioners, who were the very ministers who have negotiated the present reciprocal arrangement with the United States. In the course of my remarks, I shall have to summarize the arguments and data then put forward, but I may simply state now that the commissioners were sufficiently impressed with the strength of the fruit-growers' case to decide that the moderate protection they then had, should be continued. Under that decision, the industry still further expanded. Since that time we have witnessed the establishment of commercial horticulture in my own province of British Columbia, and the investment of enormous capital in all lines of horticultural development. In 1905-6 the government undertook an exhaustive investigation of tariff matters and for that purpose a commission toured the country from ocean to ocean, giving careful hearing to all Canadian industries. Again it fell to my lot to assist in presenting the case of the fruit-growers to the commissioners, this time in British Columbia, and still to the same two ministers, the Min-

ister of Finance, and Minister of Customs. Strong as the case was, and is, for Ontario it was still stronger for the far west, and once more, after full consideration, the government acknowledged the justice and strength of our pleas and the industry remained in statu quo. I ask the government, I ask the Minister of Finance, have circumstances altered since that date? Is the case weakened at the present moment, nay, is it not rather strengthened? He cannot reply that the wiping out of the United States tariff alters it. Not at any time did we urge this feature. It was not free entry into the States but protection against a mammoth and more favoured competitor in our own markets that we persistently asked for.

When that has induced the government to do what an overwhelming majority of the fruit producers of Canada have implored them not to do, and agreed not to do in 1907, Sir, I am driven to the only possible conclusion, viz: that our interests have been bartered away for privileges to other interests which otherwise may have been difficult to obtain. I am justified in such a conclusion, by a significant passage in President Taft's message to Congress. In the main President Taft has considered the interests of the American consumer but in fruit no one knows better than he that the American consumer will receive no benefit and he frankly and directly acknowledges that he has taken this step in the interests of the American producer. He says: It has been found possible to obtain free entry into Canada for fresh fruits and vegetables—a matter of special value to the south and to the Pacific coast in disposing of their products in their season.' Here then is the United States reason, nakedly, plainly expressed for reciprocal free trade in fruit. What answer has this government got? What justification can it offer to the House, to the country, and to the industry itself for thus penalizing the Canadian grower in his already difficult fight against an immensely powerful foreign competitor in the Canadian market. Absolutely none! Sir, this industry means far more to Canada than the layman realizes. It means so much that anything which can in the slightest degree injuriously affect it is an injury to the whole of Canada. What has been our continual pride and boast in Canada but this, that we are a nation, not primarily of shopkeepers, but of farmers. The settlement of every great province of the Dominion has been the history of settlement of the land, the foundation of the rural homes, from which have sprung so much that is strong and clean in our national life. We have arrived now at a different stage. The problem, acute in all older countries, is already showing itself here, that of too great a congestion of the cities and towns. There is a vital reason for the universal cry 'back to the land,' and in no form is that cry so successful as when it appeals to the man to throw his energies into horticultural work. The first effort of the new settler to create a real home in his new environment was the planting of the orchard. The man who plants trees thereby gives hostages to that particular spot of earth. Unlike the cattle man, the sheep man, the general agriculturist, he is in no sense nomadic. Consciously or unconsciously he has pledged himself to his soil. Each additional tree planted ties him more firmly to his home. In the earlier days it was not without doubts that he did plant. Canada was reputed the great north land of snow, ice, and harsh climate. Those pioneers who had courage and faith to attempt the beginning of our orchard work builded better than they knew, and deserve the heartfelt gratitude of those who came later. With the progress of years, with the growing proofs, orchard work branched out into a special industry, and thirty years ago, though as compared with the present development still small, it had assumed in various portions of Ontario and eastern Canada a large importance. It called for a heavier investment than ordinary agriculture. It demanded a more special attention, and I may here fitly quote the words of Dr. James Robertson that:

> The highest form of labour applied to the cultivation of the soil is that of the horticulturist.

It involved years, not only of patient labour but of patient waiting, for financial results, and in all these things it deserved and will ever deserve, the sympathy of the great mass of Canadians who are following other pursuits. In 1890 to the Montreal Horticultural Society was entrusted the task of organizing the first conference of fruit growers throughout the Dominion—the seal and sign of the industry having attained something like a national growth. Expansion continued and when the census of 1901 was taken we have the following figures of development: Apple trees, 15,053,875; peach trees, 1,301,775, pear trees, 962,101; plums, 2,415,695; cherry, 1,288,368; other fruit trees, 179,425. A total of over twenty-one million trees besides 2,783,596 grape vines, and large acreages of small fruits.

In this large area amounting to nearly 400,000 acres of orchard the great province of Ontario ranked first with nearly seventy per cent of the total, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island following, in the order named. It is impossible to state accurately the increase in the last ten years but from the careful researches which I have made I am approximately correct when I place the present acreage at more

than half a million acres. The most remarkable growth is in British Columbia where since the census we have increased ten times, having at the present time some 5,000,000 trees representing roughly from 100,000 to 110,000 acres.

Does the government ; do members of this House realize what these figures mean; what potential and actual wealth of investment they represent? Ten acres of bearing orchards will supply the railroads with freight equivalent to that from 100 acres of grain. Ten acres of orchard means the employment of practically as much labour as that employed in 100 acres of wheat land. A similar proportion exists in reference to values and I am giving the House a very conservative estimate indeed when I place the orchards of the Dominion of Canada at a valuation of $150,000,000. But if these figures imply an industry so important as to deserve the amplest consideration at the hands of the government, I ought to also point out other equally strong reasons for the same consideration. The great bulk of these 30,000,000 trees are apples. The development of these orchards calls for special skill, and great expenditures, and a close and eternal vigilance against innumerable enemies of the orchardist. It means five or six years in the west, and eight or ten years in the east, before the fruit-grower gets returns which will even pay current expenses, and many more years before he can hope to be recouped for his years of constructive but not productive work. In this respect his position is more nearly similar to the manufacturer, who is through a series of years perfecting his plant and machinery before he makes his large output. He is in a more hazardous and difficult position than the ordinary farmer. The wheat grower, the cattle grower can under pressure of adverse circumstances move to fresh fields and pastures new. The orchardist must stand or fall by the capital which he has locked up in the trees which have taken many years of patient intelligent toil to bring to the stage of production, and any blow which strikes him must strike with exceptional severity, and it can be demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that such a blow will be dealt if the proposals now before the House go through.

I have referred to the fruit-growing industry as a great national asset. It is in very truth such an asset. No specialized form of agricultural industry employs an equally large amount of labour with corresponding distribution of wages. It adds a heavy volume of traffic to the railways of the country. It feeds large and import- and subsidiary interests such as box barrel and basket manufactories, canneries, nurseries, cold storage plants, and so on. It does an invaluable service to the country by building up compact and thickly-settled communities of the best type and it affords to the world the best proof of the unrivalled climate and soil of the country. It was not long since we laboured under the imputation of being 'Our Lady of the Snows,' and you need not go far in the world even now to find the idea prevalent that this great land of the north is an inhospitable clime. There is no finer or more convincing proof to the sceptic to the contrary than that which is afforded by the magnificent fruit grown in Canadian orchards and coloured by Canadian sunshine. Sir, I remember in 1884 the first visit of the British Association to this country. Some of the world's influential men were in that great group of men, many of whom, for the first time, set foot on our soil. They, too, had harsh and convinced ideas of the character of the country. I can recall a number of them standing on the wharf at the old town of Niagara-on-the-Lake when 10,000 baskets of peaches were awaiting shipment to Toronto. It was a revelation to them, and thousands of dollars of government literature could not have conveyed the truth to those men in the manner which that sight did. Yet, of all the branches of the industry, peach-culture will be hit the hardest if reciprocal free trade in fruit becomes an accomplished fact. The theory set forth by the government, is that free entry of our fruit into the United States will compensate for such losses as we may sustain by the unrestricted influx of American fruit. I am not dealing with anything but the effect on the producer. I will touch the case of the consumer later. I have been at some pains to obtain information from authoritative sources as to the effect of these proposals in the east. Those near the border believe that the sale of their earlier apples and berries will be helped by free entry to New England markets, and I am not disputing it, although I may here point out that New England annually produces 3,000,000 barrels of apples, of which she exports twenty per cent, so that too much faith cannot be pinned to that market for apples. Nova Scotia, by far the most important horticultural area in the east, is essentially an apple-producing province, and ships, and will always ship, the great bulk of her crop to England. Prior to 1907 her exports for several years averaged 400,000 barrels. In 1909, 700,000 barrels were exported. Last year was a comparative failure.

A somewhat small percentage, then, of the whole industry in the east will be helped by these proposals. On the other hand, there will be no great effect one way or the other on the main industry. I may quote a telegram, which I have received from Mr. S. C. Parker, of Berwick, Nova Scotia, one of the foremost authorities in

the maritime provinces, and the weight of whose name was used by the Prime Minister on behalf of free fruit, in his reply to the delegation which came here the other day. His telegram to me was as follows:

Nova Scotia fruit growers practically indifferent to abolition of fruit duty. Britain is our market for winter apples. For early apples think we will gain on United States. Berry growers are pleased.

It must be borne in mind, however, that important as the fruit industry is to the maritime provinces—and fruit-growers elsewhere in the Dominion will rejoice in their progress—it occupies relatively a small position in respect to the whole industry in the Dominion. Quebec is not producing for export to any extent, and it is absolutely sure that New York State with its immense production will with free fruit find a favourable market in Quebec, and this will not tend to increase the price of his product to the Quebec grower. I am informed by good authorities that, outside of cranberries and wild berries, the orchard acreage in New Brunswick is approximately 10,000 acres. I am informed by an equally good authority that in Nova Scotia it would approximate 25,000 acres. I am aware that great progress in planting has been made in recent years, and a fair estimate for all kinds of cultivated fruits in the Dominion would be as follows:

	Acres.
Prince Edward Island	7,000
New Brunswick	18,000
Nova Scotia	35,000
Quebec	50,000
Ontario	320,000
British Columbia	100,000
Total	530,000

It will be seen that the maritime provinces constitute only two-thirds of the area of British Columbia, and less than twenty per cent of the orchards of the Dominion. Admittedly their chief market is England, and it will at once be seen that the benefits from free fruit, if benefits there are, affect only a very small portion of the industry in the east, while the enormous and valuable orchards of British Columbia are badly smitten, to say nothing of Ontario.

Now as to Ontario, fruit-growing is scattered over a wide portion of the province, but for climatic reasons necessarily centred more heavily in certain districts. Lincoln, with 20,169 acres of fruit heads the list of the great fruit counties of the province. There follow in order of importance Northumberland, Middlesex, Grey, Wentworth, Huron, Kent, Prince Edward county, Lambton, Simcoe, Norfolk, Essex, Hastings, Oxford and York, besides many others ranking closely behind. The great bulk of this fruit, more especially the more tender classes, is marketed in the Canadian markets of the east. A considerable portion, especially of apples, finds its way across the ocean, an increasing quantity reaches the markets of the prairies, and a small percentage across the international boundary. Now, Sir, let me examine for a moment the international trade as it applies to the fiscal year of 1909-10 in both countries. There was imported into Canada an amount of fresh fruit, not including those already on the free list, such as bananas, oranges, &c., made up as follows:

Apples (duty 40c. per barrel), 59,071 barrels, valued at	$ 261,792
Peaches (duty 1 c. per lb.), 200 cars (12 tons)	155,139
Grapes (2c. per lb.), 267,000 baskets (81 lbs.)	112,218
Plums (½c. per lb.), 198,587 baskets (20 lbs.)	158,756
Pears, apricots, quinces (averaging ½c. lb.), 247,000 baskets (20 lbs.)	170,346
Cherries (2 c. per lb.), 31,860 cases (10 lbs.)	40,376
Cranberries (25 p.c.), 40,854 bushels.	91,754
Berries (2c. per lb.), 2,503,594 lbs.	210,796
Other fruits	4,369
Total	$1,205,546

As to the importations into the United States, the returns are not itemized so fully, but for general purposes the comparison will be found sufficiently clear:

Apples (duty 75c. per barrel), 14,800 barrels, value	$ 29,323
Grapes	2,800
All other fruits	200,653
Total	$232,776

The United States fruit-grower then sends into the markets of this country, under present conditions, from five to six times the amount that the Canadian grower sends into his markets. What will be the effect of the abolition of the duties? Undoubtedly a lessening of the producer's prices in these markets. The reasons for such a statement are obvious to those who have given this matter any study and are perfectly plain to those great fruit-producing states who have, in their own interests, been instrumental in getting fruit placed on the free list.

It may be remarked that while the Canadian duty on apples is less than that imposed by the United States on apples entering their country, yet with other fruits it is not so. In the case of pears and plums the duties are nearly the same, the Canadian tariff being a shade higher. Grapes come here facing a duty of 2c per lb., while our product would face a duty of 25c per cubic foot, or less than the Canadian tariff. Peaches, with a duty of twenty-five cents a bushel in the United States, face a duty nearly twice as high on entering this country. Berries, on which the Canadian grower has now a protection of

2c per lb., enter the United States with a duty of only 1c per quart. Yet, in spite of having to face a higher tariff to get into this market, the United States grower, in 1910, placed $210,796 worth of berries into this market, or practically equivalent to all the fruit shipped into the United States from this country, with the exception of apples.

Let us take for a moment the case of grapes. In 1883, when I first became connected with grape culture in Ontario, we obtained 10c per lb. for the fruit. Year by year, with added acreage, increased output and strong competition amongst the Canadian growers, the price came steadily down, until the Canadian consumer could obtain the fruit at a price which put it within the reach of all, and left an extremely small profit for the grower. For the past eight or ten years the average wholesale price to the grower would run, for his main crop, from a cent to a cent and a half per pound. The ordinary commercial package is the eight-pound basket. For this he obtains from 12 to 15 cents. But, Sir, the late Mr. Murray Pettit, one of the foremost and ablest of those who cultivated this fruit on a large scale, estimated that grapes cost 12c per basket to produce. It is, therefore, obvious that the grower's main opportunity for getting a fair profit for the whole crop lies in the special cultivation of earlier varieties, when the price is somewhat higher. The Canadian grower can and does produce enough to amply satisfy the needs of the Canadian consumer, and the present duty of 2c per lb. simply secures some immunity to the grower here against a wholesale and disastrous exploitation of his own market by New York state, which has more than 60,000 acres of grapes under cultivation. These things were very ably put before the government, in the tariff discussion of 1907, by Mr. E. D. Smith, then member for Wentworth, and then, as now, an acknowledged authority on the subject. Right here I will call the attention of the Minister of Customs to a remark made by him in that very discussion. It will be found on page 1914 of 'Hansard,' 1907. The minister says, in answering Mr. Smith:

> I have listened to the hon. gentleman's remarks in regard to grapes. If I might state my own personal views I think there is a great deal in what he says, but I am of the opinion that his remarks which would apply with force to grapes, would not apply with equal force to peaches. In reference to grapes I think he is right.

Let me ask the minister how he can reconcile his words and conviction then with his attitude now. His answer then was directly applied to the argument that United States competition would injure the Canadian grower. Four years have passed. The conditions have not changed, or if they have only in a direction which makes the case still stronger for the Canadian grower. In the face of the minister's strongly worded belief at that time, I can only again assume, and I am amply justified in doing so, that he and his colleague have sacrificed our industry and their own convictions in order to benefit some one else.

Mr. PATERSON. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question, in order to be sure that I understand him? He says the conditions will be the same under this agreement as they were at that time. Does he insist that that is correct?

Mr. BURRELL. I certainly do.

Mr. PATERSON. Was there not a duty on grapes going into the United States at that time?

Mr BURRELL. I have explained that.

Mr. PATERSON. It makes all the difference in the world.

Mr. BURRELL. I do not think the minister's (Mr. Paterson's) remarks are well timed or very relevant. I have already explained that the duty on grapes coming into this country is greater than the duty on grapes going into the United States. The hon. minister will not question that. And, with the enormous acreage of New York state, they are able amply to supply their own market, and their enormous output will not permit of us getting into that market with any profit; but the removal of the duty will assist the growers there, at certain seasons when prices are somewhat higher, to crowd into our market.

Mr. PATERSON. I am only pointing out that, if the hon. gentleman wishes to be fair, he must recognize the difference in the conditions. At that time there was a duty against our fruit going into the United States; under this agreement there will be no such duty. When the fruit growers and others who spoke on this question addressed the tariff commission, the argument they used was that the United States duties were much higher against us than ours against them—I am not alluding to the particular item of grapes, but am speaking of the general argument,—and they ask that our duty be put up to equal theirs so that we might be on fair and equal terms. The terms will be fair and equal, so far as tariff is concerned, under this Bill.

Mr. BURRELL. I am afraid the minister has not followed the course of my remarks very closely. He evidently has not followed what I stated with reference to that very tariff commission.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I have.

Mr. BURRELL. I think not. I am speaking about all the conditions of growth and

crops and not the conditions of tariff. I know that the conditions of tariff under these proposals are different, but I am speaking of the condition of the crop, of production and the result of the producer's investment. As to what the minister has said, I followed all these tariff proposals. He knows well that I helped put up the case for British Columbia; he knows that I did the same for Ontario in 1896. I could bring resolution after resolution to prove that his statement is not correct—that it is only a half truth. It is true that the growers of Canada have always said that the United States tariff is much greater than ours and that ours should be raised to equal theirs. But he will not find in one resolution in a hundred—not one in a thousand—anything to show that any association or grower believed that it would be a benefit to have the duty entirely taken off. We never argued—and the minister himself knew it—that the abolition of these duties would put us on fair terms. It would put us on equal terms in one sense, but on hopelessly unequal terms in another sense. The minister ought to know that. And I think that if he will permit me to continue my argument I will drive this fact home with compelling force, if he is willing to listen to a fair statement of the case. The minister ought to admit, if he knows anything of my general method of argument in this House, that I try to avoid putting up an unfair argument. I want to put my case fairly, even in those matters which tell against myself. I am so deeply interested in this industry and my convictions are so profound that this is a serious blow, and that that fact can be so clearly proven, that I want to be perfectly fair in my contentions.

Mr. HUGHES. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrell) a question? Do not the grapes come in much earlier in the United States than in Canada?

Mr. BURRELL. Certainly. I am going to cover all these arguments as I go on. I had dealt with the question of grapes and when the minister interrupted me I was about to take up the subject of peaches. Now, as to peaches: In 1907 in the tariff discussion to which I have alluded, Mr. E. D. Smith, then member for Wentworth, was asking for a duty of 3 cents per pound. The minister (Mr. Paterson) refused, but he was satisfied that 2 cents the present duty—was fair. The peach industry is not only a very large industry in Ontario, but an important one in my own province, and in a variety of ways is one which deserves the special sympathy and encouragement of Canada generally. The area of peach culture in Canada, owing to peculiarly favourable requirements of soil and climate is comparatively limited. It takes some years of waiting before the productive stage is reached. The crops are not always regular, danger from frosts is always present, the investment in the industry is heavy. Not always do the growers reap a reward commensurate with the labour and investment. I remember vividly the last large crop we had before I left Ontario. I think it was in 1897. The crop matured quickly, markets were flooded, and in common with many others I had thousands of baskets on which I got absolutely no return, not even sufficient to pay the cost of production. Those people who attempt to argue that free competition from the United States will not injure the producer in Canada are absolutely ignorant of the facts. Sir, facing a duty now of twice their own the American grower sent into this country last year 200 carloads valued at $155,000. What he will do when that cent a pound is removed is easily foreseen. It must be borne in mind that the great southern states have immense areas adapted for successful peach culture. The crop can be cultivated by cheap labour and handled as it is on an enormous scale with every facility of transportation they are in a position of great advantage compared to our own. But it is not only the southern states. Through Delaware, Maryland and northerly to Michigan and New York the areas still exist. I am leaving out the Pacific coast phase for the moment. I am in close touch with friends in New York state who are intimately connected with horticultural work and what is their frank opinion as to all this. Sir, they tell me that they are delighted at the prospect of free fruit, that western New York will find an easy and profitable market now in the cities of Ontario and Quebec, and while candidly admitting that it will be a hard blow on the Canadian grower they are very cheerful as to their own benefits. The more thoroughly one looks into this question the more one is amazed that ministers of the Crown, who were presumably guarding, or should have guarded the interests of the Canadian fruit farmer, have thus injured and discouraged him.

Before leaving the case of the Canadian producer in the east, a case which becomes stronger the more closely it is examined, I desire to point out in passing the nature of the injury which will be inflicted on the vegetable growers of the country. In Ontario no less than 57,000 acres are given up to market gardening and vegetable growing. In my own province we are to-day shipping hundreds of carloads of vegetables, practically none of which go to the other side of the line, but which do meet a heavy competition from the states of Washington and Oregon. The government has had laid before it in detail the case of this class of producer. It is intensive farm-

ing in a very real sense. It involves an immense expenditure in labour, a heavy investment of capital and a large portion of this investment depends altogether for its return on the prices obtained in our cities and towns in the early part of the season. Wipe out such protection as they now have and you expose these men with their millions of investment to a fierce competition from the tremendous area devoted to this class of work in the United States. An earlier season, a vast area, low priced labour, are the factors which will enable the American producer to filch such small profits as he now has from the home grower.

Sir, arguments of this character are not advanced solely from this side of the House. Two years ago the present member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) a supporter of this government through thick and thin, moved a resolution asking for greater protection to the fruit and vegetable growers and argued at great length that the present duties on fruit and vegetables were not sufficient and that this government ought to increase them, and see that Canadian growers were not crowded out of their own market. What will that non. member do now that his government has given free entrance to United States produce thereby dealing a smashing blow to my hon. friend's constituents?

Now, before leaving the case of Ontario, I want to refer particularly to the demands made by that great delegation of 800 fruit growers from Ontario generally, and from the Niagara district in particular, and to the Prime Minister's answer. I have a good deal more to say, and if the Prime Minister would allow me to move the adjournment of the debate, I would esteem it a favour.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 15, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

BANKING AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE—PROPOSED REDUCTION OF QUORUM.

Mr. MILLER moved :

That the quorum of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce be reduced from 21 to 11 members.

Mr. LENNOX. Explain.

Mr. BURRELL.

Mr. MILLER. At the last meeting of the Banking and Commerce Committee, a resolution was passed asking this House to authorize a reduction in the number of the quorum. It was then urged by a member of the House who is also a member of the committee that, perhaps, the discussion which took place at that time would lead to a larger attendance at the meeting of this and other committees. The Banking and Commerce Committee was called for business for last Friday morning at 11 o'clock. We had no quorum. The committee was called again for this morning at 11 o'clock, and, although there was present a solicitor interested in one of the Bills to be up for discussion, and though that solicitor endeavoured to drum up a quorum, he failed to do so. I understand that the new Banking Act will be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee this session. If so, there will be a large number of meetings of the committee, and I think it is very important that business be not impeded, and, with that view, that the quorum be reduced to a possible number. It has been urged, as the members of the committee number 132, that 21 is not an unreasonably large quorum. But I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House, that while there are 221 members of this House, 20 constitute a quorum. It does not seem unreasonable that we should have the same proportionate quorum on committees of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. When the committee proposed the reduction of the quorum, their recommendation was that it should be reduced from 21 to 15. The chairman (Mr. Miller) now proposes that it should be reduced to 11. I think that number is low, and especially in view of the very important Bill likely to come before the committee, the general banking Bill. I think that the quorum of the committee to consider so important a Bill should be more than 11 members. It seems to me that 15 would be a reasonable number, but quite low enough.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not think that the House should make any change in the quorum of the Banking and Commerce Committee. My hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) spoke of the meeting this morning. Well, this morning, three different committees were called for the same hour—eleven o'clock ; Public Accounts, Agriculture and Banking and Commerce. If the chairman of committees are not more careful in seeing to it that committees are not called for the same hour and day, they cannot expect members to attend in such numbers as, I am sure, my hon. friend from South Grey would expect in the case of a committee that has to deal with such important questions as those which come before the Bank-

ing and Commerce Committee. I rather think that, when any change is made with respect to the quorum of these committees, it should be by a change in the rules of the House, and not by selecting one committee for change while leaving the others as they are. This is a matter that ought to receive very careful consideration by the House, and should not be done in this sudden way of simply passing a resolution. Perhaps it would have been all right to pass a resolution of this kind even with respect to the Banking and Commerce Committee at some other time, but my hon. friend knows that there is to come before this committee the most important matter that will come before any committee this session, the change in the banking law. I think that the committee should not take up the consideration of these very important enactments without at least 21 members out of the 221 members of this House present. I suggest to the chairman that he leave this over for further consideration and for more thorough discussion in the Banking and Commerce Committee itself. Surely he will not wish to press a matter of this kind now. I think that when the discussion was on in the House the other day the general expression of opinion was in opposition to the proposal to reduce the quorum of this committee.

Mr. FIELDING. I was not able to be present at the meeting of the Banking and Commerce Committee at which this matter was considered. Personally I should be willing to accept the judgment of the committee and its chairman on this subject ; at the same time, unless there is something like a general concurrence of view in the House, it would not be desirable that the change should be made. If there be any considerable difference of opinion, I would suggest—though I agree with him on this subject—that it would be better to withdraw the resolution for the present, and let it be further considered in the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. HUGHES. It was not considered in the Banking and Commerce Committee this morning?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise with some diffidence to discuss this matter as I am not a member of the Banking and Commerce Committee, but I desire to be heard because this is a very important time in connection with the work of this committee and it is a very important committee, and its action affects the interest of all classes of people in Canada. It seems to me that the difficulty pointed out by the chairman of the committee (Mr. Miller) is not overcome by his motion. Did I understand him to say that when the committee was called to meet a few days ago no one attended?

Mr. MILLER. I said that not a quorum attended.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood him to say that no one was present. And how many were present at the meeting called for this morning?

Mr. MILLER. About eighteen or nineteen.

Mr. SPROULE. There were nineteen present at one time.

Mr. LENNOX. That, I presume, was after the drumming up referred to by the chairman. This difficulty arises out of a general condition of things, and not out of anything connected with this committee specially. I have taken the liberty more than once of calling the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to this subject. No matter how good and active a member of parliament a man may be, he cannot be in two places at the same time. Nor can the member of parliament do his work properly by trying to divide his attention between two committees that are meeting at the same time. The trouble arises through summoning a number of committees for the same day. And the reason for that—which may be regarded as another difficulty—is that we do not summon committee meetings for Monday or Friday.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Yes, the Public Accounts.

Mr. LENNOX. I am corrected as to the Public Accounts Committee. I venture again to suggest to the Prime Minister that it would be better if we had committees meeting on Mondays and Fridays as a regular thing. There is no reason why members should be encouraged to absent themselves from attendance on their public duties on these days. If the suggestions I make were adopted, and if the membership of each committee were reduced to a reasonable number, the difficulty we are now discussing could not arise. Now, the special reason why I speak at this time is that a most important matter is supposed to come before the Banking and Commerce Committee this session. I have heard the rumour that the government does not intend to introduce and pass the Banking Act this session. I trust that is only an idle rumour.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It has been introduced.

Mr. LENNOX. I said 'introduce and pass.' I have heard, since the Bill was introduced, that the government does not intended to move forward and pass it.

Mr. FIELDING. No foundation for that.

Mr. LENNOX. I am glad to hear from the Finance Minister that there is no foundation for that. I would urge the Finance Minister to get a little active in regard to this matter, and not leave it till the last of the session, when, as we know by experience, matters that come up do not receive very close attention. The Banking and Commerce Committee this session has more important work before it than any other committee of the House, I venture to say; and I can promise my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) who moved this motion that when the Banking Act comes up for consideration there will be no lack of members there, and there will be no lack of spectators either. The country is aroused on the question of the banking law of Canada, not only by reason of the Farmers' Bank, but by reason of other earlier events, and of events that have supervened. When this Bill comes up to be dealt with, we want a full attendance of members, we want a quorum which will guarantee responsibility to the people, and we want a condition of things which will insure a most careful and rigid handling of that question. Therefore, speaking with a sense of responsibility, I for one decidedly object to a change in the number constituting the quorum of the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). I do not agree with the remarks of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lennox) as to the work being less efficiently done by a smaller quorum of members. I think 11 or 15 members of that committee are able to do the work just as well as twenty-one. As a matter of fact, referring to one very important matter, the Lumsden affair, the House felt perfectly safe, and in the opinion of my hon. friend the interests of the country were perfectly safe, in the hands of only seven members.

Mr. LENNOX. The four did better than the seven.

Mr. WILSON (Laval). As a matter of fact, after some of them saw fit to leave the committee, the affairs of the country were thoroughly well managed by four members of this House who were on that committee. Now it occurs to me at the moment that there are two ways of bringing the 130 members of that committee to a sense of their duty, to bring them into action. The first way is by persuasion, by sweet remembrance of the duty of each one of them. The second way is by chastisement—my English expression may be poor——

An hon. MEMBER. It is all right.

Mr. WILSON (Laval) but if it is all right so much the better. I was a victim of the second way a few days ago. In the Montreal 'Gazette' and Montreal 'Star' a list was published of the members who were absent when the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) presented his motion asking for delay in regard to the reciprocity arrangement; and the insinuation was made in those papers that the member for Laval was not in the House for the very good reason that he approved of the motion of the member for Jacques Cartier. But it so happened, Mr. Speaker, that I was not aware that the hon. member was going to present that motion, and that is the reason I was absent. Now, I would propose that the members of the Banking and Commerce Committee should be chastised in the same way in order to induce them to do their duty, and that the names of the absent ones should be published. But when the names of the absent are published, I for one will be under a great disadvantage, because the names are usually published in alphabetical order, and as my name begins with the letter W, it comes last on the list—always excepting one other hon. member of this House, that is the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright). He may be the wrong Mr. Wright some times, or he may be the right Mr. Wright at other times. So I think perhaps the best way to settle the matter would be for each member of this committee to perform his duty. Now the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) used an expression about members getting 'busy.' Well, perhaps I am not entitled to speak for other members in this regard, but there is another member of this House, a very prominent one, who is nearly always busy at his duty somewhere else than in the committee. I venture to suggest to my hon. friend from Simcoe that he urge upon his friend, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), to attend more often the Banking and Commerce Committee, where his services would be so valuable.

Mr. NESBITT. I think hon. members lose sight of the fact that we do not want to change the number of members on that committee. Everybody can attend the committee, and it is their duty to do so, even if the quorum is reduced. I quite agree in the view of the importance of the Bank Bill that is to come before the committee. I might also mention the Insurance Bill which was before the committee, when it was very difficult to get a quorum, although the Bill was just as important perhaps as the Banking Bill which is to come before the committee. In the case of the Insurance Bill it was very difficult indeed to get a quorum, and nearly every morning the chairman had to preside over the committee when there was not a quorum present. I do not see any reason why the quorum of the committee should not be reduced, because at present we do not get a full quorum there. It is not fair

to those who do attend to keep them waiting from 15 to 20 minutes or half an hour for other members to turn up. So far as I am concerned, I strongly endorse the recommendation to change the quorum so that we can get on with the business.

Mr. MILLER. This is a matter not of much interest to any except those members who are interested in the work of the committee. They have been doing business morning after morning without any quorum at all, and we thought that it would be better to do business with a quorum that could be obtained under the authority of the House. The members of the committee who are in favour of reducing the quorum are those who are regularly present. I do not care to press the matter contrary to the wishes of the House, and if it is the wish of the House that the quorum should not be reduced, I beg to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GRAIN STORED IN ELEVATORS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What quantity of grain was stored in the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William during the four months commencing September 1, 1910?
2. How much of the grain so stored has been forwarded to the sea-board?
3. By what routes have the same been sent forward, and what was the quantity forwarded by each route?
4. How much was forwarded in Canadian bottoms?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. 56,673,690 bushels.

2, 3 and 4. The government have, as yet, no information on the other three questions.

NORWEGIAN BARK 'PETRA.'

*Mr. CROSBY:

1. Has the Marine Department any information regarding the Norwegian bark 'Petra,' which was lost at Pennant on or about the 20th or 25th of December?
2. Have the men from Pennant and Sambro who went to the rescue of the crew, running great risk of their lives in doing so, been in any way specially provided for, or any payment given to them, by the Marine and Fishery Department? If not, has the department any intention of remunerating them liberally for their services, and when may it be expected?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Yes. The 'Petra' stranded on a ledge of rocks near Big Pennant island, Pennant Bay, Nova Scotia, on the afternoon of Monday, 19th December, 1910.

2. No. The matter is being inquired into, and any persons who will have been shown as having assisted in saving life will be rewarded.

RIFLE RANGE AT BEAR RIVER, N.S.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Have any communications, telegrams, letters, petitions or plans relating to the rifle range at Bear River, N.S., been received since January, 1909?
2. If so, from whom have such been received, and upon what dates respectively?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to make that a notice of motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as a notice of motion.

PRINTING BUREAU EMPLOYEES.

* Mr. HUGHES:

1. How many persons are employed in the Printing Bureau now?
2. How many were there on or about December 23, 1910?
3. How many are Protestants, and how many are Roman Catholics?
4. Are there upwards of seven hundred persons employed in whole or in part at the Printing Bureau?
5. Is it true that of that number only about eighty are said to be Protestants and upwards of six hundred are Roman Catholics?
6. What is the reason for such recognition of ecclesiastical influence?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. 687 employees; 6 carters; 36 charwomen.
2. 682 employees; 6 carters; 36 charwomen.
3. The information asked for could not be obtained unless each employee of the Printing Bureau was questioned as to his or her religious belief, and the government is of opinion that in the public interest, it is not advisable that this should be done.

The Printing Bureau is a manufacturing establishment, and, in accordance with the rule that prevails in mercantile houses, the employees are engaged not on account of creed but because of their fitness for the work, which they are to perform.

4. Answered by reply to No. 1.
5. The statement, if made, would be untrue.
6. No such reason exists as ecclesiastical influence has neither been exerted nor recognized.

POSTMASTER GENERAL'S VISIT TO ROME.

* Mr. HUGHES:

1. What was the object of the mission of the honourable the Postmaster General to Rome as he returned from South Africa?

2. What correspondence, either by voice, letter, wire, or otherwise either direct with him or indirect through others, passed between the government or any member thereof and the honourable the Postmaster General concerning his visit to Rome?

3. What instructions, requests, or suggestions were indirectly or directly given him?

4. Has it been arranged with His Holiness the Pope of Rome that ecclesiastics of his church in Canada are commanded not to take, or are to be prevented taking, part in political discussions?

5. Has it been arranged with the aforesaid personage that the Nationalist party in Quebec is to be an ally of the Liberal party?

6. Why is it necessary in Canadian political affairs to obtain or to permit the intervention of His Holiness the Pope of Rome?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

The answer to all these questions, is simply that the Postmaster General had no mission to Rome.

SHAD FISHERIES.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. Who composed the commission that took evidence re shad fisheries in 1908?

2. What was the cost of said commission?

3. When may the House expect the report, and what is the reason of the long delay in presenting it?

4. Will the said report be printed, and when?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. S. F. Morrison, Halifax, Nova Scotia; Simon Melanson, Moncton, New Brunswick; E. E. Prince, Commissioner of Fisheries, Ottawa, Canada.

2. $2,651.07.

3. The report is now in the press, and will issue within a few days. The preparation of some shad fishery maps has delayed it.

4. Answered by No. 3.

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES.

* Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. What is the total amount of bounties paid by the present government since 1896 in connection with the steel, iron and other industries, respectively?

2. Before the government commits the country to the renewal of the iron and steel bounties, will parliament have an opportunity to discuss the advisability of such plan?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. From June 30, 1896, to January 31, 1911: iron and steel $16,315,862.00; lead, $1,580,793.37; manila fibre, $243,254.15; crude petroleum, $1,888,195.38.

2. The bounties can only be extended by proceedings which require legislative sanction.

Mr. HUGHES.

CANADIAN VETERANS AT CORONATION.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

Is it the intention of the government to include in the Canadian contingent at the Coronation any representatives of the veterans of 1866 and 1870?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

See unrevised 'Hansard,' p. 3346, 1st paragraph of answer to Mr. Middlebro's question as follows:

'It is proposed to send representatives of every regiment or independent unit of the permanent force and active militia, including departmental corps.

* * *

'Preference will also be given to those who have served in the field.'

So far as the above may include veterans of 1866 and 1870, they will be represented, but no special contingent of veterans will be sent.

ST. ANDREWS WHARF, P.Q.

Mr. PERLEY:

1. When were tenders called for building the proposed wharf at St. Andrews, Quebec?

2. Who were the individual tenderers, and what were the amounts they asked, respectively?

3. Has the contract been awarded? If so, to whom and at what price?

4. How much money has been spent in connection with this matter since March 31, 1910, and for what purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. September, 22, 1910.

2. Bridge and Wharf Builder Company, $3,245.00; G. R. Phillips, $3,790.00; Eugéne Patenaude, $3,837.00; G. P. McClintock, $4,120.00; James McAllister, $4,159.00; O. B. Lafleur & Fils, $4,320.00; John Guilbault, $10,500.00.

3. Yes, to the Bridge and Wharf Builder Company for $3,245.00.

4. $135.78 for advertising and printing.

THE RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the orders of the day are called I desire to ask a question of the government. On the front page of the Montreal 'Gazette' of this morning, I find the following:

Washington, D.C., February 14.—'We are preparing to annex Canada,' announced Champ Clark, leader of the Democratic party in the House of Representatives, in the course of the discussion on the proposed reciprocity treaty. Immediately after he had made that sensational statement, he and all the other Democrats except three from Louisiana, proceeded to vote for the passage of the reciprocity agreement.

As a result of Democratic support of the proposed treaty, the final vote by which it was passed in the House to-night showed 220 members to be for it and 92 against it. Eighty-nine representatives refused their support to a measure backed by a Republican president. On the other hand, with the exception of the three votes mentioned, all the Democrats supported the titular leader of the opposition party, a thing that has not happened in this country for many years.

Annexation of Canada was the keynote of the speech by Mr. Clark, who will be Speaker of the next house, in whipping the members of his party into line in support of the reciprocity agreement with Canada. Not once, nor twice, but thrice, did he boldly declare:

'We are preparing to annex Canada.'

Further down it says:

Mr. Clark, who at a public meeting yesterday joined with President Taft in advocating reciprocity between the United States and the whole world, has now called attention to the rumored movement of the 'one flag, the Stars and Stripes, from Central America to the north pole.'

Has the attention of the government been drawn to this matter? Have the government taken any cognizance of this statement, and if so what is their intention? Do they propose immediately withdrawing the reciprocity agreement if the foregoing report is verified.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not had my attention drawn to this until this moment, and I have only to say that the policy of the government is already settled on, but if some nefarious intention of the kind mentioned in this article should be put into action, I shall call upon my hon. friend as a gallant soldier to dispose of it.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the right hon. gentleman place the matter in my hands? If so, I shall proceed forthwith to Washington.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Might I ask whether, if the statement made by Mr. Clark, the leader of the Democrats, be true, will that in any way alter or influence the course of action of this government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I gave my answer a moment ago.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance what countries will come under the free list and the reduced list in the reciprocal arrangement with the United States. It seems to me that to give that information ought to be a simple matter. I asked my hon. friend, when he brought down the information we have already had, to include that in it. It must certainly be accessible because such a list was prepared in connection with the French treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend refer to the question put to-day by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to know to how many countries besides the United States will the proposed arrangement apply under the favoured nation treaty clause.

Mr. FIELDING. A memorandum was sent me answering the question as I came into the House, but I found it imperfect and thought better to let it stand over. The exact number of countries is twelve. I do not remember what countries they are, but they will be found in the published tariff list. The only qualification is that France is not a favoured nation country generally but to a limited extent. The list will be found in the customs tariff book, but I shall bring it down in a more formal way if my hon. friend wishes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In answer to a question my hon. friend said there were certain countries as to which he could answer definitely, but certain others as to which he could not and therefore I should like a definite statement as to which these countries are to which these provisions will certainly apply.

Mr. FIELDING. At earlier stages there were some doubts—perhaps I should not say difficulties—in answering the question because the imperial authorities were not very clear themselves as to the operation of all these old treaties, but there came a time, particularly in connection with the French treaty, when we had to determine officially what countries were so entitled. A list was then made up which will be found in the customs tariff book, but I shall bring it down in a more formal way.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask if, when these changes were being arranged in Washington, quarantine regulations were considered. The hon. minister will remember that some 30 or 40 years ago quarantine regulations were made by order in council under which live animals coming into Canada must have a certificate of health. For instance, in the case of hogs, a certificate was required from the parties who raised them that they were free from disease; but as I understand it, if hogs or other cattle went from Canada to the United States they did not require any certificate as there are no quarantine regulations in that country. You cannot, however, bring hogs into Canada under this arrangement unless you have those certificates which it is impossible for the pork packers to get.

Mr. FIELDING. The reciprocity arrangement does not touch on the question of quarantine regulations at all. Each country remains free to impose any quarantine regulations it may deem necessary either for public health or for the health of animals. That matter has not been dealt with at all.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BURRELL. Mr. Chairman, in continuing the remarks which I addressed to the House last night, I wish to refer for a few moments to the demand made by that great delegation of 800 fruit growers who came from Ontario generally and from the Niagara district in particular, and the Prime Minister's answer to them. They came to Ottawa on February 10 and on February 6 the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) asked the following question of the Prime Minister:

Mr. BLAIN. I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether or not serious consideration will be given to any special interest in Canada that may be affected by the proposed reciprocity arrangement should it become law? In the county I have the honour to represent there is a very strong feeling in respect to these matters. Throughout the western part of Ontario, at the present moment, large sums of money are being subscribed to send delegations to the government to explain the position of specific interests that will be affected if these tariff changes become law. Will the government give serious consideration to the representations of these interests if they are made to the government? I may anticipate by saying that a general answer that the government will listen to all complaints of everybody will not be quite sufficient. I want to know if the government will give serious consideration to these matters, or whether it will be better for these gentlemen to stay at home on the ground that this proposal will not be changed?

To this the Prime Minister replied:

We will give most serious consideration to all the interests represented, reserving our judgment.

I think the Prime Minister will frankly admit that the unanimous views of these men, practical fruit growers, all of them, men who are thoroughly familiar with the multitudinous details of their own special business, presented, the Prime Minister will also admit, in a fair and moderate and absolutely convincing manner, should have been listened to with a great deal of attention. From 1883 to 1899 I lived in that district, devoting myself entirely to fruit growing. I may fairly say that I know the conditions as no other man in the House knows them. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs could not have listened to that careful presentation backed by statistics, and presented not by opponents of this government, but largely by their political friends and not realize how grave an injustice had been done these great interests. I am not going to repeat those arguments, but two phases of this matter I will touch on for a minute. In that belt of country stretching from the Niagara river to the city of Hamilton, a country, Sir, which is the pride and delight of every Canadian who knows it, there are 1,000,000 peach trees in cultivation, roughly 10,000 acres. A low estimate of their value would be from three to five million dollars. There is absolutely no doubt that this special and vastly important branch of horticultural industry is grievously injured by these proposals. I can tell this House that western New York has been earnestly hoping for some such thing as this. Even with the duty it has been possible for some of the canners to buy at twenty cents a basket, or a cent a pound, on the New York side of the river, the duty protecting the Canadian grower so that he can get a livable price. Let me point out to the Prime Minister another grievous wrong done. Amongst other matter presented on that day was the following memorial:

To the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled:

We, the undersigned, the president and executive committee of the Old Country Association, composed entirely of men born and bred in the British Isles, and the great majority of whom are engaged in the fruit industry, respectfully and earnestly beg to draw the attention of the Dominion government to the peculiar hardship which will be imposed upon us should this proposed tariff legislation come into effect.

We have been induced to leave Great Britain, and to come to this peninsula, and to invest our capital in the purchase, planting and general improvement of fruit lands in a large measure owing to the very wide distribution of official pamphlets and other literature emanating from Canada, and distributed throughout the British Isles, positively stating that 'the Ontario grower is protected in the home market by a high tariff against foreign grown fruit and vegetables, and thus enjoys that market without serious competition from outside sources.'

The amount of customs tariffs on the various fruits is specifically stated in these pamphlets and literature; and in order that this particular advantage to the Canadian grower may be clearly understood by the Britisher, this tariff scale is not only set forth in Canadian money but is also set forth in the coinage of Great Britain. Under the belief that these conditions would be stable, we have not only sunk our own capital, but have been instrumental in bringing many of our countrymen here to invest in this growing industry, which owing to the steady rise of recent years in the values of land now requires a large amount of capital to purchase and equip even the small farms the majority of us own, and to provide for the maintenance

of our families during the years it takes to bring an orchard into bearing.

(Signed),WILLIAM BRIGGS,
President.
" R. Y. GRACE,
" H. LAMPARD,
" RICH. F. ROBINSON,
" A. BAKER,
" A. N. DAVIS,
Executive committee.

St. Catharines, Feb. 4, 1911.

Now, Sir, the facts are as stated. Some of these men, and there are a great number of them, were sent by the Dominion government officials to the officials of the Ontario government, because, as is natural, that government had special knowledge of the Ontario fruit districts. Canada invited them to come and embark their capital. Canada set forth the advantages they would get. Stability of tariff in relation to the fruit industry was assured them. They came, scores of them. They have been a splendid type of immigrant. These men have done what I wish Englishmen would do elsewhere, joined themselves together in an association to help others who come here in their initial steps; to assist them in learning to know Canada and to so adjust themselves to its conditions as to become worthy citizens of their adopted country. They have invested their thousands, and have in many cases brought their orchards almost to the bearing point. They have found it an expensive process, more especially as they had to pay, and still have to pay under these proposals, heavy duties on their spraying machines, their tools, their implements with which they had to equip themselves. Is it any wonder that this large body of men feel that Canada has betrayed them?

Sir, what was the character of the Prime Minister's answer to these 800 Canadian citizens? I do not want to use extravagant language; but no man can have heard the Prime Minister without feeling that it was a hopelessly trivial, unbusinesslike and disappointing answer that he gave. He made no attempt whatever to give a serious answer to a serious statement. He showed no appreciation of the issues involved. I do not expect that my right hon. friend should be intimately acquainted with the details of the fruit industry, but I did expect, and these men had the right to expect, that the First Minister of the country would at least have given an intelligible and intelligent answer to their presentment. He told them that the Canadian orchards were the finest in the world—that the Montreal melon was eaten in New York. If he attempted any answer at all to arguments, it was this, that some time before a delegation of farmers had come to the government, and that amongst them the fruit interests were voiced in favour of free fruit, and therefore, as the opinion of the growers was a divided opinion, the government found it a difficult matter to deal with. Sir, if the delegation on December 16 from the west had been a delegation of the fruit growers of the Dominion, I could understand such a reply; but what are the facts? One gentleman from Nova Scotia spoke—and I have already dealt with this statement and shown that the Prime Minister cannot shelter himself there. One man from New Brunswick spoke, and I cannot find that he spoke with authority even from that province; but his remarks were to the effect that he would find a better market for his hay and potatoes and turnips in the United States, and would have saved $200 on his strawberry crop by free fruit. Sir, it is almost inconceivable that the Prime Minister of this country could cite such evidence in detail as a reason for refusing these eight hundred men, and the thousands whom they represented, their requests. One man also from Ontario spoke, an apple grower of Norfolk who has had business connections in the United States for some time past and is interested in shipping some of his fruit in that direction. But even from Norfolk much of the fruit has gone to the prairies, where it will now not be able to withstand the free competition from the western states, and I may point out that even if every Norfolk apple grower wanted free fruit, which is far from being the fact, Norfolk county, excellent district though it may be, is only tenth in the list of the fruit growing counties of Ontario. Its orchard areas are not so valuable as the single strip of peach area to which I have alluded, and not one-tenth of the area of British Columbia, where the damage brought by these proposals is deplorable. Yet, Sir, this was all the argument brought to the consideration of this great delegation's case.

I have read the report of the western farmers' delegation very carefully. They stated that they had come to Ottawa at great expense and inconvenience, but that they felt justified in incurring it all in order to show the government they were in earnest. Sir, was that still greater delegation on February 10, representing the fruit industry, less in earnest? In the report of the western farmers' delegation 17 pages are taken up in a lengthy plea for government ownership and operation of terminal elevators—this was what they pleaded for at greatest length; 3½ pages in a plea for the establishment of the chilled meat industry, 7 pages in urging the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, and

amendments to the Railway Act, 8 pages in dealing with the customs tariff, chiefly, I might almost say solely, with the argument for a lowering of the duties on manufactures and on easier entry into the United States' markets for grain and cattle. One of the most forcible addresses on customs tariff matters was from Mr. Thos. McMillan. He said on page 43:

> We come before you asking no favours, but we claim that agriculture should under the tariff be placed on an equal footing with the other industrial enterprises of the land.

That applies with equal force to the horticulturists. Let me commend it to the Minister of Customs. But, Sir, in the whole of this report there is but a scant page which deals at all with fruit, and which even then deals with it in the fragmentary and unrepresentative way which I have already touched on. To say that the western farmers were making the abolition of the fruit duties an important part of their case is to mistake plain facts. To say that the fruit interests were in any adequate way represented at that time is also entirely contrary to the facts. The Prime Minister may have been in a tight place—he may have already made up his mind; but it would have been fairer to have told these men not to come than to have treated them in so shabby, so unconvincing, so hopelessly inadequate a manner. Man after man, family after family, in that district will see his business prospects clouded, will see his long years of waiting unrewarded; and it leaves but a bitter taste in the mouth to be told in reply that they must go home and sacrifice themselves and their hopes—not, as the Prime Minister suggested, for other horticulturists, but for other and not more important interests, who are being catered to by these proposals.

Now, Sir, I wish to turn for a short time to the case of the fruit growing industry in my own province of British Columbia. In no part of Canada is this national industry hit with equal force by the proposals before the House. Not within the whole range of our economic history in Canada can there be found so strong an instance of a great industry, which has deserved, and has had some encouragement and some aid from all governments, being deprived of such help without the shadow of an equivalent, or of compensation. I can emphatically state that the pressure of the western fruit-growing states, which are already faced with great difficulties in disposing of their large surplus of second grade fruit, is responsible for President Taft's desire to obtain the privilege of free entry into Canadian markets.

The very first fruit trees planted in British soil west of the Rocky mountains were planted in the life time of many members in this House. Until the eighties the vast interior of the province was practically a terra incognita. Such settlements as there were made under unusual hardships and drawbacks. The trees for the earlier orchards were, in many cases, brought hundreds of miles on horseback over dangerous and difficult mountain trails. Mining and cattle ranching formed the chief activities of the huge, but sparsely settled, country. But there were not wanting evidences of the special suitability of the climate and soil for the production of fruit. The coming of the Canadian Pacific railway stimulated the work, but even up to 1891 but slow progress had been made, and it was not until 1897 that the first shipment of fruit was sent beyond the limits of the province itself. Commercial horticulture in British Columbia practically commenced then, commenced when this government had decided that fruit-growing was still to have something approaching to a fair measure of protection in common with other Canadian industries. In 1901, ten short years ago, our industry was still small, 567,000 trees representing the orchards of that far west. We have had the faith and energy to build it up under conditions more expensive and difficult than those ever faced in other fruit-growing districts of Canada. We have had to bear the enormous cost of clearing land of our heavy timber and immense outlays in engineering works for irrigation purposes.

I may point out to hon. members that in one valley alone, the Okanagan, $1,500,000 have already been spent in irrigation works for orchard purposes and vast outlays of the same kind are going on all over the province at the present time. We have had, and yet have, unusual difficulties in transportation, owing not a little to the mountainous character of the whole country. We have had, in addition, always a scarcity of labour, with a corresponding high remuneration. We have had little or no help in procuring more labour or additional settlers. I might refer ministers to a speech in this House in 1907 delivered by the former member for Yale-Cariboo, in which he pointed out to the government which he supported that they had done nothing to assist in solving this problem. Yet, Sir, in spite of these things, we have progressed to an extent that in the past ten years we have increased our orchards one thousand per cent, and to-day have 5,000,000 trees. It is a record that should be a source of pride, not only to ourselves, but to every true Canadian who realizes that the sound development of the Pacific coast province is as vital to the welfare of the nation as the development of the east. But although we have made rapid progress we are still only in the beginning of things. Immense tracts of land are in process of

being subdivided, and of being turned into more orchards. As yet but a small percentage of our trees are in bearing. Thousands of men have spent their all in the expensive work of bringing their small holdings to a stage when they will see some reward for their labours, and it is a deplorable and cruel proposal put forward by this government, for the wiping out of the moderate tariff assistance now in force can be described in no other terms.

What is our position? Our natural, our great market is in the Canadian prairies. We face there competition from our sister province Ontario, whose friendly rivalry we do not deplore. But we face, also, a much more dangerous and fierce competition from the Pacific coast states. Absolutely no argument can be advanced to show that British Columbia has an equivalent in the form of a market in those states. Their markets are glutted with their own products, and each of the great fruit-producing states is exporting an enormous annual surplus. California, besides her vast exports of citrus fruits, exported this last year 14,050 cars of such fruits as we grow in British Columbia and Ontario. A careful estimate of existing conditions indicates a twenty per cent increase in their output annually for the next few years. I submit an extract from a report carefully prepared by the chief of the horticultural department in British Columbia dealing with production last year:

Apricots—Wenatchee valley, 300 cars, Yakima valley, 12 cars, other producers, 15 cars.

This is in the state of Washington alone.

Peaches—Wenatchee valley, 300 cars, Yakima valley, 1,000 cars, other districts in Idaho and Washington, 300 cars. Total, 1,600 cars. The tremendous preponderance of these districts in peaches over British Columbia districts resulted in a bad glut and low prices this year. In plums the American side produces principally the Italian prune. The Williamette valley put up 200 cars of the dried article. Washington valleys shipped 100 cars of the fresh fruit, and southern Idaho shipped 450 to 500 cars. This latter district broke the market for British Columbia prunes and made the season, while not disastrous, one of quite low prices.

Apples—Yakima valley, actual shipment about 2,800 cars. Wenatchee, 2,000 cars. Walla Walla and Dayton not quite 400 cars. Mood river, 500.

And many other similar returns from the innumerable well established fruit valleys of the whole of the northwest states.

In apples the tremendous production indicated above broke the market latterly.

The market referred to is our own prairie country.

And No. 1 Rome Beauties are being offered in Calgary laid down at $1.45, which equals $1.10 in the Okanagan valley for high class fruit. The total yield in the States west of the Rockies, including Colorado, this year was close to 15,000 cars.

A typical illustration of these valleys is that of Yakima, in Washington. A recent sketch in the 'World of To-day' magazine contains the following:

Yakima valley is 200 miles long. The Yakima river extending through the valley irrigates the immense orchards. The acreage in full bearing is relatively small, but there are in different stages of bearing about 18,000 acres principally apples, peaches and pears. There are at present 45,000 acres set to fruit and the acreage adapted is fully double that now planted. The shipments for 1910 are upwards of 5,000 carloads of which 3,000 carloads are apples.

Now Sir, the tale of this great horticultural field in the western states might be extended, but I have already given the House a sufficient idea of the standing of our competitors. With this enormous output, it is obvious that profitable markets are a matter of keen anxiety to the United States. And here I might read part of a speech of President Taft as showing why they want these markets and why, from their point of view, this agreement should be put through. President Taft said:

We have, with pioneer energy, pushed on to the Pacific, and taken up all the good land. We are now spending millions to reclaim the arid and semi-arid lands of the great western desert.

They are reclaiming these lands for the purpose of extending their fruit ranches.

Should we not, by taking down a useless and unnecessary tariff wall, bring within our agricultural resources the great plains of the Canadian Northwest?

In other words: Should not we get this duty removed in order that we may get the enormous Canadian market in the Northwest.

The United States secured for the farmers the free listing of such important agricultural products as cottonseed oil, all kinds of fruits and vegetables, timothy and clover seeds, eggs, and numerous other products in which the movement to Canada from the United States is much greater than from Canada to the United States.

I think it is absolutely clear what President Taft intended, and what is the knowledge on this particular matter of the men on the other side of the line.

The transportation rates of Washington and Oregon to Winnipeg are as favourable, if not more so, than our own. American capital is already quite heavily interested in the wholesale trade in the western provinces. The wholesalers who have American connections, keep in constant touch with the shipping houses and pack-

ing firms of Washington and Oregon. The highest class fruit is customarily shipped eastwards to the big American cities, to which they get a more ready access than we could ever hope for. The tremendous surplus is forcing its way into our own market, competing against our No. 1 stock and often beating down our prices to a point none too profitable for us, but which their growers accept rather than get nothing. Much of the fruit is bought outright f.o.b., on the American side, but Sir, in addition to the great quantity of cars handled in this way, there were this last season, 95 cars sent into our prairie markets on consignment—not ordered, but literally dumped—the growers of Washington and Oregon prepared to take whatever a commission house could procure. These conditions obtain with a duty of 13 cents a case on apples, 20 cents a case on peaches and 10 cents a case on plums. What will happen when that duty is wiped out? I need not point out that the danger to the Ontario and especially to the British Columbia, producer, is not only the loss of the amount of the duty, but the fiercer competition from those large and ever-growing areas which will naturally deflect a far greater volume of their products when even that slight barrier is swept away. If it is retorted that we have just as good a country and should be able to hold our own on equal terms, I can but reply that the terms at the present time are not equal. To say nothing of the handicap which a business in its constructive stage must always have as against a powerful rival firmly established. I may point out that our costs of production are greater than those of our southern competitor. I again quote from a careful report made to our Provincial Association:

In the Rogue river valley, Southern Oregon, a team costs $4 to $5 per day, as against our $6 and $7. Day labour is from $1.50 up to $1.75 as against our $2.50. The average cost of packing apples is 6 to 7 cents a box as against our 8 to 10 cents. The boxes themselves cost 10 to 11 cents as against our 14 cents. In the apple districts of eastern Washington prices are somewhat in advance of these, but as a rule prices for labour and boxes are 25 per cent cheaper than in British Columbia. Our selling prices, however, must be based on those of our competitors who are operating under those more favourable conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to place the claims and the position of the British Columbia producer as fairly as I could before the House. It is the same position that was taken in 1907 when the last tariff revision took place, a revision which slightly increased the fruit duties. At that time the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), remarked that it was a tariff which applied to the whole Dominion of Canada and he urged members to look upon it from the standpoint from which the Finance Minister felt it to be his duty to look at it—that is—and I quote his exact words (Hansard 1907): 'to see what he could do that would be fair to all parts of the country.' No further hearing was given to the fruit-growing interests before this blow fell. There was a bare possibility that our fruit interest might be endangered by pressure from Washington and accordingly, the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association at a representative meeting in Toronto on November 17 last, passed the following resolution:

Resolved, that in view of the possible negotiations with the United States in regard to reciprocity of tariffs, the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association wish to put on record our unqualified disapproval of any reduction in the duties on fruit coming into Canada without consulting a committee to be appointed by this association, the same being now much lower on an average than the duties on manufactured goods and lower than they ought to be in view of the fact that there can be no monopoly or combine in fruits, the prices being fixed absolutely by the law of supply and demand within the Dominion, which contains ample territory suitable to produce in the utmost profusion all the fruits that the country can consume for at least many decades to come, which insures that the consumer cannot be injured in the long run, and the fruit industry can be extended in proportion to the growth of the population with some assurance of a permanent market at home.

Now, Sir, I desire to call the attention of the House particularly to two points in connection with this matter. The Prime Minister hinted to the delegation of fruit growers the other day that they were too late, that their views should have been made known when the western farmers' delegation presented their case on December 16. Sir, this very resolution which I have read was forwarded to the Minister of Customs, and he acknowledged receipt of it, on December 15, the day before the western farmers were heard. But, Sir, the report of the western farmers' meeting, the report which I hold in my hand, contains a resolution specifically setting forth the views of the fruit growers along the very lines of the other resolution which I have read. I will not read the resolution, it can be found in the earlier part of this report, and is from the Niagara District Fruit Growers' Association, and is along the same lines. It was brought before this House, or telegraphed, on the same day. Does the Prime Minister think that these subterfuges were creditable to him? Did he think they were likely to deceive those men who came up here? Should it ever be too late to keep faith? Should it ever be too late to fulfil promises? Should it ever be too

late to do justice to the people of this country? Now, in addition to the resolution to which I have referred, there was another one passed almost a year ago by the British Columbia Fruit Growers' Association. On January 7, before these proposals were put into effect, the British Columbia Fruit Growers' Association, in annual convention, passed this resolution:

That this representative meeting of British Columbia fruit growers is absolutely opposed to any reduction on fruit entering Canada, as such action will undoubtedly result in great loss to the fruit industry here in its present stage of development.

Now, when I was speaking here last night, urging upon the Minister of Customs that the condition of the fruit industry had not altered since 1907, except in the direction of making a still stronger case, the minister took a rather curious stand. Hon. gentlemen who were here will remember that he interrupted me and claimed that I was not fair in my presentation, and that the conditions were different, as we would now have free entry into the United States. In all, or nearly all, the resolutions recently dealt with, the consistent plea is for retention of our duty. Where we have asked for equalization or revision, it has been for revision upwards on a scale something like that of the United States. Equalization by the abolition of all duties would not be equalization, but it would be the absolute destruction of those interests. No fruit grower ever dreamed of abolishing the Canadian duties. Why, Sir, the minister was there for the express purpose of guarding those interests. If he, who should have known the facts, has allowed himself to be over-reached, or to be out-played by the great fruit interests of the United States, upon him and upon this government the responsibility must rest, and for ourselves we can only regard it as the most culpable negligence on their part. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to this point.

Mr. HUGHES. The Minister of Customs is not here.

Mr. BURRELL. I very much regret that the Minister of Customs is not in his place, the Minister of Finance is not in his place, and the Prime Minister is not here either, when a great national industry is being menaced with destruction. I am glad my hon. friend has called attention to the fact that they are absent. I must say that when the only fruit grower in this House, representing this enormous industry, is doing his level best to put a moderate and fair presentation of the case before the House, and to protest against the proposal to destroy this industry, one of these ministers ought to be in his place to listen to the case.

Mr BORDEN (Halifax). I would suggest to my hon. friend that he move that the committee rise until we can get some of the ministers present.

Mr. BURRELL. I understand that the Minister of Customs is not very far away. But I think the suggestion of the leader of the opposition is one that should commend itself to this committee, and I beg to move that the committee rise and report progress, or rise until a minister comes in.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can move that the committee rise and report progress, but he cannot move that it rise for the other reason given.

Mr. BURRELL. Well, I move, then—Ah, here is the minister. Now, Mr. Chairman, that we have got one of these gentlemen back in his seat, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to a point which he did not seem to understand last night. I regret, of course, that he has not been able to follow me when I quoted the resolutions which bore on that matter, but if he will carefully read the various resolutions to which I have referred, he will note that the one from the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association, which he received and acknowledged the day before the western farmers' delegation came here, plainly put on record its 'unqualified disapproval of any reduction of duties,' and it states that the duties are now 'lower than they ought to be.' The resolution from the Niagara district, to which I have referred also, urges that the present duties, if continued, will be to the advantage of the country. The whole argument is against the abolition of duty. The British Columbia resolution urges in positive terms that no reduction be made. Now, Sir, these protests came to this government before the reciprocity proposals were known, and since the nature of these proposals has become known to every industry of Canada, and since the intention of the government has been disclosed, the government is aware that petition after petition, resolution after resolution, have been sent in, and all these are along the same lines, deprecating a reduction of duty, and pointing out the grave nature of the injury to the fruit industry of British Columbia especially. I have many of them here, and not a day passes without more of them coming. Here is one from a district where the fruit interests are as great as those of the whole province of Nova Scotia. I refer now to the valley of the Okanagan. I received this letter only yesterday, and there is with it a resolution from the Associated Boards of Trade of the Okanagan valley. I call upon the Minister of Customs, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Inland Revenue, who have all been down in that district, to pay par-

ticular attention to this resolution. I received this yesterday, but it was dated five or six days ago:

Associated Boards of Trade for the Okanagan Valley.
Office of the Secretary,
Vernon, B.C.

Copy of Resolution.

That the Associated Boards of Trade for the Okanagan Valley at their annual meeting now assembled urged in the strongest manner upon the Dominion government the absolute necessity of maintaining the present import duty on fruit as from the United States.

The fruit industry in British Columbia is in the infant stage with great possibilities which has been stated by responsible men will equal the lumber industry of the province, and at present stage requires careful handling and fostering. There are millions of dollars invested in the fruit industry in the province more than in the farm implement business of Ontario which has been nursed and protected; by so doing these factories of Canada are classed in this line as the leading industries of the world. Without this protection through their growing years these magnificent plants now employing thousands would never have existed. The same applies to the British Columbia fruit industry in which the growers have invested many millions of dollars, besides the very large investments of capital in irrigation systems running into millions of dollars.

The necessity of a protection duty outside the fostering of a young and promising industry, is the undeniable fact that the natural market for British Columbia, 'The Northwest Territories' is made the dumping ground for surplus fruit from the Northwestern States which already possess a large and fully developed fruit industry and the pernicious action of consignment is resorted to on a large scale. It is well taken that the fruit growers are entitled to have their rights guarded the same as has been the case for other enterprises.

Now, the Prime Minister knows something of the development in that country. The Minister of Agriculture has been over a considerable portion of the fruit districts of British Columbia. He stayed in the great peach district along the Okanagan lake. He knows, or ought to know, what positive and direct injury and discouragement will be inflicted on that section of British Columbia. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) told the House the other day that as a bachelor he had great difficulty in living on $9,500.

Mr. FISHER. I said I had no difficulty in doing it.

Mr. BURRELL. I certainly understood the hon. gentleman to suggest that he had all he could do to live comfortably on it.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman entirely misunderstood me.

Mr. BURRELL. Did not the minister say that while he could live on $9,500 a year it was very difficult, indeed, for a minister with a family to properly support that family on that income?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I did.

Mr. BURRELL. Now I will say that if ministers with families are hard put to it to keep within their salaries of $9,500 a year, if $2,000 or $3,000 a year was struck off from the minister's salaries what a dismal howl of lamentation, what tearful, what indignant protests would we not hear from the Minister of Agriculture when he came to address the House? Yet, that is what the Minister of Agriculture and the government practically propose to do to the peach and other fruit growers of British Columbia—to knock off a large portion of their income. The ministers sit comfortably in their seats with their emoluments undiminished and yet with a light heart they hit right and left at other people's slender earnings. These are things that sink deeply into the mind and will not be very easily forgotten. I have under my hand here a number of resolutions along the same line as those to which I have referred. I am not going to read them all, but I will just mention some of them. Here is one of the Metchosin Farmers' Institute, in the riding of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith); the Victoria Fruit Growers' Association; the Hammond Fruit Association; the Kamloops district and the large and important Kootenay district embracing an enormous territory from all the sections of which there came delegates to a large meeting at Nelson, when a resolution of strongest protest was passed unanimously.

What has the government to say in reply? Last session I asked the hon. Minister of Customs—he will remember it—to remit the duty on an ambulance for hospital purposes in my own town. He replied that one firm was manufacturing ambulances, and that it would not be fair. We paid a duty of 35 per cent, amounting in that case to over $200. Does the minister still think it is a fair tariff which wipes off the duty on a whole industry and charges 35 per cent on such articles for the benefit of one man? Last fall I purchased a wagon which was needed quickly. It came from Washington state. I paid 25 per cent duty. Under the present proposals it will still be 22½ per cent. Does the Minister of Customs think it fair to charge me 22½ per cent on a wagon with which to help produce my fruit and wipe out the moderate protection of 13 cents a case on that fruit?

The Minister of Finance reduces the duty on agricultural implements by the insignificant amount of two and a half per cent and says:

We trust that while these reductions may not be all the farmers want, they will be evi-

dence of the desire of the government to meet their views without doing any injustice to the industries of Canada.

Does he in truth consider that he has done us no injustice? In common with other men, what does the British Columbia fruit grower pay in the way of enhanced prices for other people's protection and benefit?

He produces food in the shape of fruit himself protected by a duty of from 10 to 20 per cent, and off goes his protection. He buys amongst other food products:

Coffee, on which he pays three cents a pound.

Canned vegetables—still a cent and a quarter.

Sugar—which a Conservative government made free and on which he has now to pay a heavy tax.

Meats, bacon, hams, on which he will still have to pay a cent and a quarter per pound.

Biscuits, on which he will still have to pay from 20 to 32½ per cent to help the Canadian manufacturer.

How as to his other necessaries?

On the buggy, with which he drives to his town, 35 per cent.

Machinery of various kinds severely taxed.

Nails, of which he uses large amounts, 50 cents per 100 pounds.

Cotton manufactures, 35 per cent and 25 per cent, even to Great Britain.

Silk manufactures, 30 per cent to England, and more to the United States manufacturer.

His gloves, his hat, his caps 35 per cent, and 22½ to Great Britain.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker; Great Britain, the author of our free institutions, the guardian of our liberties on all seas, penalised heavily in our own markets, a penalty which the fruit grower has to pay, while the products of his foreign rival enters without let or hindrance to cut the ground from under the feet of the British subject.

In Heaven's name, Mr. Speaker, do not let us play the hypocrite in this matter. If along the line of all our expenditures we have to pay the tax gatherer and get absolutely no protection for our own industry, it would be more manly, more honest, more just, to clean the slate, buy in the cheapest market, sell in the dearest, and resort to direct taxation.

The consumer in the prairie provinces is said to ask for free fruit. Sir, there was last year brought into Canada from the United States $4,634,268 worth of fruit. Of this amount $3,428,722 came in absolutely free. That is, for every dollar spent on fruit which is protected in the interest of the Canadian grower, there are three spent on fruit which bears no duty.

But having made it harder to enter our own market the government turns round and in this very same proposal creates difficulties for us in other markets. We have been endeavouring to get a market in Australia for our British Columbia apples and from my own valley we have already sent several carloads. Australia has a tariff against apples of two shillings a cental—75 cents a barrel. There was a reasonable hope that we could get this duty lowered by making concession ourselves, but Sir, under these very resolutions which we are discussing, the government proposes to wipe off our duties on Australian lumber, butter and all other things which are given to the United States free, thus rendering it out of our power to get a lower tariff against our apples by a friendly bargain with Australia.

To some small extent we are preparing for the English market, but Sir, anyone who knows anything at all of these matters, knows that special markets require special lines of products, special varieties, and the fruit grower with years of work behind him in growing his orchards cannot start all over again without disaster. In so far as they affect British Columbia horticulture the proposals are stamped with a lack of business acumen, an unfair discrimination, a wanton disregard of the interests affected which would be incredible if we had not the plain facts before us.

We may confidently believe that the prairie farmer, when he understands this question, will not harbour any wish to injure the business of his brother farmer to the west. The average man in the prairies would probably not buy two barrels of apples a year. If he paid the whole duty, he would pay 80 cents. For 80 cents a year would he be willing to inflict a blow, however slight, to extend discouragement, however small, to the farmer of British Columbia? I cannot so believe. Surely when we have problems of an extraordinary kind to face in the great Orient it is absolutely vital to the British farmer in the three great prairie provinces, that our waste spaces should be peopled by men of his own white race. Facing the teeming millions of the Orient, we have in the future, perhaps in the not far distant future, problems of a grave, of a portentous nature. Can Canadians on the prairies afford to withhold a helping hand to an industry which is doing more than all other agencies combined to fill the vast interior of our province with a class of men who stand for Anglo-Saxon civilization, who stand for Canadian solidarity, who stand staunchly for imperial citizenship. I cannot believe that, understanding this question in its full import, the men of the prairies would endorse a proposal which, though it may involve what may seem to some a slight injury, yet is an undoubted injury in that, it checks rapid develop-

ment of fruit-growing and the farming population. If I did believe that a savage hunt for the dollar was the dominating principle of our life—that every man and every province would ruthlessly pursue their own interests absolutely regardless of the hurt to others—that the knife was to be plunged into a Canadian brother for the sake of personal gain, then, Sir, I should indeed despair of our citizenship and could but say: God help this confederation which was built up on very different and very much more noble principles.

Sir, why did British Columbia enter confederation? There was much to lose, there was much opposition—but the deep-rooted, the passionate desire to see a great highway from east to west, in order that scattered peoples holding the same traditional faiths, might become one nation, overcame every obstacle. The echoing thunder of the first transcontinental train as it swept through the Fraser canyon to the Pacific coast, meant much for Canada. It meant not only that it was possible for east to trade with west, it stood for the close linking of province to province, of brother to brother, in ties of sentiment as well as ties of commerce.

I have said we lost much. That is too long a story to tell now, but I may remind the House that, owing to the exceptional and difficult character of our great mountainous country, we have faced a burden of administrative expenditure utterly out of proportion to any other province in the Dominion. We received an absolutely inadequate compensation financially, and that fact has been recognized, though somewhat late in the day, by the Prime Minister. But I will say to the Minister of Finance especially, that we in British Columbia accepted the responsibilities, the obligations, the burdens of confederation, though we have tried and shall still try to get them honourably and equitably adjusted. But the Minister of Finance with less reason, with far less justification than ourselves, was the man, who himself, preached a fiery and bitter crusade throughout his own province, with disruption of confederation as his text. He, of all men, knowing at least something of our difficulties, should be the last man in Canada to add another pound to our burden.

My right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, cherishes a grievance against British Columbia. He has himself to blame for the fact that the whole province is solidly arrayed against him. But, Sir, additional injustice meted out to the people of the far west is not the way to heal old wounds. No one should know better than the Prime Minister, that the alienation of a whole province is a bitter and irrefutable proof that his government has not dealt justly with British Columbia. No additional harshness of treatment can strengthen my right hon. friend's hold on the popular heart, it will lead inevitably to the further weakening of himself and his party throughout Canada.

Sir, this is a movement, confessedly initiated by the United States for their own purpose. It is in some respects a ceding of our own control over our own destiny. If consummated, it will loosen and not tighten existing ties between province and province. We who have for years purchased hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of products from our prairie friends will find ourselves compelled to buy from the immediate south, from the foreign producer. It does irreparable harm to our interprovincial trade—it lessens the national feeling of the people of Canada and turns their energies in new directions. It means the exploiting of our natural resources and raw materials by a people who will expend their own energies and labour in the varied work of turning out the finished article. If it is an economic truth that every import must be paid for by an export, then our natural products, finding their market in the United States, will soon be paid for by a great flow of their manufactured goods.

If it has a shattering effect on our interprovincial trade and puts a new face on our national life, it also foreshadows possible changes in our political future. I have only to allude to the item in to-day's paper, already referred to, the statement that the annexation of Canada, was the keynote of Mr. Clarke, Speaker of the House, in whipping the members of his party into line in support of the reciprocity agreement. Not once or twice, but thrice, did he boldly declare: We are preparing to annex Canada. In the light of these words, there is some ground for that noble and passionate appeal in the closing words of the speech delivered yesterday by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who said:

> This is our land, and please God we will keep it for our children and our children's children. This proposal cuts square across our national ideas and will endanger them. We should think well before entering upon it. The path we are about to enter leads from home; it should not be entered upon lightly.

I do not say that we in British Columbia are more imperial, more anxious than our fellow Canadians in other provinces to strengthen the bonds which bind us to the mother country, but British Columbia, of all the great provinces which form this confederation, would be most loth to see any step taken which would conceivably end in sharing the political future of that great country to the south, and in this proposal, we see nothing that strengthens

the grip of hands across the sea, but much that weakens it. The pact was unnecessary, the arrangements as a whole, have dangerous tendencies, and the scheme involves a grave injustice to one large body of Canadian producers and citizens.

No redress for plain grievances. No remedies for obvious injuries; take it or leave it, says the government. Have it all, or have none. Sir, I say for myself then, and I think I speak for my constituents too, I want none of it.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). Mr. Chairman, like every hon. member in this House I realize the magnitude and the importance of the question now before you and the great influence which it will, in all human probability, exert upon the future of this country. I happen, in this debate, to follow my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) who has devoted by far the greater part of his remarks, to one particular branch of the subject, namely the effect of the present proposals upon the fruit industry in this country. I do not for a moment claim to have the knowledge of my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo either in regard to fruit or in regard to general conditions in British Columbia. It was, I believe, arranged that my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith), who is at present indisposed and has sickness in his family, should reply to the speech of the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo, and I think that I had better leave that task to my hon. friend from Nanaimo, who expects shortly to be present again in his seat. But there are a great many general principles involved in this question which can be, and should be discussed by members from the various sections of Canada, not as they pertain to local or special interests, but as they bear upon the whole trade and future development of this great country. This is the eleventh session that I have had the honour of occupying a seat in this House. I represent a riding in the central portion of western Ontario having a population equally divided between rural and urban. The whole county of Wellington may be said to be a fair average of the counties in the western portion of the province. Its industries are similar to those of neighbouring counties such as Waterloo, Oxford, Perth, Brant, Huron, Grey, Bruce, Dufferin and other counties. These are all to a considerable extent manufacturing counties, but to a very much larger extent agricultural counties. The agriculture carried on in my own county is not the agriculture which is carried on in the west. It is not to any large extent a grain-producing county. What grain we do produce is largely consumed in the feeding of live-stock, which may be said to be the leading farm operation of the county. Consequently the county of Wellington is very greatly interested in the proposals now before the Chair. The grain we produce is fed to a high-bred class of cattle. We raise beef cattle for the supply of the local market, the Toronto market, and very largely, at certain times of the year, the Ottawa market ; but by far the larger portion of our cattle industry is concerned with foreign markets. We have in the county of Wellington a large class of pure-bred cattle, sheep, hogs and poultry. A casual drive through any part of the county of Wellington during the summer time would serve as an eye-opener to many people in regard to the conditions as they exist among the rural population of that county. I would like to take my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on a short trip through the riding of South Wellington, and let him see the class of people who are engaged in the great farming industry there. I realize that these proposals affect my constituents directly. I realize also that I represent a city population of 16,000 people, living in the city of Guelph, as well as five villages, each containing some manufacturing industry besides the ordinary village population. I believe that the various classes of the population are all vitally interested in these proposals ; and, having given them my best consideration and judgment, I have come to the conclusion that it is of the greatest interest to the county from which I come, and to all counties similarly situated in the western portion of the province of Ontario, that this measure be adopted by this House.

In this instance I desire to follow the lead and the good example set by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in dealing with this question. He discussed it in what I consider the best parliamentary form—not from the standpoint of party politics at all ; but he gave us what I assume was from his point of view his reasoned judgment—his conclusions and the reasons for those conclusions ; and while I do not agree with him, I do not think I can do better than follow his manner and method in presenting my case to the House. I may say also for the hon. member of the opposition who also preceded me (Mr. Martin Burrell), that he argued his case from his point of view without that asperity, that bitterness, which we frequently have in this House over questions which should be argued rather on their merits. I regret that I cannot endorse or approve of the method adopted by my hon. friend from North Toronto, who, I am sorry to see, is not in his place this afternoon. It might be the part of presumption for me to offer any suggestions to the hon. member for North Toronto as to parliamentary style or as to the method or manner of presenting his case ; but were

he in his seat I would tell him that if his speech were stripped of its rhetoric, if the feathers and the plumage were taken from it, and we came down to the facts he presented and the arguments he sought to make, we would find that the speech was perhaps the most meagre and insubstantial that he has delivered in this House. I hope to be able to show before I conclude that some of the arguments he presented are absolutely without foundation, or, if they have a foundation, he certainly did not reveal that foundation to the House. Some of them are ridiculous and some of them absolute absurdities. I believe that the hon. member for North Toronto himself realized that, and hence we find him in his best declamatory style, a style of parliamentary eloquence which during the last half-century has, I think, rather dropped out—if not in this House, certainly in the Imperial House of Commons, where all that they ask is the facts and the arguments, waiving the declamation.

It has been said in this debate that it would be well for the government to withdraw this measure for the present. It has been suggested that the House has not had sufficient information on the subject. I take issue with that statement. This question has been very prominently before Canada for a year at least, since March, 1910, in the newspapers, on the platforms, in political arguments at various places. Every man of ordinary intelligence knew that it would be a subject for discussion in this House, and I am sure that hon. members of this House have canvassed the situation and canvassed it pretty thoroughly. That of course was only as the question presented itself in abstract form, but since the 26th January last, we have had it presented in concrete form, with all the details and information necessary to enable us to give it full consideration and form an independent and calm judgment upon it. The ordinary channels have been open to all hon. members. We have been educated by the press, by the representations of deputations, by communications from our constituents and by petitions of various kinds, and we have had at our disposal a very complete summary of the whole case in the tariff blue-book handed to the House some ten days ago, so that if any hon. gentleman should complain that he has not sufficient information on the subject, I can only say that he has not shown the necessary energy and perseverance, because otherwise he would have had all the information he could possibly desire to enable him to pass an intelligent judgment on the question. It has been said also that there is no demand for any such measure. Where is the demand, has been asked? Whence does it come? Why, it almost seems waste of time to answer such a question, but for the purpose of my argument I desire to do so; and I state without hesitation that there has not been a period in this country since 1866 down to the present year of grace when there has not been a positive demand in Canada for better trade relations with the United States. And that demand has not been a dormant one, but one made public in many ways and on many occasions. Nor has it been the demand of one political party or one political leader, but from every government and from the whole population of Canada; and I desire, even at the expense of a few moments of our valuable time, to relate something of the history of that demand.

In the first place the old reciprocity treaty was abrogated in 1866. Sir Alexander Gault and Sir William Howland representing Canada, and Mr. Smith and Mr. Henry representing Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, proceeded to Washington and remained there a couple of weeks before the abrogation and pleaded to get a new treaty. In this they failed. Confederation came in 1867, and our first tariff Act in 1868 expressed our demand for reciprocity by containing a clause stating our readiness to enter into such a treaty. In 1869 another demand was made on Washington by the government of Sir John Macdonald. That government despatched Sir John Rose to Washington to obtain reciprocity, but he also failed. In 1871, I think it was, another deputation went to Washington, headed by Sir John Macdonald, when the treaty of Washington was negotiated, and again a demand was made for reciprocity and again refused. The government of Mr. Alexander Mackenzie, which came into office in 1874, sent a deputation to Washington with Hon. George Brown at its head. As the result of their mission, a draft treaty was submitted to the Senate of the United States which that body refused to pass. In 1879, there came a change of government, and the tariff policy of the Conservative government contained a statutory offer to the United States for reciprocal tariff legislation or reciprocity. Then we come down to 1891 when Sir John Macdonald put himself on formal record in regard to that matter in his address to the electors of that year, a copy of which has recently been published in the Montreal 'Gazette.' Commenting on the policy of the Liberal party of that day, he said of the policy of the Conservative party towards the United States.

We are perfectly willing to trade with you on equal terms. We are desirous of having a fair reciprocity treaty, but we will not consent to open our markets to you while yours remain closed to us.

In 1891, after the Conservative victory at the polls, we had another deputation going to Washington, and on this deputation, was

my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) then Minister of Finance. Nothing again was accomplished. The American authorities still turned a deaf ear to our requests, and these gentlemen were not able to make any impression on them. In 1893 was held the great Liberal convention in this city of Ottawa in which a reciprocity plank was placed in the platform as one of the things which the Liberal party would attempt to obtain if returned to power. They were returned in 1896, and in 1898 sent a deputation to Washington for the very purpose of securing a reciprocity treaty. That deputation also failed in its mission.

That then is the record up to 1899 of both parties with regard to reciprocity with the United States. Now the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says that in the year 1899 the leader of the present government, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), declared in this House and afterwards in England that he had turned his back on Washington, that he would no longer seek reciprocity with the United States, but that he would endeavour to make trade arrangements with the rest of the world and particularly the British Empire. Well, there is this to be said, that my right hon. friend was the first Prime Minister of Canada who took that dignified stand with regard to negotiations with Washington. Previous governments had made offers and had been refused, and sometimes the refusal was not couched in the most polite terms, as my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) could tell us if he would. The only proper, dignified, statesmanlike course to pursue was that taken by the right hon. the leader of this government. If any further attempts, he declared, were made to obtain reciprocity, the offer would have to come from Washington and not from Canada. We waited many years during which we made no further demand or request, nor did any come from them, but at the end of ten years a request did come from Washington, and at the end of eleven years that request is now before the House in concrete form. In the face of these facts, how can the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) or the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), argue that there has not been a positive demand in this country for such a measure since 1866.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition says that times have changed, that we are now in the year 1911, and not in 1866, and that conditions have changed. True they have, but neither geographical nor climatic conditions have changed. The nature of our products has not changed nor has the character of the products of the United States, but our lines of transportation east and west and north and south have been perfected, and if there was good reason for a demand for reciprocity in 1866, there is just as good or better in the year 1911.

Just a word as to the proposal itself. The proposal does not come in the form of a treaty, and I think it is well that it does not. Had it been in the form of a hard and fast binding treaty for 25 or 50 years, I could have seen some force in the argument that we had tied our hands and could not enter into reciprocal arrangements with other countries and could not improve our relations within the empire with regard to trade matters. It came in the form of a simple international bargain based on good faith. I think that is one of the best features of the measure as presented to the House. The terms of the measure can all be taken from a single clause in the letter addressed by the hon. Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs to the Secretary of State of the United States, on the 21st January, 1911. These are the words :

> Nevertheless, it is distinctly understood that we do not attempt to bind for the future the action of the United States Congress or the parliament of Canada, but that each of these authorities shall be absolutely free to make any change of tariff policy or of any other matter covered by the present arrangement that may be deemed expedient.

Surely, that is clear, plain and simple; and it is a statement which is formally confirmed by the letter of the Secretary of State of the United States. And that is all the bargain or agreement between the two countries at this time.

Now, treaties may be good at times and they may be bad at times. Treaties do involve, sometimes, international entanglements of an unforseen kind. Treaties sometimes involve or cause subsequent embarrassments. A treaty made between a country having the wealth and population of the United States on the one hand and Canada on the other hand might, some day, prove an embarrassment to this country and an embarrassment to Great Britain. So, if my opinion is worth anything, I give my opinion that the present arrangement, based on the mutual good faith of both countries, and, as we hope, for the mutual advantage, of both countries, is the best possible arrangement, so far as Canada is concerned, in the way of reciprocal trade arrangement with the United States.

It has been argued: Why do not you wait until the colonial conference has met in London this year; something new may be developed there, something new may be evolved. The answer is that we have not made any hard and fast treaty; no binding arrangement has been made; our hands

are not tied, our hands are free; and, if anything better for the interests of Canada shall be developed or evolved at the colonial conference, Canada is perfectly free to take advantage of it. These are the reasons which lead me to the conclusion that the present arrangement, resting as it does on a mutual bargain, is by all means the best form in which to put an arrangement with the United States.

It has been said by some that Canada has all the best of the bargain and by others that Canada has all the worst of the bargain. I do not believe that arguments of that kind will appeal to any reasonable man. A bargain has always two sides to it, and unless the advantage of the arrangement be mutual, it will not last a twelve month. We cannot have it all our own way, the other contracting party must have some of the advantages. It is very much as was said by David Harum in the book of that name: 'When you make a horse trade, it is always well to let the other fellow get something out of it.' I do not think that a one-sided bargain would have been of any advantage to us at all. But what I do say is that the arrangement presented before us will give Canada tremendous advantages over the position which she now occupies, and, on the other hand, I am ready to admit that the United States may get some advantage also. But I do think that the advantage preponderates on the side of Canada very, very largely.

In order to place my case connectedly before the House, I would like to examine the trade position of Canada to-day? I do not intend to impose a lot of figures on the House, and I shall only refer to them in round numbers and as rapidly as I can; but I think that it is necessary, if one is to have a proper appreciation of the effect of the present proposal, to have regard to our present conditions. I find that the total trade of Canada of last year, exports and imports, amounted to $693,000,000: based on home consumption, $649,000,000. And the astonishing, even startling, fact is that $580,000,000 of our total trade is done with the United Kingdom and the United States. Our export and import trade with Great Britain is $245,000,000, and our export and import trade with the United States, $336,000,000. In other words, 90 per cent of our whole foreign trade is done with two countries and only ten per cent with the rest of the world. As this trade proposal or agreement affects the trade with our two best customers, it is of far more consequence that we should scan it very carefully to see that in what we may now do we injure neither our trade with the one nor our trade with the other of them.

Mr. GUTHRIE.

It is well also to note the nature of the trade we have with Great Britain, and the nature of the trade we have with the United States. From Great Britain we import $95,000,000 worth of goods, and to Great Britain we export $149,000,000 worth. From the United States we import $223,000,000 worth and to the United States we export $113,000,000 worth. In other words, Great Britain buys from us 54 per cent of all our exports, but the United States buys from us 40 per cent of our exports. Great Britain sells to us 20 per cent of all our imports, and the United States sells to us 60 per cent of all our imports. Now, it is frequently said that the balance of trade, as between Canada and the United States, is entirely against Canada. It is also argued and urged— and was urged by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax)—that we have given Great Britain no real preference at all, that all we ever gave was a sham preference, a pure fiction. I must say that, on the tariff rates which my hon. friend gave to the House, and which I believe to be approximately correct, there is, apparently, a discrimination against Great Britain in favour of the United States. But I think the leader of the opposition should have been candid enough to give the reason, because he knows the reason and knows that the discrimination is not a real discrimination but an apparent one. You may examine the rates of duty which we charge in Canada, and you will find in the Trade and Commerce report, page 15, the following average rates: On all imports entering Canada from all countries, the average rate is 16·416; on all dutiable imports coming into Canada from all countries, 26·713. On all imports coming from Great Britain, the average rate is 18·914; on all dutiable imports from Great Britain the average rate is 25·107. On all imports from the United States, the average rate is only 13·570 and on all dutiable imports from the United States, the rate is 24·837. And the difference on total imports as between the United States and Great Britain on goods coming into Canada, is now 5¼ per cent in favour of the United States, and the average difference on all dutiable imports is one-fourth of one per cent, or 25 cents on $100 in favour of the United States. So that there is an apparent discrimination in favour of the United States and not a preference for Great Britain. But, as I say, it is apparent and not real. The reason for it is not hard to find. The reason for the apparent discrimination is to be found in the list of free imports. On our total imports from Great Britain, amounting to $95,000,000, only $23,000,000 came in on the free list.

On our total imports from the United States, amounting to $223,000,000, over $98,000,000 come in on the free list.

When you average the free and the dutiable goods together, an apparent discrimination in favour of the United States appears, because the United States supplies to us so much of our free imports. Well, some one says, why don't you buy them from England? Why do you buy them from the United States? The reason is obvious, and if any one will glance over the trade and navigation returns of this country he cannot fail to be struck with the reason almost in the first two or three pages of that report. Of the free imports I will take only a few of the large items. The imports of corn amount to $4,600,000; we get that all direct from the United States free, and it is not produced in, nor is it exported from, Great Britain. We want it here to feed our hogs and cattle. Hon members will remember that prior to 1896, under the Conservative government, the farmers paid 7 cents a bushel to get that corn to feed their stock. I wish the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was here now, because I never look at that corn item without thinking of the anomaly which he permitted to exist in the government of which he was Finance Minister. He charged the farmers 7 cents a bushel to bring in corn to feed to their export cattle, and he allowed the distillers to bring in corn free to make whisky for export purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question? If I understand him correctly, he said that there was an apparent difference in favour of the United States, but it was only apparent, and he gave the free imports from Great Britain and the United States to show that the duty charged against the United States was only apparent. But leaving out the free imports entirely, when he considers the dutiable goods separately, the balance is really in favour of the United States; in other words, the duty was a little lower against the United States than against Great Britain.

Mr. GUTHRIE. That is correct; I will come to that.

Mr. SPROULE. If that be so, is it not real?

Mr. GUTHRIE. No, it is not, as I will show presently. Do not anticipate me. Before I leave that question of importing corn for the distillers, I must say that after a time that anomaly in the tariff was removed. The people in my county who imported dutiable corn to manufacture export cattle did not like their neighbours in the adjoining county of Waterloo to have the privilege of importing free corn for the manufacture of export whisky, and the present junior judge of the county of Wellington informs me that he, as the leading prohibitionist of this House on the Conservative side, called the government's attention to it, and they took it off.

Mr. BLAIN. Which government did this?

Mr. GUTHRIE. The government of which the hon. member for North Toronto was Finance Minister. The next item of importation of free raw material from the United States is anthracite coal and coke, amounting to $16,000,000. Then comes binder twine, $1,750,000, made free for the benefit of the farmers. Then comes manilla grass, or hemp, or fibre, $1,000,000, I think chiefly used in the penitentiaries. Then comes raw cotton, $9,360,000. That is not a product that England exports, but one that she imports in tremendous quantities. The next item is tropical fruits, $3,700,000. Then, crude rubber, and rubber sheets for manufacture in rubber factories, a little over four millions. Then lumber imported, chiefly hardwood, $8,000,000. Raw tobacco, $3,115,000; metal ores and minerals, $16,000,000. These are some of the items on the free list. You can go over the free list of goods imported into this country, and you will find that about seventy or seventy-five million dollars worth come in from the United States free of duty which are not the product of Great Britain at all, and are not goods that she exports.

Now, in regard to dutiable goods, there is an apparent discrimination of 25 cents on the hundred dollars, and how is that accounted for? It is accounted for by reason of this fact, that this government, and, for aught I know, its predecessors, considered that the manufacturers of Canada should be allowed to bring in partly manufactured goods at nominal rates of duty, largely goods used in iron and steel industries. I know of goods coming into Guelph by the carload for the manufacture of an article of iron called skelp; it comes in sheets at the rate of five per cent, and comes in on the list of dutiable goods, but the duty is placed at a nominal amount. If you look over the trade and navigation returns you will find item after item of this kind going into the manufacture of implements, into manufactures of hardware, and into the manufactures of various kinds of machinery, on which the rates run from as low as 2 to 5, 7 and 8 per cent. Then there is the matter of agricultural implements, on which the rate is only 17½ per cent. We do not get any of these goods from England. So that in the general average there is an apparent discrimination in favour of the United States to the extent of 25 cents on the $100. But is that a test? Here is the test: Take goods that both countries manufacture and export, take goods of common manufacture which Canada buys from the United States and

Great Britain, and see whether there is a preference or not. Woollens or manufacture of woollens—last year we bought from Great Britain $19,000,000, and from the United States $925,000. Is there not a discrimination in favour of Great Britain there? And so on with the other articles in this list :

	From Great Britain.	From United States.
Silks and manufactures of	$ 2,500,000	$ 571,000
Ribbons..	650,000	106,000
Oil cloth..	1,000,000	274,000
Flax, hemp, jute and manufactures thereof..	3,000,000	210,000
Fancy articles..	1,500,000	740,000
Earthenware and china.	1,100,000	269,000
Manufactures of cotton..	12,500,000	3,250,000

Now, that, I submit, is the test. There are goods which both countries manufacture in their complete form and send into Canada, on which we have given a British preference of one-third less rate of duty on goods coming from Great Britain. Now, compare the sales made by Great Britain and the United States of that class of goods which they manufacture in common, and see whether there is a real preference or an imaginary one. I have only enumerated nine of the larger items, and I find that in the nine items the volume of imports from Great Britain is $42,000,000, and the volume of imports from the United States is $6,-000,000. The United States goods come on an average five or six hundred miles, and Great Britain's goods come on an average of about 3,500 miles.

I am going to turn now to another definite question involved in the proposed arrangement. A great portion of the speech of the member for North Toronto yesterday and the day before, was directed to an effort to show that you are interfering with the British preference, and generally wiping that out, that you are interfering indeed with our imperial standing. I propose to show that we are not interfering with it, and I submit that he gave no facts that would convince any reasonable man that we are interfering with it. In the first place, I know that he has devoted time and attention to this subject. I know that he is a man very capable of examining this question from every point of view. I believe he has left no stone unturned. He has gone into it from top to bottom, turned it over and examined it. Taking his speech, as reported in 'Hansard,' at page 3405, I find he says that the total trade to be displaced or affected will be $95,000,000, that the arrangement will affect an import trade of $47,800,000 and an export trade of $47,300,000. I do not think his figures are correct, but I will, for the purpose of my argument, give my figures which are largely in excess of the figures which he quoted; so that, if his argument be correct, it will be more correct and more imposing than the presentation which he put before the House. I do not know where he got his import figures, which, as given by the blue-book, are $40,000,000. Adding to that $650,-000 for pulp wood and paper under a special item, the amount would be about $41,-000,000. Then he places the imports which come to us under the schedules under discussion at $47,800,000. He has increased the amount by about 18 or 20 per cent, but I do not know that that will make any difference in his argument. As I say, I do not know where he got his figures. I submit that the present arrangement will not affect merely $47,000,-000 of our exports, but that the amount of our exports to be affected is the amount set out in the blue-book, called Tariff Relations, at page 68 and that is $205,000,000 and not $47,000,000 as stated by the hon. member for North Toronto. That $205,000,-000 is made up of exports as follows: To Great Britain, $127,000,000; to the United States, $49,000,000; and to all other countries in the world, $28,000,000. Take these figures as set out in the blue-book, which are entirely favourable to the contention of my hon. friend, and arguing from that basis, let me show first the situation with regard to schedule 'A' that, I know my hon. friend must have gone through from top to bottom, because he counted the items. He says there are 69 items in schedule 'A,' 39 of which have been untouched—not a very good word to express what he meant, a word that might be very misleading to many people. In regard to 30, he says the duty has been wiped out. What he means by 'untouched' I do not know. What he should have said was, that there was not any duty on them, because they have always been on the free list, and the other 30 articles have been placed on the free list. But, in looking over schedule 'A' I found that there were 44, sections, subdivisions or groups, schedule 'A' being the free list, and that 30 of these groups relate exclusively to natural products, that 11 of these groups relate exclusively to partly manufactured goods, which come into this country as raw material for the benefit of the manufacturer, and that only three of the articles under schedule 'A' consist of manufactured goods. These three articles are (1) cream separators, which have always been free; (2) type setting machines of which we only got from Great Britain last year, $177 worth, and (3) paper, paper being a special item by itself. These are all the manufactured goods included in this schedule. Cream separators always were free, and I do not know that they should always have been free, because I have been

down here with one or two deputations to get a duty put on them. I thought they were machinery just as much as other things were, or that they should properly be classed as agricultural implements, but the government persistently refused to place a duty on them. They always have been free and if they did come in from Great Britain, they would still come free. Type setting machines never did come from Great Britain, and as we only imported $177 worth last year, we could not have brought in any complete linotype machine. Wood pulp never came from Great Britain, but paper did. Paper to the extent of $7,302 came from Great Britain last year. What are our total imports under schedule 'A'? Last year we received of goods now under schedule 'A' $13,894,000 worth. Of that $13,000,000 worth we received from Great Britain, $4,190,000, and from the United States $9,163,000. One third of the goods coming into this country last year now under schedule 'A' came from Great Britain and two thirds from the United States. The reduction in duty, by reason of the change and by reason of placing the thirty articles mentioned by the hon. member for North Toronto on the free list, will be, on the trade of last year, $1,400,000, or about 17½ cents per head of our population, placing it at $8,000,000.

Now, my hon. friend's objection was that you have injured the trade of Great Britain, that you have displaced the trade of Great Britain by the effect of your free list embraced in schedule 'A'. I am not going to the extent of quoting his language: it can be found in 'Hansard.' It was a most extraordinary statement, and one for which he had not the slightest foundation. If we examine the list we must be convinced that the hon. member for North Toronto wanted to cover up the scanty foundation by a wealth of words, where he was at a loss for argument. What is that trade? We import from England $4,190,000 worth. It is nearly all made up of the single item of rolled iron and steel plates, amounting to $3,490,000. That is on the free list, but that always was in the free list and Great Britain sent that amount into Canada last year as a free article. Will that be displaced?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That is not free.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Not from Great Britain?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE. It is from Great Britain.

Mr. AMES. From Great Britain, but there is 5 per cent, when imported from the United States, on that article.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I understand that it was a free article from Great Britain, and I also thought it was free from the United States, but I will not be sure about that.

Mr. AMES. It was free from Great Britain, but there is a duty of five per cent from the United States.

Mr. GUTHRIE. It came in on the free list from Great Britain and from the United States it came in with a five per cent duty.

Mr. AMES. It was last year free from Great Britain, but there was a duty of five per cent when imported from the United States. Now that five per cent is wiped off, and it is free from both countries.

Mr. GUTHRIE. That represents about seven eighths of the free list embraced in schedule 'A'. I am not going to take up all the items; I only propose to deal with the larger ones. The next item that I shall mention is that of grapes, of which we imported from Great Britain $104,000 worth. Every one knows, who knows anything about the kind of grapes we import from Great Britain, that they are the grapes that retail at $1.50 a pound, or $2.50 a bunch, and are not produced in Canada. They only had a duty of 1½ per cent and the duty amounted to nothing in comparison with the value of the grapes. That trade will not be displaced. Then, we take vegetables and beans. Of vegetables, we imported $91,000 worth. These are not the vegetables we grow in Canada. I am informed that almost the whole value is represented by the one item of Spanish onions, which can only be produced in tropical countries and which are shipped into Canada via Great Britain. Another article is beans, by which, they tell me, is meant Lima beans, which represent an import of $64,000. These are not produced in Canada; they come from South America and are shipped into Canada via Great Britain. Therefore, no trade will be affected with respect to these articles.

Take the argument of the hon. member for North Toronto, that when duties are reduced down to 10, 12 or 15 per cent, your preference amounts to nothing. I say that under that argument rolled iron and steel plates will come in from Great Britain just as freely as they came in before. These items that I have enumerated amount to almost the entire free list, as represented by schedule 'A'. What is that to the total imports into this country from Great Britain—$4,191,000 out of a total of $95,000,000? In all probability,—indeed I would stake my reputation upon it—in two or three years, as our purchasing power increases our purchases of goods under that same schedule 'A' of which we now buy $4,191,000 will be largely increased and not diminished.

Now, let me look at schedules 'B' and

'D.' These are the schedules of goods on which there has been a tariff reduction. The total tariff reduction is $1,095,000, or about 12½ cents per head upon the population of Canada, and if my estimate is correct it is about 3§ per cent on the average. Now, is that going to seriously affect trade either with Great Britain or the United States? It cannot affect it with Great Britain because the duties are maintained at substantial amounts and Great Britain has one-third off that duty, which constitutes a decided preference. It cannot materially affect trade with the United States or imports from the United States because there is not enough reduction in any instance to allow American manufacturers to compete with Canadian manufacturers. If we have to-day a duty of 30 per cent against the United States upon manufactured goods of any quality and it is reduced to 27 per cent, the increase of imports will be small at most because the reduction of duty has been small, and that argument applies to all the goods comprised in schedules 'B' and 'D.' What do sections 'B' and 'D amount to? Last year all the goods enumerated in sections 'B' and 'D' imported into Canada amounted to $26,500,000. Of these we imported from the United States $23,196,000, and from Great Britain only $2,196,000. Our imports from Great Britain amounted to practically nothing, $2,196,000 out of $26,000,000 of goods included in these schedules. I maintain, and I think I can maintain it in the face of any argument, that there is every probability that next year and the year after, and the year after that we will have an annual increase in our purchases from Great Britain of the very goods mentioned in schedules 'B' and 'D.' When you look at the schedules of the goods that come in from Great Britain you will find they are made up nearly all of goods that sell on their own brand or patent. By reason of their inherent virtue they not only come into this country but in the face of a 40 per cent to 50 per cent duty they go into the United States and are sold there. The whole list comes to only $2,196,000. How is that made up? Biscuits and confectionery make up $522,000 in that list. Do you mean to say that one, or two, or three, or four cents duty will affect the sale in this country or in the United States of Huntley & Palmer's wares, made in Great Britain? Go into any large purveyor's store in New York like Park & Telford's, and see the magnificent display of Huntley & Palmer's biscuits and confectionery. They are there in the face of what? A duty of 40 per cent to 50 per cent. Is there any reason why they should not come into Canada in preference to any goods from the United States with one-third tariff advantage over the United States goods?

Take another large item, pickles, Crosse & Blackwell, Lea & Perrin, Holbrooke, these are the names and brands that sell goods, and they sell them by reason of their inherent quality. They sell in the United States in the face of the highest kind of competition and of very stiff tariffs. Is there any reason to suppose that these goods will not come into Canada just as freely as before?

Then take cutlery, of which we import from Great Britain $223,854. People who know, or are supposed to know, tell me that English cutlery retains its place in the markets of Canada by reason of its brand, by reason of its name, its reputation and its inherent virtue. They tell me also that the cutlery from the United States never did have any large market in Canada, the chief competitor of British cutlery here being Germany, and Germany does not receive any advantage under this reciprocity arrangement with the United States. There is no reason to suppose that the cutlery imports from Great Britain will be reduced one dollar if this arrangement is brought into force.

Imports of automobiles from Great Britain amount to $106,000. These are all controlled by patents and a man who wants an English motor car can get an English motor car, the question of duty does not, as a rule, enter into the consideration.

Another item is musical instruments of which we import $118,000. They are sold largely on the reputation of the maker of the instrument. I think these are largely band instruments, and if English band instruments are better than American, and I believe they are, they will probably come in, in just as great quantities or greater, because they still retain their one-third preference, and we will have far more purchasing power to buy musical instruments than we have had in the past.

I have gone over only a few items but if they are figured out they amount to almost three-quarters of our total imports under schedules 'B' and 'D.' Will the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) or any other member rise in his place and state as his considered judgment that the British manufacturers are going to be injured by schedules 'B' and 'D.' Can they be injured? They will retain their position in regard to the tariff with their one-third preference. Nearly all goods mentioned in schedules 'B' and 'D' are sold by virtue of the reputation of the makers, by virtue of patents, trade marks, designs, &c. I think we have every reason to believe that as our prosperity grows we will import very much more of these same articles than we have ever imported in the past.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) grew very eloquent on the question and even went so far as to charge the Minister of Customs, not directly but indirectly,

with something like a breach of faith in a cablegram which he had sent to the Colonial office in Great Britain, setting forth that the proposed changes in the tariff between Canada and the United States would not interfere with the British preference. The statement made by Mr. Asquith, the Premier of Great Britain was :

The American-Canadian agreement had been carefully watched by the British Ambassador at Washington on behalf of British interests and he has been assured that, so far as British imports into Canada are concerned, the British preference would be scrupulously maintained.

I submit that that statement is true in substance and in fact, and I submit further that Mr. Bryce is perfectly satisfied on behalf of Great Britain with the arrangement that has been made. The official correspondence sets forth that Mr. Bryce was a party to it. Let me, in passing, read to the House a clipping which has been handed to me, taken from the Manchester 'Guardian,' a very influential paper published in Great Britain. It reads :

The whole policy of Mr. Bryce, the most successful British Ambassador at Washington in our generation, has been—if we may speak of an Ambassador's policy—directed towards drawing closer the bonds between Canada and the United States. He has been called the first Canadian Ambassador at Washington, and his policy has been in the best interests of Canada. But it has been governed primarily by British interests. Canada, in British world policy, is a gage of friendship between England and America. England gains a friend by every act that brings Canada into closer relations with the United States. There is no rivalry between England and the United States for the affections of Canada. She will best serve our policy by broadening the basis of her own prosperity and by a cordial policy of friendship with the United States.

Coming to the end of my argument on that point my statement is, and I am absolutely convinced in my own mind that I am correct in what I state, that in no way, shape or form, in no way general or particular, are we interfering with British trade interests in Canada by the proposals now before the Chair, and that if these negotiations when passed into law have any bearing whatever upon the status of British trade in Canada, it will be a beneficial effect, that our imports from Great Britain will not decrease ; there is no reason to make them decrease. As our prosperity increases, our imports from Great Britain will increase year after year. So that the action of the Minister of Finance in sending his telegram, and the statement of the Premier of Great Britain founded on that telegram, were strictly in accordance with the facts.

Let me touch upon another of the more important points made by my hon. friend from North Toronto. I do not know that I have ever heard in this House, during an experience of eleven sessions, a more exaggerated statement of fact than was given to the House by one of its old members in the person of the hon. member for North Toronto yesterday, when he referred to the effect of this treaty upon our natural resources and the inroads which were to be made upon them by American grabbers, American grafters and American millionaires. So far as I can see, the present proposal does not afford one shred of argument to support my hon. friend's noisy declaration in that respect. To dignify it, I might call it dogmatic assertion. It was more than that: it was deliberate exaggeration, because there is nothing in the proposed agreement to support it, and I will ask any hon. member opposite, as I would ask the hon. member for North Toronto if he were in his place, to stand up now and quote any statement on which that assertion was made.

Mr. SPROULE. If there was nothing of that nature in it, why did President Taft say the other day that one of the great virtues of it was that it opened up the forests of British North America to the United States?

Mr. GUTHRIE. My hon. friend either did not follow me or else he spoke too soon. I say that there is nothing in this proposal to give the United States one whit of advantage in their access to our natural products that they have not had during the last 50 years. We have not changed the status one iota. If the United States wanted our lumber, our minerals, our fish, our wheat, or our live stock, all they had to do at any time during the last 50 years was to take off their tariff and come in and take them.

Mr. SPROULE. Then Mr. Taft must have been entirely wrong?

Mr. GUTHRIE. The hon. member for North Toronto must have known these facts, because he has told the public of Canada time and again that the United States could obtain all the access they desired to our natural resources by dropping their tariff, and so they could. Yet he spent yesterday a whole hour in a laboured argument to show that there was nothing standing in the way of Canada if this treaty came into force, but devastation of our natural resources, that they would be taken to the United States, there manufactured into the finished product, and then shipped back to Canada. How could they come back to Canada under this treaty? Where is there any reduction in the schedules that would permit them? One branch of his argument is just as unfounded as the other. The United States, if they want our lumber, our minerals, our wheat, or our cattle, will come here and pay for them. We are

not asleep; we are the owners, the proprietors of these natural resources. If we see fit to dispose of them to the United States, it must be at a price and on conditions satisfactory to the private owner or the public of Canada. There is no opportunity given to them to raid our resources—nothing of the kind; and yet the hon. member for North Toronto so argued in this House, and was applauded by every member on the Conservative side. I do not care what President Taft may say in regard to this matter; I do not care what Senator Beveridge may say; and I do not think it is in very good taste for my hon. friend from North Toronto or my good friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to be guided by what these gentlemen or the newspapers of the United States have to say on this subject. Let them be guided rather by such papers as the Manchester 'Guardian', which I have quoted. But an effort has been made to bring into this debate all sorts of political entanglements in the United States. There is an effort to found the Conservative opposition to this measure upon the statements of President Taft or of the leader of the Democratic party in the United States Congress or of Senator Beveridge, or of the newspapers of one political creed or another. Surely we as Canadians can judge of this matter irrespective of what the people of the United States may have in their minds.

The statement which has been read here to-day as having been made yesterday in Congress by Mr. Clark has a queer bearing upon another incident which I might mention. Perhaps the greatest annexationist in the United States for many years past has been Speaker Cannon. In a speech which he addressed a few weeks ago to the Grand Army men, and which has been going through the press, he said he was looking forward to the day when Mexico and Canada would be annexed to the United States, and when the American flag would float over the whole of the North American continent, and yet he is the greatest opponent of this measure in the United States Congress to-day. Why should we be upset by any wind of political opinion that blows across the way? The only consideration that should guide us on this question is: How is this measure as a pure trade matter going to operate in Canada—will it be to our advantage or against our advantage?

Take another instance of what I consider to be the utter inconsistency of the hon. member for North Toronto on this matter. People sometimes in the heat of debate say things which they do not positively or actually mean; but when a man deliberately sits down and writes an article, copies and recopies it and corrects it, he is taken to mean what he has written. Now, the hon. member for North Toronto has distinctly said in print, in an elaborate composition in the 'Canadian Magazine' for the month of December last, entitled, 'Reciprocity—why the United States wants it', by the Rt. Hon. George E. Foster—I suppose that was a Christmas present to the hon. gentleman—this is his own vigorous language:

> No sane man will predict any large overflow of natural products from the United States Northward.

And yesterday he argued to a demonstration that market gardeners, fruit growers and pork men would be ruined by the natural products of the United States coming into Canada. I never heard a greater mass of contradiction and inconsistency in the space of a three or four hours' speech during my eleven years experience in the House of Commons.

Now, I am going to take issue with the hon. member for North Toronto on another point, and I think I know a little about this: that is, the question of the price of hogs and cattle as between the United States and Canada. When he made his plea for the pork men, he said that there was a steady supply of pork at a good price in Canada, and that only for a few weeks of the year was the price of pork at Buffalo any higher than in Canada. He makes the same plea with regard to cattle, but I challenge the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and will let the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' decide the issue—let him take the columns of that paper during the last five years.

An hon. MEMBER. Not its editorials.

Mr. GUTHRIE. No its market reports, and let him compare Montreal and Toronto markets with Buffalo and Chicago, and he will find that the general average is higher, and markedly so, in Buffalo and Chicago during the last five year period. Now what is it we want? We want in my county the privilege of selling our cattle and hogs in Buffalo and other farm produce as well. You say: What is the use, the Buffalo market is lower. Well, if it is, are we hurt? We will then sell in the British market, and not touch Buffalo or Chicago. My hon. friend tells us that we have two markets now, the home market and the British; but when this arrangement comes into operation, we shall have three markets, and the one we have not got now, but which we want to get, is by far the largest. We will not send our products to Buffalo or Chicago unless we get better prices than we do at home or in the mother country. Our western people are not going to send any cattle to Chicago unless they can get better prices there than elsewhere. If they cannot, they will send them to eastern Canada or Great Britain. What is there unpatriotic or disloyal in that pro-

position? How do business men conduct their business? If the prices in Buffalo are good, they send their wares there; if not they send them elsewhere. Then why should not the government carry on the business of this country on business lines? Why should the government stay its hand at this juncture and deprive our people of one of the great opportunities of their lives?

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) took a rather strange position with regard to the framing of a tariff. He said he did not believe in the way in which our tariff was altered or revised at present. He thought that the system was an improper one. Now the reason I refer to this is that this is a question of vital interest to our people. If my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, desires to place himself on record on this question, I think it well the people should know it. What he said is to be found on pages 3379 and 3380 of 'Hansard.' There he practically proposed that the framing or revision of the tariff should be taken away from this House and placed in the hands of a permanent tariff commission. I do not say, from the language he used, that he gave that as his concluded opinion, but he certainly declared that he thought that was the best method to be adopted. No doubt such a plan would meet the desires of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association; but if my hon. friend would adopt such a system, he would be reversing one of the cardinal principles of the British constitution, which is that the right to tax must remain with the peoples' representatives. The right was established many long years ago, and I have no doubt will survive to the end; but if the leader of the opposition desires to depart from that principle and appoint a permanent tariff commission to regulate our tariff, the sooner the people know it the better. I do not know what his proposal precisely is because he did not put it in very concrete form. He merely said it would be well if we established a permanent tariff commission in Canada, and I take it that means a delegation of the powers of this House to a tariff commission.

If he made any definite statement in regard to the proposed agreement at all, it will be found on page 3374 of 'Hansard.' These are his words:

> Now in view of the statistics I have given, are we not moving along the line of material progress and development about as fast as we could expect to go or about as fast as it is desirable to go?

And in this he was heartily applauded by hon. members opposite. Further on he said:

> To use a well known expression, what we have we will hold in that regard. But the proposals of this government if they mean anything at all, seem to me to mean a considerable departure from that path which we have pursued with so much success.

Mr. BLAIN. Would my hon. friend read the whole sentence.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I thought I had.

Mr. BLAIN. If the hon. gentleman would read further, he will find that it conveys an entirely different impression.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Well, at all events what the hon. gentleman said will be found on page 3374 of 'Hansard.' The point to which I wished to call special attention is conveyed in these words:

> Are we not moving along the line of material progress and development about as fast as we could expect to go or about as fast as it is desriable to go?

Mr. BLAIN. Read the lines that follow.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have no objection. He went on to say:

> Are we not at the present time following a perfectly sure and safe path.

Is that the position taken by the leader of the opposition and the Conservative party. Are they reduced to this position: Let us leave well enough alone; we are doing well enough now. Have I not fairly stated the position taken by my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition. He believes in the good old maxim: What we have, we will hold; but let well enough alone. I submit that with regard to trade and commerce that is neither a statesmanlike nor a proper position, nor is it one which the people will endorse. You cannot get a young country like ours, full of vigour, vitality and energy, to sit down and fold its arms and let well enough alone. Is there any period in the business life of any business man when he can conclude to sit down and let well enough alone? He can do this if he retires from business, but we are not retiring from business in Canada. We must keep moving. If we do not go forward, we shall be drifting backward. That is what was the real trouble with the Conservative government from 1890 to 1896. They flattered themselves that they were doing well enough, and were content to stand still, and I am inclined to think that they really believed what they said. I really think that they had convinced themselves of this, and no one was more eloquent on that point than the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Session after session he pointed to the increase in our exports, which had leaped up some $66,000,000 in eighteen years, to the increase in our bank deposits, to the business disorders in the United States which we have escaped, and urged his audiences to let

well enough alone. But as a matter of fact we were not progressing at all, but were actually going backwards, and that is what we would do if we were to adopt the policy advocated by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. And I ask any one to note this—and it is the proudest, grandest fact, I think, in connection with the present administration—that from 1896, from the day whereon they took power, you can go to the record of any department, you can open any blue-book we have, and you will see, year by year, during the whole fourteen years, without a single halt in any year, forward—forward—forward! And the reason for that is that they were not content to say, we are going fast enough; we will let well enough alone, content with the old maxim, 'What we have we'll hold.' That is a good maxim, it is a Liberal maxim; but we add, 'We will get more if possible.' And this is one instance in which we are endeavouring to hold our own and get more.

Now, I must say a word about the effect of the proposal upon what is, perhaps, the largest branch of the subject, so far as Canada is concerned, and that is the export trade of this country. Up to this time I have discussed the effect only on our trade with Great Britain, the effect on our imports from Great Britain and the United States. Now, what about our exports? I believe that, without exaggeration, the exports of Canada to the United States, if this proposal is adopted, will increase by leaps and bounds. I agree with what has been said by others, and inferentially stated by my hon. friend opposite, that the great increase will be in what we may call natural products—I do not mean natural resources; I mean the products of the farm chiefly. I note that we only sold to the United States last year $113,000,000 worth of goods, but I note, also, that we bought from them $223,000,000 worth. And that, according to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster)—and I will not say it is my opinion—constitutes an adverse balance of trade, which, in the end, has to be met through the banks with cash. My hon. friend from North Toronto has had an annual complaint against this government, an annual criticism of its policy. Whereas trade conditions with the United Kingdom were satisfactory—we sold them more than we purchased from them, the balance of trade, he said, was in favour of Canada—he argued, and pages in 'Hansard' will show the argument, that our trade with the United States has been absolutely unsatisfactory; in fact, he said the condition of things had become startling, that we were only selling them a small quantity as compared with the goods which we were purchasing from them, and ultimately this balance would have to be settled. He discussed it as an adverse balance of trade, and, from his point of view, I must say, he discussed it very ably. It is a vexed question, it is about as intricate and difficult a problem as any that I know of, and I do not feel able to cope with the argument of my hon. friend in regard to the adverse balance of trade. But I think the present proposal should cause a genial smile, 'the smile that won't come off,' to illumine his countenance, because he must see, if his statement in the House is correct, that the balance of trade as between Canada and the United States will now shortly be in favour of Canada. Speaking in this House, in March, 1908, the hon. gentleman gave a statement of the goods exported and imported as between Canada and the United States, which statement appears at page 5273 of 'Hansard' of that year, and shows:

Ten years Conservative rule, adverse balance of trade of $167,841,393.

Ten years of Liberal rule, an adverse balance of trade of $384,950,596.

Then he proceeds:

In 12 months ending June 30, 1907, the imports from United States were $206,715,914, the exports to the United States, $82,194,661, and the adverse balance of trade reached the enormous sum of $124,521,253.

Now I think that is a somewhat startling showing. This adverse balance of trade has to be met, it has to be met every month, every three months, every year. You cannot run credit for that adverse balance of trade, it has to be adjusted through the banks and through the business of the country. Now let me point out that in this statement I have simply taken the exports of home products, because I wanted to show the exact relation of trade as regards the export of Canada's own produce, to the foreign produce we were importing. Now if you deduct the foreign produce also exported to the United States in that period of ten years, it amounts to $30,000,000. Subtracting that, taking both the home and foreign products, the adverse balance of trade against us in those ten years, with the United States, was $552,000,000.

That would be an average of $52,000,000 a year of an adverse balance. Turning to page 5277, we find the hon. gentleman saying:

Now, what I think about the balance of trade is this: That the balance of trade in the first place must be settled presently. It is not as if I could go to my friend here and borrow $100 from him and give him a note for three years and pay him interest. These international balances are not arranged in that way. They have to be adjusted every month, every three months, every six months at the longest and they are so adjusted, and the banks are the mechanism which we use for that adjustment. That is the first point I make. We have got to pay our balances; we cannot run credit from year to year on them. Now, they can only be paid either in goods or in gold, and whichever it is it is our export trade which in the final analy-

sis has to pay our bills and we have nothing else to pay them with. Well, so far as trade and navigation figures go you may call that a trade balance if you like. That is the visible trade of the country. You might so far as that goes balance one by the other, or be in debt, or have a profit. But it may be said: That is not all that is coming and going between the countries; there are invisible exports and imports. And that is true. But yet it is absolutely true that in the end even the actual international balance has got to be settled by exports from the country that owes and it can be paid in no other way.

There is hope, and I think a splendid hope, that the result of the present proposal, if carried into effect, will be to adjust that adverse balance of trade. There is no doubt, in the opinion of my hon. friend from North Toronto, in the opinion of any member of this House, I think, that Canada, under this arrangement, is going to sell a tremendous quantity of goods to the United States, a tremendous quantity of our natural products. And if I may take the written statement of my hon. friend from North Toronto upon the question: 'No sane man will predict any large overflow of natural products from the United States northward.' The balance will be in our favour. And I add to that, we need not fear an increase of imports of American manufactured goods; there is nothing to warrant the idea that we will have more than we have now. The reductions in the tariff on these goods have been so small that there is no encouragement for more importations, and gradually our manufacturing establishments are assuming larger and larger proportions, and are able to produce more and more goods and at lower prices, so that with the reasonable tariff which is still retained under schedules 'B' and 'D,' there is not the slightest reason for believing that there will be any increase in United States manufactured goods coming into Canada. Trade will go from the north southward. I, in my county, look to a heavy increase in the exportation of cattle, sheep, lambs, poultry and the like. In my county, and in the counties surrounding, we looked to the old barley crop, which, prior to the McKinley tariff of 1901, was a vastly paying crop in the province of Ontario. Barley, which used to bring 85 cents a bushel, latterly brought only 55 cents. Barley, I believe, this week in Toronto brings 60 cents, and in Buffalo 90 cents. Barley, no doubt, will be a large and profitable crop in the province of Ontario if this proposed arrangement should take effect.

I cannot say so much in regard to wheat. The wheat that is grown in my county is largely used for local milling purposes. and for the purpose of feeding stock. I am not familiar with the movement of wheat as between Canada and the United States, so I prefer to leave that question to be settled by those who are familiar with it. I do say this, however, that so far as I have been able to examine the matter—and I have looked into it with some care—I cannot see any reason why we should expect any very great increase in the price of wheat for exportation to the United States. There may be a reason, and there may be an increased price, but I am not able exactly to find out how it will come about. I do think, however, that the time is coming, the time indeed is almost at hand, when the United States will not be exporting wheat. The time is coming, indeed the time I believe is at hand, when the United States will not export cattle. By the end of the present year, it is said. there will be no exported cattle from the United States ; and if the figures I have seen are correct, the time is almost at hand when there will be no wheat exported from the United States. I think there is a great chance of the wheat growers of the west obtaining in the markets of the United States an advantage which perhaps they do not enjoy now, as the price of wheat is still regulated in the British market. I have taken trouble to look up some facts in regard to wheat, chiefly having reference to a statement made in the address of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

Mr. LENNOX. As the hon. gentleman is apparently going to another subject, I have been waiting to direct his attention to a point on which he started to speak, and left it. He directed us to pages 3379 and 3380 'Hansard,' containing the speech of the leader of the opposition, and I understood him to say that he proposed to deal with it. But inadvertently, I suppose, he immediately turned to page 3374, and dealt with what was there, taking two disjointed sentences and dealing with them. The hon. gentleman, however, did not take up what I understood he intended to take up when he gave us pages 3379 and 3380 dealing with the policy of the opposition. The hon. gentleman told us beforehand that he intended to refer to the policy laid down by the leader of the opposition in reference to the framing of our tariff.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I thought I said all I intended to say, which was that the statement as set out in the 'Hansard,' and as I heard it in the House in regard to a permanent tariff commission, came to me as a great surprise, and I did not consider from the language the leader of the opposition used, that that was his matured and fixed idea, and I hoped it was not, but that if it was his settled opinion and his policy, the sooner the country came to know about it the better, because it was a reversal of the foundation of the British constitution.

Mr. LENNOX. This is the point to which I wish to call the hon. gentleman's atten-

tion. I understood when he referred to the policy of the leader of the opposition, and gave the pages containing his speech he proposed to do the leader of the opposition the justice of reading them. Now he did not do so. I understood his object was to show specifically and exactly what the leader of the opposition said.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The leader of the opposition was not in his place at the time I mentioned it. I referred to the pages mentioned by the hon. member for Simcoe, but that was in regard to the policy of letting things alone.

Mr. LENNOX. No, my hon. friend is wrong about that. The hon. gentleman first referred to pages 3379 and 3380.

Mr. GUTHRIE. That is in regard to a tariff commission ; I said all I intended to say on that. I was discussing the question of wheat, and chiefly in reference to a remark made by the leader of the opposition in the course of his speech to the effect that if Canadians were not particular we would find that foreign countries like the Argentine Republic would send their products to Great Britain, and I was under the impression that they send a large quantity of their natural products there now. Great Britain is not disposed to be over particular as to where she purchases those products, and there is no benefit to her to buy from Canada rather than in Argentina. So I looked up the reports, and I found in the library a volume published annually known as the 'Statesman's Year-Book' for 1910. And here I wish to remark, that in looking through the volume I saw that some vandal has cut out 15 or 20 pages of the most valuable information in it. I mention this, for one reason because I have noticed the same thing in regard to other statistical works. It ought to be brought to the attention of those having care of the library, that mutilations of this kind should not be allowed, and that anybody who does mutilate a volume should be deprived of the privileges of the library. However, I found the report that I required, and I find in the 'Statesman's Year-Book' for 1910, that wheat imported into Great Britain during 1909 from all parts of the British Empire amounted to 69,000,000 bushels. The figures given in the volume are given in hundred weights, 60 pounds to the bushel and 100 pounds to the 100 weight. I find that the total imports of wheat into Great Britain for 1909 were 163,000,000 bushels. I thought it rather strange to see a published interview with the Hon. Robert Rogers within the last three or four days, I think after he left Ottawa, in a Minneapolis newspaper, in which he expressed himself as opposed to the present trade arrangement, and said that if this arrangement were negatived, in a very short time, I think he said next year, Canada would be exporting to Great Britain 200,000,000 bushels of wheat. I think, on the face of it, that statement is ridiculous, because all that Great Britain takes from the whole world is 163,000,000 bushels. It is interesting to know where she gets her wheat. Have we interfered with Argentina in that respect? Why, Great Britain takes more wheat from the Argentine Republic than from any other quarter of the globe. From the Argentine Republic in 1909 she took 33,000,000 bushels ; from Russia, poor distressed, protected Russia, 30,000,000 bushels ; from Canada, 27,500,000 ; from the United States, 24,000,000 ; from India, 24,000,000, and the balance is made up of wheat from Chili, Australia, Lower Egypt, and all other quarters of the world. I wont give the statistics in regard to flour, though the member for North Toronto did give them, and probably they are correct. Now, what is the position with regard to wheat in the United States? I looked up the statistical year-book of the United States for 1910, and here let me say that the statistical information prepared by the United States government is far in advance of that prepared in Canada ; it is in a more convenient form. I have the greatest difficulty in finding the information I require in our blue-books, and I think it would be a good thing if our government sent a deputation to Washington for the purpose of learning a better method of preparing statistics.

However, in the United States Statistical Year-book, I find that the greatest year of production was 1892, when they produced 748,000,000 bushels. The exportation that year was 235,000,000 bushels to all places in the world. That is nine years before the next item that I give. The wheat produced in 1909 was 664,000,000 bushels, there was consumed in the United States 550,000,000 bushels, and there was exported 114,000,000 bushels. But, take the year 1908, and you will find that in that year they exported 163,000,000 bushels—not 114,000,000—and that they consumed only 490,000,000 bushels, whereas the following year they consumed 550,000,000 bushels, and so the ratio of consumption is increasing, while exportation is decreasing. It has been said by such men as Jas. J. Hill, in fact, I think the President of the United States—anyway by competent authority—that it is only a question of time when the exportation of wheat from the United States will stop. Then, I take the question of cattle. My statement with regard to cattle is hardly as precise. In some cases numbers are given and in some cases values are given. I find that in England, in 1909, there was received from all sources 321,000 head of cattle; no value given. In the United States Statistical Year-book for 1910 I find that in 1900 the United States ex-

ported 397,000 head of cattle, and that in 1909 they exported only 207,000 head, a decrease of almost 45 per cent. The value of cattle exported in 1900 was $30,000,000, and in 1909 $18,000,000. But I have it from pretty fair authority that during the present year—that is 1911—there will be no cattle exported from the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he has taken into account the amount of chilled meat they are exporting now?

Mr. GUTHRIE. No, I have only taken into account the export of live cattle. I also have this to say with regard to the cattle trade and the export of cattle finished in my county, that during last fall and summer fine export steers weighing 1,400 pounds were shipped to Toronto for export to Liverpool, but on account of the better price being paid in Chicago they were reshipped from Toronto back to Chicago. This has not been in a single case, but in many cases, and, as my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture reminds me, they were shipped to Chicago in spite of the duty. I believe that in all western Ontario we will ship a tremendous amount of live stock to the United States if this proposal succeeds. It will be more convenient to ship to Buffalo than to Liverpool. The freight rates will be less, and I believe that on the average the price will be higher—I do not say to any great extent higher—but on a 1,400 pound beast, if only one cent a pound, that is $14 to the farmer, and that is a most important increase in price to him. I believe that the price of mutton and lamb is higher in Buffalo on the average than in Toronto, and Buffalo is the market for lambs for the southwestern portion of Ontario. They now pay a duty of 75 cents on lambs, and of $1.50 on sheep. I believe the farmer will get a better price and have a better market for sheep and lambs if this tariff change takes place. Turnips we ship in large quantities. Turnips are a paying crop in our county, because we feed and ship a great quantity of them. The regulations which the United States have been enforcing at the border have interfered with a profitable trade in that product. Turnips now pay a duty of 25 per cent or something of the kind, but it is not only the rate of duty but also the regulations of which we complain. A turnip shipper told me that turnips which he has bought for 10 and 12 cents a bushel are revalued at the border at as high as 18 and 20 cents, and that he has lost on the transaction because of such re-valuation. The United States have some system by which they regulate what they believe to be the actual value of any article. These drawbacks to trade, I understand, are to be removed, or it is the intention of both parties that they will be removed. Potatoes, which, likewise, are very largely produced in my county, and in counties similarly situated, are placed on the free list. We will ship a tremendous quantity of such articles, and of poultry, butter and barley large quantities will be shipped to the United States, which we do not ship there now.

I mention these facts to show that the balance of trade is going from the north to the south, and that there will not be a great quantity of trade coming from the south to the north if this arrangement is carried out as it stands before the House to-day. I do not know sufficient about the case of the fruit growers to discuss it intelligently. But I hear on the one hand the cry that if this trade arrangement goes into force the cost of living will be increased, and I hear, on the other hand, the cry that the cost of fruit to the grower will be lowered, the cost of vegetables to the grower will be lowered, and that the price of meat and bacon and beef products will be lowered—so the packers' association tell the people of Canada. I will give my own best judgment in regard to that question. I am as convinced as I can be of anything that the great farming community of this country, representing sixty per cent of our population, is going to be very materially benefited. The farmers are going to make money, they are going to make a lot of money, and year after year they will make more money as long as this arrangement lasts.

What about the people who live in the villages, towns and cities? It would be illogical to declare that there would be an increase in the price of farming commodities and no increase in the price of living. What I say with regard to that is that there is not going to be anything like any immediate jump, there is going to be a fair increase in value, and there will be a steady value, there will be no fluctuation between this country and that country, as there will be no tariff between them. There will be a fair increase of value, and where you have a general prosperity and increased receipts by the great bulk of the people of this country, it will be in the nature of a national prosperity, and every man, woman and child in the land must feel the result of it. I believe that it will be a tremendous advantage to the people of the northwest, the people of the prairie provinces, if this trade arrangement is put in force. It will increase the rapidity with which that great country is being settled up. What would be the effect on the manufacturing industries of Ontario if we had one million more farmers in the northwest raising wheat and cattle? That is the true policy of the east and west, and I wish to be understood as not to say one single word against the development of our own manufacturing industries.

One reason I have for appreciating this trade arrangement in particular is that our commissioners, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, have scrupulously avoided anything in that arrangement which could be an injury to any section of our manufacturing industries in the Dominion of Canada as far as I am aware. I wish to see them enjoy a fair amount of protection. I am not an out-and-out free trader; in fact, I disagree with the principles of free trade as expressed in this House unless we have the broad world to trade freely with. I believe we must have some kind of protection in Ontario.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not for the farmers as well as others?

Mr. GUTHRIE. If the farmers were to come here and cry out for it that might be a very good reason for granting it, but they seem to desire it the other way around.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman had been here last week he would have seen 800 of the most intelligent farmers crying out for protection and presenting very strong arguments for it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The fruit growers?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, and vegetable growers.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Well, that is a subject I am not competent to discuss. I do not know that I had better venture upon that subject because I do not know anything about it. I am talking about conditions as I find them. I have no quarrel with any industry because I believe that if we adopt a measure that will promote the general prosperity you help the manufacturing and every other interest in Canada. I am not supported very largely by the proprietors of factories in Guelph. I am sorry I am not, I have tried to support them, but the fact is I am not. In Guelph we have a very large industry manufacturing all grades of hardware. We have another large factory manufacturing sewing machines and cream separators. We have a carpet factory making Brussels and other high grade carpets. We have a large pipe industry making iron pipe and employing 200 or 300 men. We have the Bell Organ and Piano Company, we have an axle works, two stove foundries and many other important manufacturing concerns. I am sorry they do not yield me much support at election time, and I think they should. However, I want to support them if I can and so long as our tariff, kept down to a revenue basis, affords enough protection to protect them I am satisfied with that feature of the tariff. I am not a high protectionist; I think high protection in Canada would be a ridiculous proposal, but for the last five or ten years Guelph's shipments have gone where? To the Northwest. Where have they gone from Toronto and other cities in Ontario and Quebec? They are finding their best market in the Northwest to-day. Give them a million more prosperous farmers out there with a convenient market, increase their purchasing power, and you will increase their demands and then if you maintain a revenue tariff with sufficient incidental protection you will increase the industry in every manufacturing establishment in Canada. You will increase the price of wages, you will increase the demand for labour. Make the great bulk of the people of this country prosperous on their farms and the cry of 'back to the land,' will have some effect and a large number of people who are to-day coming into the towns and cities who are not mechanics or artisans will go back to the land where they can make a reasonable profit for their labour. You create a demand in that way in the labour market. I believe in a thorough examination of the immigration that is coming into Canada. I congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior and the branch of his department that has charge of immigration on the efficiency of that service at present. We have a better class of people coming in, more suited to conditions in this country. We have a carefully selected immigration coming in, and I believe that the figures this year will run to about one half million people, nearly all for the Northwest. Place these on the farms, make them comfortable, and increase their purchasing power and you solve the problem of the cost of living. Give an artisan in my city an opportunity of earning $2 or $2.50 more per week, and he is more than repaid for any extra cost of living that may be engendered by the farmer receiving more for his produce. In the case of the individual, the proportion of increase is very small. An additional fourteen dollars on a beast to the farmer means but one or two cents extra on a piece of steak to the customer in the city. Let the clerk have a chance to get a better salary. On what does the ordinary merchant in a country or village store depend? On the prosperity of the surrounding farmers. We have it in Guelph, they have it in other towns the same way, our great commerce is between the townships and the city, between the villages and the city. Give these farmers more money to spend, and the merchants in town will make more. They can pay more salaries to their clerks if the farmers of the country enjoy a greater power of purchasing. They will want more home made goods and more British goods, and it is on that principle I argue that the purchasing power will be increased and imports from Great Britain will be increased and not decreased—and the preference will be a real preference.

I take no stock whatever in the cry that we are going to ruin the railroads; the railroads have always been able to take care of themselves. I take no stock in the cry that we will frighten British capital. I believe the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) yesterday based 75 per cent of his argument on the declaration or letter written by Mr. Blake in 1891 upon a proposal radically different from the one now before this House. That was a policy of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union; this is a proposal for a very limited trade agreement. The one was to be in the shape of a definite binding treaty, this is in the shape of a treaty which we or the United States can set aside at will, which will remain in force only so long as it proves mutually beneficial. The arguments of Mr. Blake, for whom I have the highest respect, do not pertain to the question now under consideration in this committee, although they might have pertained and probably did pertain, to the question under discussion at the time Mr. Blake wrote his letter. But what about the railroads? Who says the railways of Canada have any fear of this? Who has the right to say so? Who has heard from them in regard to the subject? Have any railroads pronounced upon the question? The only railroad man who has pronounced upon it is Sir Donald Mann of the Canadian Northern. It was rumored in one paper that Sir William Mackenzie had said something but this was promptly denied by Sir William. But Sir Donald Mann is quite clear in his statement, which is published in a very respectable financial paper in Canada called the 'Financial Post' in the issue of February 4. Sir Donald Mann there says:

> The products of the farm, of the sea and of the mine are entitled to especial consideration. Nor should the lumbermen be overlooked. Timber is a crop which ripens, and should be reaped. If it is not, it deteriorates. He who cuts down one ripe tree and plants one or more in its place is a producer of wealth.
>
> If we have seven or eight millions of people in Canada, with a free market for the producer, and to that number we add the 95 millions of the United States, we are assisting the most important industries in Canada.
>
> Next in importance to the producer comes the manufacturer and it is the duty of the government to provide increased market facilities for both. The United States has ceased to export cattle, and may soon cease to export wheat. The balance between production and consumption is drawing nearer adjustment. If it were possible to prevent grain from going south, without injury to the producer, I would say avoid a treaty or other reciprocal arrangement, but it is beyond our power to hold our wheat within British territory. The United States can remove the tariff whenever it suits her convenience so to do, without consulting us.
>
> With regard to the export of wheat, Canada will have her own lines of railway across the continent as well as ships upon the sea. This will enable them to take grain for export from the producer to the consumer, without any division of rates, and, in the same way, manufactured goods as return cargoes from the producer to the consumer in the west. On the other hand, going south through the United States, wheat for export would have to pass over three or four lines of railways, and thence by independent vessels to European markets. This through rate, which is necessarily low, would be divided among three or four transportation companies, making it impossible to compete with Canadian through lines. Depend upon it Canadian railways handling natural products of the west for export will retain the traffic on their own tracks and in their own vessels to destination.
>
> Personally I would prefer to have a preference between the United Kingdom and the Dominion, and between the Dominion and other colonies. This preference should be increased from time to time until, say in 25 years, the cost of production would reach a common point throughout the empire. Then we would be able to have free trade within the empire, and protection against the non-British nations.

That is a very strong statement and it is the only authoritative announcement by any important railroad man I have seen. Why then raise that cry about railroads? The railroads are not afraid of it. What are the Canadian Pacific railway doing. They have completed their lines to Chicago and Duluth, owning now the Wisconsin Central through the United States and the Sault line to Duluth. What are the Canadian Northern doing? At this moment they are completing their line from Winnipeg to Duluth and by the first of August that line will be in operation and it will be carrying grain in September. The railroads are not afraid of it. Who is afraid of it? I do not know that the Manufacturers Association have made any pronouncement upon the subject. I do not think they have. They probably will oppose it on the ground that they have opposed almost everything that emanates from this government in regard to tariffs.

Then, what is their real objection? I think the weakest objection I have heard, and one which it is almost useless to discuss, is that a good trade agreement between Canada and the United States, which will be beneficial to this country—and if it is not, we will abrogate it—and which will be beneficial to the United States—and if it is not, they will abrogate it—will lead in some way to a commercial or political union between the two countries. Some people say—I do not think they are very brave in the idea—that it is the entering of the wedge, that it is the beginning of the end. Well, I cannot see in a trade measure anything of the kind. There is nothing to support such an idea. There has been no experience, so far as I

am aware, of anything like it. Never anywhere throughout the world, so far as I know, have good trade relations between two countries brought about commercial or political union. Look at the trade today between Great Britain and Germany, amounting to £60,000,000 or £70,000,000 a year. Is it drawing them together? Why, hon. gentlemen opposite say they are ready to spring at each other's throats. Did the trade treaty between England and France, negotiated by Richard Cobden 50 or 60 years ago, bring about political union between those two countries? Previous to that treaty there was a pretty bad feeling between England and France, and out of it came peace and harmony, but no political union. On what is this theory based? I know of no reason why there should be any annexation feeling in this country. Before the negotiation of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, there was an annexation party in Canada. We have not forgotten the annexation manifesto signed by such men as the late Sir John Abbott, afterwards Prime Minister of Canada, Sir John Rose, Sir Francis Hincks, and other staunch Conservatives. They afterwards changed their opinions and became great men in public affairs, I am free to admit. Why did they sign that manifesto? What was the cause of it? It was because they could not get reciprocal trade relations with the United States. When I make that statement, I am backed up by a very high authority. Let me read what was said by Lord Elgin himself, in a letter written to Lord Grey, which is to be found in the 'Letters and Journals of Lord Elgin,' published in London, in 1872.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the date of the letter?

Mr. GUTHRIE. March, 1849. Lord Elgin said:

> There has been a vast deal of talk about annexation, as is unfortunately always the case when there is anything to agitate the public mind. A great deal of this talk is, however, bravado, and a great deal the mere product of thoughtlessness. Undoubtedly it is in some quarters the utterances of very serious conviction; and if England will not make the sacrifices which are absolutely necessary to put the colonists here in as good a position commercially as the citizens of the States—in order to which free navigation and reciprocal trade with the States are indispensable—if not only the organs of the league, but those of the government and of the Peel party, are always writing as if it were an admitted fact that colonies, and more especially Canada, are a burden, to be endured only because they cannot be got rid of, the end may be nearer than we wot of.

In November of the same year Lord Elgin wrote to Lord Grey:

> But if things remain at their present footing in this respect, there is nothing before us but violent agitation, ending in convulsion or annexation. And I much fear that no measure but the establishment of reciprocal trade between Canada and the States, or the imposition of a duty on the produce of the States when imported into England, will remove it.

Now, that was the cause of the disturbance at that time.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the hon. gentleman say that was the cause of the agitation?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I take the word of Lord Elgin for what I said, because I was not in being at that time, and I am only stating the fact as written by a Governor General of this country.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). What is meant by free navigation as the alternative to reciprocity?

Mr. GUTHRIE. It says free navigation and reciprocal trade.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Does he not mean that the navigation laws should be abrogated there?

Mr. GUTHRIE. The hour of adjournment is so near, that I cannot continue this discussion longer. I have heard no substantial reason advanced against this proposal, which will bear investigation. Every interest of Canada is guarded. It gives us three markets, instead of two. Every interest of Great Britain is guarded. If a day comes when Great Britain is able to enter into better arrangements with the colonies and to bring us all together, our hands are free. If we become a greater and more prosperous people, if we become a richer people, we shall be all the stronger as a British nation and a part of the British Empire, and we shall never, with my consent, be other than a part of the British Empire. But why mix this matter up with questions affecting our political relations? The whole and sole question for us is, have we made a good bargain? As for me and the part of the country which I represent, this proposal will be welcomed as one of the most progressive acts of a government which for 14 years has shown nothing but progress, development and success in Canada.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 16, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McLEAN (Queens) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 118) to amend the

Canada Shipping Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to amend section 477 of the Shipping Act so that coal barges under tow may come into the ports of Canada without being obliged to pay pilotage fees. Up to a recent decision of the Privy Council, coal barges have been coming into our ports in the maritime provinces without paying pilotage dues. Under this decision it is held that the words in the Act 'ships propelled wholly or in part by steam' do apply to coal barges under tow. For example, the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company send from Parrsboro' to St. John coal in barges towed by a steam tug, two or three barges in tow; and they have been coming in under the decision of the court as to the meaning of those words I have just quoted, holding that they do apply to coal barges under tow. This decision of the Privy Council holds that they are obliged to pay pilotage. The object is to allow coal barges of that description towed by steam to be exempt from paying pilotage dues.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY AND GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY ARBITRATION.

*Mr. FOSTER:

1. When was the commission appointed to settle the difference between the Intercolonial railway and Grand Trunk railway in reference to matters in dispute in Montreal?
2. What were the points to be determined?
3. What have so far been settled and how?
4. What has been the cost so far?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Board of arbitrators appointed under agreement of February 1, 1898, clause 46 thereof, for award and determination of questions, arising under said agreement prior to the appointments of said arbitrators, June, 1904.

2. Questions arising under agreement of the 1st February, 1898, confirmed by statutes of 1899, chapter 5, and brought into force on September 26, 1899, in the matter of issue of bills of lading, routing of freight, diversion of traffic, disputed accounts. The several matters were submitted for arbitration under the provisions of the said agreement, either at the initiation of the Crown or of the company and disposed of by the arbitrators, some in favour of the Crown, and others adversely, and were practically questions of interpretation of the provisions of said agreement as applying to matters from time to time arising in connection with the operation of the respective railways, subject to the agreement. Other questions submitted were not disposed of by the board of arbitrators, owing to the death of the then chairman, the late Judge Killam, and are now for the consideration of the board of arbitrators as at present constituted.

3. Answered by number 2.

4. Amount paid by Intercolonial railway to date is $49,737.97.

MEN DISCHARGED FROM INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

*Mr. CROSBY:

1. How many men have been discharged from the Intercolonial railway since the 1st of November, 1908, who were working at a daily wage, at what points on the Intercolonial railway, and the number discharged at each point?

2. What number of men have been taken on since the 1st November, 1908, working at a daily wage; and also the number of men that have been taken on as clerks and officials generally, working by the week, month or year?

Mr. GRAHAM:

At what points on I.C.R.	No. of men discharged at each point.
Amqui	2
Amherst	2
Bartibog	1
Bagot	1
Cross Creek	1
Chaudière	28
Chaudière Curve	1
Campbellton	23
Chatham	2
Doaktown	1
Dalhousie	1
Greenville	1
Gibson	4
Harbour au Bouche	1
Halifax	35
Richmond	141
Lévis	12
Mount Uniacke	1
Moncton	151
Mulgrave	2
Moffatts	1
Newcastle	14
North Sydney	2
Oxford Junction	2
Oxford	1
Point du Chêne	2
Point Tupper	2
Rothesay	1
Rivière du Loup	57
St. John	15
Sydney	34
St. Arsène	1
Stellarton	12
Ste. Flavie	8
Shediac	1
St. Moïse	1
Sackville	1
St. Apollinaire	1
St. Eugène	1
Springhill Junction	5
Truro	44
Windsor Junction	1
	618

2. The number of men that have been taken on as clerks and officials generally, working by the week, month and year, is 175.

RECIPROCITY—TRADE OF OTHER COUNTRIES.

*Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. What is the number and the names of the countries, if any, that will be entitled to have their natural products and manufactured articles come into Canada under the same terms as the United States under the proposed reciprocity agreement?
2. Was there any understanding reached at the recent conferences regarding reciprocity that the Canadian tariff or articles not specifically mentioned in the treaty would not be increased?
3. If the tariff of Canada on all or any articles not specifically mentioned in the agreement was considerably increased, would the United States have any cause for complaint or excuse for terminating the reciprocity agreement?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. France is a favoured nation country to a limited extent, that is to say, as respects the lists of articles specified in schedules B and C to the French Treaty. Twelve countries: Argentina Republic, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Venezuela—are accorded most favoured nation treatment generally. These are consequently enjoying the benefits of the French Treaty. As respects the dutiable schedules in the agreement with the United States, the concessions to be granted to the United States are largely the same as already have been granted to France and the favoured nation countries. As respects a large part of the list, therefore, no additional advantage will be enjoyed by such countries. There are however, a few articles in the French schedules which in the agreement with the United States are made free or dutiable at lower rates. In these cases the advantages granted to the United States will extend also to France and the favoured nation countries. In the case of a few articles which are not to be found in the French Treaty the favoured nation countries will be entitled to receive the concessions on the same terms as the United States, but France will not be so entitled. Although not arising from any agreement, in no case has any advantage been granted to any foreign country that did not at the same time extend to all parts of the British Empire. In the few cases in which the rates to be established are lower than those already enjoyed by British countries the reductions will apply to such countries.

2 and 3. There is no understanding of any kind except what is found in the correspondence and schedules already before the House.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar):

1. Is the tariff agreement with the United States made to apply with that country alone so far as Canada is concerned?
2. If not, what other countries besides the United States would be allowed to import into Canada farm products on the same terms as the proposed arrangements with the United States?

Mr. FIELDING:

The answer given above also applies to this question.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY MILEAGE.

Mr. DANIEL:

1. What is the present mileage of the Intercolonial railway?
2. What is the value of the rolling stock on said railway?
3. What is the number of locomotives, freight cars and passenger cars, respectively, included in above valuation?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. 1,456 miles.
2. First cost, $19,049,837.93.
3. 397 locomotives; 454 passenger cars; 12,491 freight cars.

IMPORTS AT KINGSTON FROM UNITED STATES.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What quantities of cheese, butter, eggs, dead poultry, potatoes, hay, straw, oats and barley, with their respective values, were entered at the port of Kingston, Ontario, from the United States for home consumption during the fiscal year ending March, 1910?
2. How many horses, cattle, sheep and pigs, not for improvement of stock, were brought into Canada from the United States by way of Kingston, Ontario, for the fiscal years 1908, 1909 and 1910, and the respective values thereof?
3. What were the quantities and values of pork, bacon, lard and other animal products entered at the port of Kingston, Ontario, from the United States during the fiscal years 1909 and 1910?
4. What were the quantities and values of fresh vegetables entered at the port of Kingston, Ontario, from the United States during the fiscal years 1909 and 1910?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The quantity and value of cheese, butter, eggs, &c., entered for consumption at the port of Kingston, from the United States, during the fiscal year 1910, was as follows:

	Quantity.	Value.
		$
Cheese	..	..
Butter	..	..
Eggs	..	..
Poultry and game	..	..
Potatoes ..bush.	67	87
Hay	..	..
Straw	..	..
Oats	..	..
Barley	..	..

2. The imports for consumption of horses, cattle, sheep and pigs (not for improvement of stock) at the port of Kingston from the United States during the fiscal year 1910, were as follows:

	No.	1908. Value.	No.	1909. Value.	No.	1910. Value.
Horses	1	$150	1	$155	2	$340
Cattle	...	..	...	..	...	..
Sheep	...	..	...	..	...	..
Pigs	...	..	...	..	...	..

3. The quantities and values of pork, bacon, lard and other animal products entered for consumption at the port of Kingston, from the United States, during the fiscal years 1909 and 1910, were as follows:

	1909. Lbs.	1909. Value.	1910. Lbs.	1910. Value.
Lard	....	.....	10,437	1,197
Pork	....	.....	.....	.....
Bacon	....	.....	.....	.....
Other animal products	....	1,145	.....	2,987

4. The quantities and values of fresh vegetables entered for consumption at the port of Kingston, from the United States, during the fiscal years 1909 and 1910, were as follows:

	1909. Quantity.	1909. Value.	1910. Quantity.	1910. Value.
Melons No.	2,259	$180	1,258	$106
Potatoes. Bush.	406	451	68	87
" sweet "	175	149	262	212
Tomatoes "	10	39	13	24
Vegetables, n.o.p.	.....	82	.....	277
Total	..	$901	..	$706

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC LABOURERS' WAGES.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Is the government aware, as alleged, that men working for the Grand Trunk Pacific railway at Lafond, in Alberta, have not been paid moneys owing to them by this company, which have been long overdue?

2. Is the government aware that these men after alleged repeated demands have been absolutely unable to obtain either payment or satisfaction?

3. Does the government intend to take any steps in this matter?

4. Is there any reason why these men should not be paid what is owing to them?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. There is no such station on the Grand Trunk Pacific railway as Lafond.

2. The government has no knowledge of men on the railway not having been paid; the general manager reports that all men employed on Grand Trunk Pacific railway are paid promptly.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. Answered by No. 2.

GLACE BAY BAIT ASSOCIATION.

Mr. MADDIN:

1. How much money was paid to the Glace Bay Bait Association, Glace Bay, N.S., during the years 1906, 1907, 1909 and 1910?

2. What were the dates of payment?

3. Who are the members of the Glace Bay Bait Association?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. 1906, nothing; 1907, $1,000 advance on account of construction of Freezer; 1909, $100 on account of bonus earned by association during 1908; 1910, nothing.

2. October 21, 1907, and January 28, 1909.

3. The department has no list of the present members of the association, the freezer having become the association's exclusive property when it was completed.

PELAGIC SEALING.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to call the attention of the government to an item which I see in to-day's 'Citizen', which reads as follows:

Washington, Feb. 15.—Action was taken to-day by the senate committee on foreign relations which if sustained by the senate will not only put an end to pelagic sealing in the Behring sea, but will also stop the killing of seals on shore for a period of years. The committee to-day ordered a favourable report on the draft of a treaty between America and Great Britain providing for the protection of seals in this manner. It is based upon the declaration of experts that the seal herd, now nearly exterminated, will be completely restored to its original strength in the course of a few years if left completely undisturbed. Russia and Japan must also make similar treaties to make this effective.

I would like to inquire of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if such a treaty is being negotiated, and if he can communicate to the House any information regarding it, or upon what lines it proceeds, or tell us if we are bartering away any rights which we possess in the seal fisheries at the present time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There has been a treaty signed between Great Britain and the United States, of course Canada being a consenting party, not for the abolition but for the cessation during a

term of years of pelagic sealing upon terms which have been mutually agreed upon and which, I have no doubt, will be found satisfactory. I am not in a position to-day to put the treaty before the House, but I hope to do so within a short time, and certainly as soon as we have received it.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the right hon. the Prime Minister say whether that treaty goes into operation unless it includes the other pelagic sealing nations?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say as to that at the present time. I do not think it does, but I cannot say certainly.

Mr. HUGHES. Does it cover sealing on the American islands off the coast of Alaska or only upon the islands which are common to the two countries?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, it applies to pelagic sealing on the high seas. It affects only, as far as I remember, the Pacific ocean.

THE FLAG ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to bring the attention of the government to the fact that it has never been customary to fly the flag on the public institutions of Canada on St. David's Day. St. David's Day is the 1st March. The white cross of St. David forms a part of our Union Jack and I am satisfied that the people of Welsh descent in Canada will be only too glad to find the government ordering up the flag on public buildings on that day. The eldest son of our Sovereign takes his title as Prince of Wales from that part of the United Kingdom and Welshmen have always been found to the front doing their duty in defence of the empire. I trust the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will be good enough to order the flag to be flown on public buildings on the 1st March.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) will receive due consideration. While the question of flying the flag on public buildings is before the House I might refer to a question put by an hon. gentleman a short time ago. He asked me for information with regard to flying the flag throughout Canada. There are certain days, with which hon. gentlemen are no doubt familiar, upon which the flag is always flown upon all the public buildings, and then it may also be flown upon other days to be named by the Minister of Public Works. Latterly the question has come up with reference to flying the flag upon public buildings upon every day in the year. It has been thought that would be a somewhat expensive matter, and, therefore, it would be worthy of some consideration before deciding to do it. In an informal way I have conferred with my colleagues upon this subject, and they approve of the suggestion that in the border cities and towns, including the seaports of Canada, it would be desirable to have the flag flown every day in the year. The reason for that is that the United States flag is flown upon the American consulate every day in the year. It was a matter of remark in the city of St. John that a stranger coming by steamer to the city, upon whatever day he came, saw the Stars and Stripes flying to the breeze and unless it happened to be a special occasion he would not see the Union Jack. Therefore, in the seaports to which strangers are constantly coming, and in the border towns I have directed that the flag shall be flown upon our public buildings every day in the year. With regard to having it flown upon all public buildings in Canada upon every day in the year, that is a matter that is still under consideration.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the minister consider the flying of the flag on public buildings on St. David's Day?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I have told the hon. gentleman that it will be taken into consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. I have thought sometimes that it would be a good plan if the flag were flown on public buildings during the time that parliament was in session so that in any part of the country, if the flag were seen flying from public buildings, it would be known at once that parliament was in session.

OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when the report of the Ottawa Improvement Commission will be brought down. Under the statute it should be down fourteen days after the beginning of the session. I mentioned this to the Prime Minister about a month ago.

Mr. FIELDING. The finances of the Ottawa Improvement Commission have already been reported to the House by the Auditor General's Report but the formal submission that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) asks will be made immediately. I thought I had the report here, but there is really nothing which is not already before the House in the shape of the Auditor General's Report, I think.

RENTAL OF OTTAWA BUILDINGS—LIGHTING CONTRACT.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I desire to rise to a question of privilege. In the Evening 'Journal,' published in the city of Ottawa last evening, I find a statement prepared by Mr. Ellis, the treasurer of the city of

Ottawa, and who is the head of the municipal lighting department of the city. Referring to certain statements which I made in the House with reference to the lighting of certain buildings owned by the Imperial Realty Company, Mr. Ellis is reported as making the following remarks :

On my return from Toronto a few days ago I found that the Hon. Dr. Pugsley had in the House of Commons charged me with having issued false vouchers in connection with the electric light consumed by his department in the buildings rented from Mr. Woods.

I emphatically say that no vouchers or accounts, false or otherwise connected with this matter were ever issued by me, or on my instructions, or with my knowledge.

When the department became a tenant of Mr. Woods, he had a flat rate from the Consumers' Company. The department was offered but refused a flat rate, and determined to pay according to the meter rate. It then requested Mr. Woods to instruct the Consumers' Company to place meters in the building in order to measure the current. The company complied with this request, for the sole purpose of enabling the Public Works Department to be furnished officially with correct statements of the amount which they had agreed to pay. Mr. Woods had nothing to do with the meter readings. He had a flat rate with the Consumers' Company and he continued it.

The position therefore was that Mr. Woods, as landlord of the buildings, had a flat rate with the Consumers' Company, and the department, as tenant, desiring to pay according to the amount of electricity which it should actually consume, obtained installation of meters and required for its own information quarterly statements taken from the meters. These statements were furnished by the Consumers' Company until the city took over its plant, and since then have been furnished by the city. There is no other way in which the department could have been informed as to what it ought to pay. Neither the Consumers' Company nor the city need have taken the trouble which they did to give the department the information which it desired to have. Both did it merely as a business courtesy, and the return which the city gets is a recklessly untruthful villification.

In March, 1906, the city offered to give the Department of Public Works direct, Mr. Woods' flat rate contract, but this offer was not accepted, the department thus refusing a flat rate for the second time. The government therefore could from that time have had a contract direct with the city at the same rate which Mr. Woods paid the city, but instead continued paying him the full meter rates. If Mr. Woods has made a profit in the meter out of the government the Public Works Department is alone to blame.

Mr. Pugsley has no justification whatever for the statements he made regarding myself or for bringing my name into the matter at all. In fact, he had information at his disposal at the time he made the statements which conclusively showed this.

The remarks which I made and to which Mr. Ellis refers will be found on page 3240 and following of 'Hansard.' I have looked over the statement I made and I have nothing to add to and nothing to retract from that statement, except in one respect. I find that upon page 3240 I stated that when I became minister there was rendered to my department by the Imperial Realty Company bills upon a meter basis. I stated, further, that these bills were rendered by the company, that they were accompanied by bills on their regular account forms rendered by the electric light department of the city of Ottawa, presided over by the city treasurer, Mr. Ellis, showing the indebtedness of the Imperial Realty Company, or James W. Woods, as the case might be, to the city for the amount of current consumed based upon the meter rate, and that these bills were marked 'settled' by the electrical department of the city, that they were receipted as vouchers, and that they accompanied the bills which the Imperial Realty Company rendered to my department. You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that I stated that these bills had been rendered by the electrical department of the city of Ottawa. I did not mention Mr. Ellis's name then, although I knew that Mr. Ellis was the gentleman who presided over that department, and who I would suppose would be responsible for vouchers or bills that would be issued by that department. A little later in the discussion, as will be seen by page 3241 of 'Hansard,' the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) referred to Mr. Ellis—and this was the first mention that was made of Mr. Ellis's name in that connection, as follows:

Mr. SHARPE. Would not that arouse suspicion?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, because I would never dream that the treasurer of the city of Ottawa would issue a false voucher.

Then the member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) proceeded to say:

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). It is only fair to the city treasurer to state that the president of the Imperial Realty Company went to him and personally asked him to supply the amount of electricity that was consumed on a meter basis. He said he did not know what purpose it was to be used for; he had been personally requested by the president of the company to furnish the amount on the meter basis. He did not get paid for it and did not do it with intent to deceive the department.

Then I replied:

Mr. PUGSLEY. So also the Imperial Realty Company say they did not do it to deceive the department.

That was the first intimation that Mr. Ellis, the treasurer of the city, had personally intervened in the matter. All that

I was concerned in was to inform the House of the fact that the electrical department of the city, over which Mr. Ellis presides, had rendered these bills, as showing the indebtedness of Mr. Woods to the city, and which showed an indebtedness for the identical amount as contained in the bills which the Imperial Realty Company rendered to the department, and which were paid by the department. Now, in the statement of Mr. Ellis, he says:

I emphatically say that no vouchers or accounts, false or otherwise, connected with this matter were ever issued by me or on my instructions or with my knowledge.

Now, I am not concerned with the fact as to whether Mr. Ellis actually put his hand to these vouchers, or whether they were issued by an official of his department. That was of no importance to me; it would be of no importance to the department; it would be of no importance to the Auditor General, whose duty it would be to examine into the accounts; the question of importance was that the electrical department had issued these accounts and that based upon them were the bills which were rendered. Now, Mr. Ellis says that no vouchers, either erroneous or otherwise, were ever issued with his knowledge.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Would the minister allow me? Was the Department of Public Works deceived by these accounts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes; I say they were.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Was the city treasurer mistaken in his letter when he stated the department was not deceived?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The city treasurer could know nothing with regard to that. The various departments of the government are made up of officials, and above and beyond the officials of the departments is the Auditor General, and then comes the Public Accounts Committee, and it is all important, it seems to me, that in matters with which the government, or the various departments are connected everything should be open and above board, and I can imagine nothing which would be more calculated to deceive the officers of the department whose duty it is to check the accounts than to have erroneous statements presented as vouchers; statements which were not true on their face, but which contained statements which were absolutely incorrect. If hon. gentlemen will turn to page 580 of the report of the Public Accounts Committee of last session they will find a sample of these accounts which were rendered and which Mr. Ellis, in his statement, says never were rendered with his knowledge or authority. I find that one of these, which is printed here, is as follows:

Mr. PUGSLEY.

The Municipal Electric Department.
Ottawa, September 20, 1909.

Mr. J. W. Woods,
Slater street, Ottawa.

Acct. Folio 32 Meter No. 20212.
1909—to electric current supplied as follows:

	Watt Hours.	
Sept. 17—Present meter register.. ..	86,207,000	
June 15—Previous meter register.. ..	80,281,000	
Consumption, 5,926,000 W.H., at 8c.		$474 08
Discount of 10 per cent if this account is paid on or before October 5, 1909..		47 41
Net balance..		$426 67
Meter rent ($1.00 per annum)..		20
		$426 87

Arrears on which no discount is allowed——
Settled by Imperial Realty Company.—Municipal Electric Department. (Sgd.) G. E. Pennock, September 23, 1909.

Now, I understand from the statement of Mr. Ellis that no accounts, no vouchers, no bills, were issued by his department with his knowledge or authority. Well, we have here a statement showing the indebtedness of Mr. Woods to the municipal electric department of the city of Ottawa, charging him with the quantity of electric current consumed, charging him by the meter rate upon that quantity, showing the balance which Mr. Woods paid to the city of Ottawa, and showing that the account had been settled by the Imperial Realty Company. Now, Mr. Speaker, I leave it to you and I leave it to the House, as to whether or not that is a mere statement of the meter reading which Mr. Woods, or the Imperial Realty Company might hand over to the Department of Public Works. I ask you, Sir, whether I was wrong in the statement I made that the municipal electric department, from the time I became minister at all events, had furnished the bills showing the actual indebtedness of Mr. Woods to the municipal electric department of the city.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Would the minister permit another question?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Did the electric department offer a flat rate to the department in 1906?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it did not.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Then Mr. Ellis is mistaken in that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Ellis is absolutely mistaken.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). After reflection, will the minister say now that his department was deceived by these accounts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is true as I stated, and as is found in 'Hansard,' that away back in 1904, before I became minister,

when the question was put to Mr. Ewart, chief architect, as to whether he would prefer to pay by the meter or flat rate, he preferred the meter rate, because he said the department would prefer to pay for the electric light actually consumed. But so far as the records show, at all events during the years that I have been in charge of the department, it does not appear that the government was paying one cent more for electric light than the city was charging Mr. Woods or the Imperial Realty Company, that, in other words, the accounts show that the department was paying to the Imperial Realty Company the identical amounts which the city was charging for the electricity consumed. You will observe that these accounts show that they were settled by the Imperial Realty Company, and so the accounts go along all in the same way. A little later on I find in the very last account rendered a statement exactly in the same form upon the bill-heads of the municipal department of the city. Here is a statement of what it was alleged by the city Mr. Woods was indebted to them for lighting, and on it there is this statement. 'Settled by cheque, Municipal Electric Department,' signed by Mr. Pennock. That is a little stronger than these others, because there is here an allegation that a cheque had been given by Mr. Woods to the city of Ottawa for the identical amount which Mr. Woods was charging to the Department of Public Works.

Mr. Ellis refers to the three buildings. The evidence before the Committee on Public Accounts discloses that in respect to the Queen street building the city of Ottawa was paid by a meter rate and not by a flat rate, and if you take the accounts from beginning to end, you will find that the city dealt with the lighting of the Queen street building in exactly the same way as it did with the lighting of the buildings on Slater street, so far as the issuing of these accounts and vouchers was concerned.

Mr. Ellis says:

> In March, 1906, the city offered to give the Department of Public Works direct, Mr Woods' flat rate contract, but this offer was not accepted, the department refusing a flat rate for the second time.

I have examined the records of the department and I cannot find a trace of any such offer having been made. No offer was made, so far as I have been able to discover, but I do admit that in 1904, and I so stated when I addressed the House previously upon this question, the department, through Mr. Ewart, had the opportunity of paying for lighting by meter or flat rate, and it preferred to pay by a meter rate, but there is nothing to show that the officials of the department knew that Mr. Woods was receiving anything from the Public Works Department beyond what he was paying to the city of Ottawa, and I wish to emphasize the statement which I have already made that I cannot conceive how it is possible for Mr. Ellis to be mistaken in regard to these accounts. It may be that he did not see the accounts which were rendered by an official of his department, who is acting under his supervision, it may be that they were issued in entire ignorance upon his part, but that they were issued and were presented as vouchers from time to time there can be no doubt, as appears from the vouchers as they appear in the report of the Committee on Public Accounts, and as they appear also in the records of the department.

I ought to call the attention of you and of the House to what took place upon the 23rd of May, because I think I will show that the official of the municipal department recognized that what he had done had misled the Department of Public Works. Upon the 23rd of May, 1910, I wrote this letter, addressed to the mayor of the city of Ottawa:

> Dear Mr. Mayor,—During the recent session of parliament it was stated by a member of the Public Accounts Committee, who professed to know, that the government was paying a considerably larger amount for the lighting of buildings owned by the Imperial Realty Company, Limited, in this city, than was actually charged by the city.
>
> In looking over the accounts, I find that the Municipal Electric Department of the city furnished from time to time bills charging the company meter rates, and which bills were for the same amounts, as paid by the department. These accounts were submitted as vouchers, and the proper officials of my department, as well as the Auditor General, acted upon these vouchers, presuming that they were correct, and paid the bills.
>
> As an illustration, I find that an account was rendered by the Imperial Realty Company on the 22nd September, 1909, a copy of which is attached. Accompanying the account are vouchers, copies of which are also hereto annexed. These accounts are marked "Settled by the Imperial Realty Company," and are signed by the Municipal Electric Department.
>
> I shall esteem it a favour if you will kindly advise me as to whether or not my information in regard to there being a difference between the amounts paid to the city, and the amounts of the vouchers, signed on behalf of the city, is correct, and, if so, I shall be glad to have such explanation as the officials of the city have to offer upon the subject.
>
> I am, dear Mr. Mayor,
> Yours very truly,
> (Sgd.) WILLIAM PUGSLEY.
>
> Charles Hopewell, Esq.,
> Mayor, Ottawa.

On the 27th of May I received the following reply:

City of Ottawa,
Mayor's Office,
Ottawa, May 27, 1910.

The Honourable
The Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Mr. Pugsley,—Your letter of May 23rd to hand, re lighting of the buildings owned by the Imperial Realty Company, Limited, in this city. I beg to say that I have written to the officials in charge asking for an explanation and will forward to you, a copy of same as soon as received.

Believe me,
Sincerely yours,
(Sgd.) CHAS. HOPEWELL,
Mayor.

On June 9th, I received the following from His Worship the Mayor:

To the Honourable
The Minister of Public Works,
City.

Dear Mr. Pugsley,—I am enclosing you copies of letters sent by me to Mr. G. E. Pennock, and his reply in explanation of yours to me of some days ago.

Believe me,
Very sincerely yours,
(Sgd.) CHARLES HOPEWELL.

And this is the letter of Mr. Pennock, the accountant of the Municipal Electric Department, an official under Mr. Ellis, to His Worship the Mayor:

Ottawa, June 3rd, 1910.

His Worship,
Mayor Hopewell,
City.

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of May 27th, regarding a letter received by you from the Minister of Public Works in reference to account for electric current furnished to the Woods Building.

You say that the Minister of Public Works asks: 'Whether his information in regard to there being a difference between the amounts paid to the city and the amounts of the vouchers signed on behalf of the city is correct, and also if such be the fact what explanation can be given.'

In reply I beg to say,—

Mr. Woods pays the city for the Queen street Building the regular meter rates and for the Woods and Canadian Buildings, the flat rate. I am informed that his agreement with the government provides that they shall pay him on a regular meter rate for all the buildings. The meter rates are invariably higher than the flat rates. In order to enable him to render his account to the government on the meter basis, meters were installed in these buildings and meter readings have been regularly made, first by the Consumers Company and afterwards by the city.

The practice of installing meters for this purpose was commenced in 1904 before I was employed by the company.

The accounts referred to in the minister's letter were made up from such meter readings and for the purpose only of enabling Mr. Woods to render to the government his accounts upon the regular meter rate.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

The statement put upon them by me 'Settled by the Imperial Realty Company' was not intended to lead anyone to believe that the company or Mr. Woods had paid the city the amounts of money shown in them but only that the claim of the city against that company and Mr. Woods had been settled.

On the fuller consideration which I have recently given to the matter, I believe it would have been better for me to have made such a statement in a separate document and that I should not have made the memorandum on the copies of the accounts.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) G. E. PENNOCK.

Having presented those facts to you, Mr. Speaker, having called your attention to the vouchers issued by the city and the accounts which profess to show the indebtedness of Mr. Woods to the city for the supply of light charged by him to the Department of Public Works, I think you will agree that the city treasurer is not justified in making the statement that no accounts or vouchers were submitted to Mr. Woods by the city treasurer or with his knowledge. If Mr. Ellis means that he had no personal knowledge of it and that it was done by the accountant of the city behind his back, it may be that his statement would be correct; but if he meant that the city did not issue those statements and vouchers, as I said in my previous explanation, you will agree with me that in this he was not in accord with the facts. I therefore have felt it my duty to bring this matter to the attention of the House at the earliest opportunity. I desire to repeat now what I said before that I did not charge either the Imperial Realty Company or the electrical department of the city with fraud.

What I said was that they both had made the statement that they had no intention to deceive the department, but that they did deceive the officials of the department. I came in as minister in 1907 and a year or so after, or a considerable number of months after, my deputy came in, and he would not know what had taken place some years before. So far as I am able to discover neither did any of the other officials know that a lesser rate was being charged Mr. Woods by the city than was being charged by him to the department from time to time. It is true, as I have said, that Mr. Ewart had the opportunity in 1904 of getting the light at a flat rate, but he decided it was better to take it by the meter rate; but so far as I am aware, there is nothing on the files to show that Mr. Ewart or any other official of the department supposed that Mr. Woods was making anything out of this contract. So far as I am concerned, I never knew it, and my deputy says he never knew it, and so far as the Auditor General is concerned, whose duty it is to protect the interests of the department, these vouchers which were issued from quarter to quarter for the amounts which the department was

called upon to pay, would indicate that the department was simply paying Mr. Woods the charges made by the electrical department of the city of Ottawa from time to time.

THE WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to recall the promise made by the hon. the Minister of Public Works some time ago to the effect that before we discuss the Waterways Treaty, the plans, so far as they are made by the commission, would be laid on the table. I would like to ask the hon. minister if those plans are ready and when they will be laid on the table.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I made the inquiry at once and found that the plans were not completed and it was supposed they would not be for some time. I shall make further inquiry and if my hon. friend will bring the matter to my attention I will let him know.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH UNITED STATES.

House in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I am glad to see that the very general attendance of members on this side indicates the deep interest the Conservative party are taking in this question. It is no wonder that this should be the case because never during the past 15 or 20 years, or perhaps a longer period, has anything been presented to this House which will probably have such far reaching consequences as the resolution now before us. I paid very careful attention to the very able address made yesterday by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), and if I have to take exception to that address, it will not at all be as to the fluent and eloquent way in which he presented his argument, but rather to the attitude assumed and his failure to carry out the promise he made in opening his speech. After making a very elaborate and carefully prepared statement of figures and drawing from them many somewhat strained and difficult conclusions, he closed his address by saying that in the bargain made between Canada and Washington, every interest affected had been guarded both as regards this country and Great Britain. I submit that my hon. friend will hardly be prepared to stand by that proposition if he gives the matter a moment's reflection. Around about the city of Guelph, comprising some 16,000 inhabitants, there are market gardeners and others raising fruit and vegetables—a growing industry—so that he need not go beyond his own riding to ascertain that interests of a very important character have been struck, and struck very hard by the proposed arrangement. In the exuberance of words in which he indulged yesterday, he forgot that within the last week we had within this very chamber some 1,500 representatives of the two important industries of fruit growing and market gardening who protested that their interests were about to be injuriously affected, and he forgot also that the right hon. the Prime Minister had to admit that he was absolutely helpless to assist that large delegation which had so ably pressed on him its views.

I might multiply instances and point out that, whilst my hon. friend may think this is a matter of comparative insignificance, yet these men represent families probably aggregating 8,000 or 10,000 people; that they employ perhaps tens of thousands of labourers in their industry—which is a growing industry, and in the early stages of its development,—and that the people in the towns and cities which are surrounded by these industries, are receiving large emoluments from dealing with these people. So I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a trifling matter to be brushed aside by my hon. friend as beneath his consideration. And it does not end there. Does my hon. friend forget that the whole future of British Columbia is practically sacrificed by the proposals which the government have presented to this House; that, so far from guarding the various interests of this country, the government, or the government's representatives, negotiating behind closed doors, utterly ignored the rights and interest of a whole province of this Dominion?

Now, the hon. gentleman saw fit to attack the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), in a very animated, if not to say vicious way. He greatly deplored that the leader of the opposition had spoken in reference to the appointment of a tariff commission, and he pointed out that this would be a complete departure from precedent and from the system upon which British countries are usually governed. Not to do the hon. gentleman any injustice, I will read what he said:

> No doubt such a plan would meet the desires of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association; but if my hon. friend would adopt such a system, he would be reversing one of the cardinal principles of British politics, which is that the right to tax must remain with the peoples' representatives. The right was established many long years ago, and I have no doubt will survive to the end; but if the leader of the opposition desires to depart from that principle and appoint a permanent tariff commission to regulate our tariff, the sooner the people should know it the better.

Was that—especially as coming from a gentleman of the ability of my hon. friend—a fair way to present the remarks of the

leader of the opposition ? Did the leader of the opposition propose to rob representatives in parliament of any of their rights; did he ever propose to shackle parliament in the exercise of its powers ? No, Sir. It comes with rather poor grace from a supporter of this order in council government, which has been so actively at work, in this direction, in the last few years to talk of limiting the rights of parliament. But so that we may know exactly how that matter stands, I will read a few lines of what the leader of the opposition really said. And I might call the attention of the committee to the fact that, while my hon. friend was brave enough to start out with the idea of reading the language of the opposition leader, he changed his mind and could not afterwards be got to do it. What the leader of the opposition said was this:

Upon what should our policy be based? Should it be based upon an attempt to create millionaires in this country or to impose unfair conditions upon any portion of the community?

Not by any means. Does my hon. friend object to that proposition? I believe that we in Canada, in the future still more than in the past, should attempt to shape our tariff upon scientific consideration of known facts. I believe it would be well that we should have exact information as to these matters laid before parliament. I believe it would be well if we established a permanent tariff commission in Canada so that our tariff should not be made by rule of thumb. An agitation arises in some part of the country against a duty of 25 per cent, and it is said it should be reduced to 15 per cent, and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs get together and the industries affected declare in stringent tones that a reduction of 15 per cent would absolutely wipe out their industry, and throw thousands of men out of employment, and then the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance say: We will compromise, and we will make it 20 per cent. I do not think that is the manner in which our tariff should be framed; I think it should aim at equalization of cost of production so far as that can reasonably be accomplished. We ought to give the people of this country a fair opportunity to create industries and to give employment, but we ought not to give it under conditions as would impose burdens upon a portion of our people.

Does my hon. friend object to that proposition which he would not read ? He seems to think that we should not consider the Manufacturers' Association. He had his little fling at this side of the House, in connection with that matter. Therefore, I can assume, surely, that neither he nor any hon. gentleman on that side of the House has been coquetting with the Manufacturers' Association upon this subject. Let us see what the records show. There was a meeting of the Manufacturers' Association in Montreal in October, 1908. At that meeting, several distinguished members of this House were present. A gentleman addressing the banquetters said:

It is in this spirit that I am authorized to state to you, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that while we recognize that the responsibility rests upon the government of the day of settling the tariff, this association will heartily welcome the establishment of a permanent tariff commission, to which the multifarious details that enter into the tariff question must be referred for investigation and report. Such a suggestion does not flow from any desire to infringe upon the rights of parliament or to restrict its responsibilities, but rather to aid it by bringing to bear upon the difficult and complicated tariff problems which are constantly calling for consideration, the fullest possible light from every possible quarter.

What the leader of the opposition proposed was, that we should not be dealing with this question in the dark, that we should have a permanent tariff commission to investigate matters pertaining to the tariff; that they should collect data and that the information which they collected should be reported to parliament so that parliament could intelligently act upon and deal with the question. Well, Sir, I have the opportunity of showing that a reasonably prominent gentleman in the ranks of the government entirely concurred in that view.

There is just another idea as to which I want to have a word of expression. You have stated, Mr. Chairman, in your address, that you desired to have a permanent tariff commission. I do not exactly realize yet what is meant by a 'Permanent Tariff Commisison,' but I am free to say that if it be meant that you would have a permanent commission such as I think they have in the United States to follow the workings of the tariff from day to day, to follow the incidence, to follow the effects upon the producer and the consumer, and its daily effects upon the community, I do not see any reason why such a commission should not be appointed.

That was the statement of the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. But he did not stop there; as he so often says, 'that is not all,' because he also pointed out to them that he had decided to appoint a commission, which would not be composed of politicians or party heelers, but of business men and of experts, to make inquiry in foreign countries. And that was not all, either. He told these gentlemen whom my hon. friend is so much afraid of, that if that did not satisfy them, he was willing to appoint another commission, and he was willing to have them represented upon that commission. So the government, to say the least of it, has gone one better upon that question of a tariff commission.

Now, my hon. friend also thought that the leader of the opposition was very weak

in using the expression 'let well enough alone.' Well, if he had read what the leader of the opposition said as the foundation for that advice, he would have realized that it is pretty sound advice. The leader of the opposition had pointed out the policy upon which this country has been built up, with transportation lines running from east to west. He had shown that we had for a great number of years, for forty years, pursued the steady policy of self-reliance, that every industry in this country was practically booming at the present time, and he intimated that in this condition of things, for a shadowy chance of gain it was not wise to make this radical departure without consulting the people, and it would be wise, perhaps, to leave well enough alone. I want to say, Sir, that I believe there is a large majority of people in this country who would echo that sentiment to the full. Why, listen to some facts in addition to those referred to by my honoured leader as showing the prosperity of the country at the present time. Take the building permits, last year they amounted to $94,000,000, and in 1909 to $65,000,000; so there was a net gain in the building industry, indicating the prosperity of the cities, of $29,000,000, or 45 per cent. Back to the farm, said my hon. friend; the rural population is also in a thrifty condition. We must remember that Ontario is being drained to some extent by the flow of her sturdy sons to the west, yet notwithstanding that drain, Ontario, according to the last report, has gained 5,000 in population in two years, while the annual products of the farm now amount to $250,000,000. Live stock in Canada, in 1910, was valued at $599,768,000; in 1909 it was valued at $555,879,000. So there has been a net gain in the value of live stock alone of nearly $35,000,0000. Let me give you a summary of other evidence of progress. Since 1868 we have doubled in population; we have enormous American industries planted in Canada, representing $250,000,000; we have more than that number of millions of capital waiting to come to Canada, and halted by reason of the attitude of the government at the present time. The area of Canada under cultivation is ten times what it was in 1868; the banking capital is ten times what it was; deposits in the banks are nearly thirty times what they were; our railway mileage is about twelve times what it was, and the freightage is about twelve times what it was in 1868. We have an unexcelled system of railway transportation in Canada; we have a greater railway mileage and greater facilities for carrying our products to the markets of the world, rated per population, than any other country in the world. Therefore, having made this progress in face of the steady opposition of the Americans for forty years, is it not wise, even without regard to what this may lead us to, in a political sense, is it not somewhat wise that we should adopt the motto of leaving well enough alone?

My hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) promised us something that he was not able to carry out; he promised us that his address would be non-political, but he could not keep that promise. I do not think there is an hon. gentleman on that side of the House who could redeem a promise of that kind. Within four or five sentences, he had plunged deeply into politics. He did not lash and slash the leader of the opposition to any great extent, but there is one man whose influence upon him cannot be withstood, and that is the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). So within a few sentences the hon. gentleman got into his old habit, he forgot all his good resolutions, and he plunged deeply into politics, where he wallowed until the end of his address. My hon. friend had a leader whom he could not disregard in that respect; he was only following in the lead of the Minister of Customs, who, after he had uttered four sentences, following the speech of the leader of the opposition, in which not one political sentence is to be found, in his fifth sentence, plunged into a comparison of the old way and the new—the prosperity of the country was all due to the Reform party—it was all brought about by this magnificent government now in power. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, and you are a fair man, what has that got to do with the matter? How does it affect this great issue, whether our prosperity was brought about by the Liberal party or by the Liberal-Conservative party? It is business we are after, and it is safety we are considering in this matter, and in the consideration of these questions, it is a poor policy to descend to the discussion of which party has brought about prosperity.

Then my hon. friend referred to geographical conditions—a boundary line of 4,000 miles contiguous to the United States, it was a pity that these geographical conditions should be ignored. In that he is only following the lead of American newspapers The New York 'American' is very eloquent upon the geographical conditions of the two countries. Do not fight against nature, they say; it is not right, it is not christian, it is not kind, it is not wise, and yet for thirty years these same Americans fought against 'geographical conditions' and the geographical conditions have not changed one iota in these forty years. Then if that is so, we want some better explanation of not fighting against geographical conditions than we have got so far. My hon. friend spoke of the wheat industry. I must say he was

rather fair in that. He said that he did not expect any great quantity of wheat to be exported to the United States, that he did not expect any immediate increase in price, but that he expected a gradual rise. He is contradicted in that by the President Mr. Taft who says that he expects a gradual fall. Mr. Taft has studied this question. The object he has in view is to lower the cost of living in the United States. If the cost of living is to be decreased by bringing in Canadian wheat, of course, it goes without saying that you must reduce the price of wheat in the United States. Mr. Taft says :

Reciprocity with Canada must necessarily be chiefly confined in its effect on the cost of living to food and forest products.

He says again :

I do not wish to hold out the prospect that the unrestricted interchange of food products will greatly and at once reduce their cost to the people of this country. Moreover, the present small amount of Canadian surplus for export as compared with that of our own production and consumption would make the reduction gradual. Excluding the element of transportation, the price of staple food products, especially of cereals, is much the same the world over, and the recent increase in price has been the result of a world-wide cause. But a source of supply as near as Canada would certainly help to prevent speculative fluctuations, would steady local price movements, and would postpone the effect of a further world increase in the price of leading commodities entering into the cost of living, if that be inevitable.

In other words, agreeing with Mr. Hill and agreeing with all people who have studied this question, the President recognizes that as both Canada and the United States have a surplus of wheat the price must be ruled by the price at Liverpool, and it is just as idle as anything possibly can be ; it is not appealing to the intelligence of the people of Canada, to argue that there will be any substantial or permanent increase of price by reason of this reciprocity arrangement. My hon. friend argued though that the United States would soon cease to be a country producing a surplus of grain. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) tells us that there will be immediately an enormous increase in the production of grain in Canada by reason of this reciprocity and that reciprocity is going to be mutually beneficial. With the vast areas available for producing wheat in the United States, and with an enormously increased production there, is it not idle for my hon. friend to talk about getting an advantage by reason of that feature of the argument? My hon. friend says that if we had a million more people in the west what a great stimulus it would be to the industry of Ontario. Yes, it would be if we were getting their trade. He says that the manufactured productions of his own city, and probably of Ontario generally, go to the west. Yes, they go to the west, but they go on the basis of exchange. Will that continue if the products of the west are poured down into the United States? My hon. friend says : How can you expect that manufactured goods will come into Canada? They will come into Canada because of a law which has been in existence for a long time that where you will sell you will buy, and the return cargo is something which enters very largely into the question of the price. They will carry grain, cattle and other products of the west down into the various states of the union, they will have a cargo and what more natural than that we should deal very largely with people to whom we have sold. I notice that the hon. member for South Wellington is quite convinced on this subject—when he became convinced I do not know—but he is perfectly convinced that this proposal is all right, and that Canada as a whole is going to gain by it. I admit he did not show us how but he said that Canada is going to gain. How long has my hon. friend been of that opinion? I remember that a little while ago a prominent gentleman from the Senate, Sir George W. Ross, made a very eloquent address before the Board of Trade in Toronto. He demonstrated as clearly as a proposition can be demonstrated that reciprocity would be prejudicial to the interests of Canada. He demonstrated that and he pronounced his opinion very distinctly at a time when reciprocity of a much more confined character was supposed to be what was in contemplation than what it has turned out to be. I have to ask my hon. friend from South Wellington if it is a fact that he wrote Sir George W. Ross approving of his attitude, or of the address he made upon that occasion, and congratulated him?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not think I did. I have no recollection of ever having done so, but I will verify that information. I have no recollection whatever of writing him on any subject within the last five years.

Mr. LENNOX. We will leave it at that.

Mr. GUTHRIE. If my hon. friend knows anything I wish he would remind me of it now because I would like to be correct in my statement.

Mr. LENNOX. I have reason to believe that the hon. gentleman did, but I am quite prepared to accept the statement that he does not recollect having done so.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not.

Mr. LENNOX. And if the hon. gentleman will inform us later on I am sure that I

will appreciate it because I have a very considerable respect for my hon. friend's opinion.

Mr. GUTHRIE. That is very kind of you.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps it is a case of sudden conversion.

Mr. LENNOX. Well, he did not expect these gentlemen were going to get into such a hobble, and my hon. friend is one of those who very frequently has to come to the rescue. The forces would seem to be a little lacking on this occasion, they do not seem to line up as they used to do, there seem to be a number of them faltering and so my hon. friend is compelled in a sense to take the position that he takes at the present time. I have a great admiration for the hon. member for South Wellington as regards his power of speaking—everybody on this side of the House, I think, has—but I have no admiration for the hon. gentleman when he begins to deal with figures. Somehow or other, whenever that hon. gentleman begins to deal with figures, he seems to be lost and anybody who would follow him would be lost too. I do not therefore, purpose following him through the dense mass of figures he presented yesterday, but at some time at my convenience I shall pick out the most glaring inconsistencies, which judging not only by the indications we had yesterday, but on many other previous occasions they undoubtedly contain. For instance, he was going to annihilate the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)—he seems to lose his head when he gets after the member for North Toronto—and in endeavouring to show that every tittle of the British preference was being preserved, he takes what he says is the largest item namely rolled iron and steel billets to the amount of $3,490,000, and he says it is free all round. Well, he is just 5 per cent out. He told us Britain and the United States were on the same basis before with regard to this item and they are on the same basis now, and therefore the preference remains. That is not a very strong argument in any event, but it turns out that the hon. gentleman is wrong, and that we have had up to the present time—I hope it will continue and that the common sense of this parliament will not allow this arrangement to go through—we have had 5 per cent against the Americans and nothing at all against Britain on $3,500,000 worth of imports of this character. Britain came in—to use a colloquial expression—upon the ground floor, and the Americans had to climb a wall, and Britain therefore, had a preference. And, it is proposed in this and other respects—and the Americans are gloating over it—it is proposed now that we shall wipe out the preference, and that the Americans shall come in on the ground floor with Britain. Indeed, the Americans will come in on better terms than Britain, because the United States are at our doors and Britain has to transport her products over the sea and thence by rail to their destination. Therefore as a matter of fact on this item and on all items of the same class, Britain is actually in a worse position than the United States. But that is only a slight error for my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie). A little while ago he pointed out that in 1896 our import trade with Britain amounted to $41,000,000, and that to-day it amounts to $270,000,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE. What is the hon. gentleman referring to?

Mr. LENNOX. I will explain.

Mr. GUTHRIE. If it is something that occurred in the debate at the beginning of the session the hon. gentleman must not refer to it now, and as a matter of fact I explained it at the time.

Mr. LENNOX. I have a perfect right to illustrate why I would not like to follow the leadership of my hon. friend with regard to figures.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I take the point of order that the hon. member has no right to refer to a former debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A former debate may not be referred to for the purpose of entering into the merits of it in any way. But, if the reference is not too prolonged, it may be allowed as an illustration.

Mr. LENNOX. I will try to make it brief. My hon. friend said that Britain sells us $270,000,000, but when his attention was afterwards called to it, after mature and careful consideration, he stated that in revising his speech he had changed it to $217,000,000, which, therefore, may be considered the best my hon. friend could then do in that regard. But the facts are that in 1910 our imports from Great Britain instead of being either $217,000,000 or $270,000,000 were $95,000,000, and in 1908 is was $70,000,000, and in 1909 $94,000,000 odd. On the original figures my hon. friend was out $175,000,000, and on the corrected figures he was $122,000,000 astray. But, in a matter of that kind he is not unlike the government, for on their estimate of the cost of the Transcontinental railway they also were woefully astray in their figures. Then, in order to show how weak the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had been as Minister of Finance the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) said that our trade is now a little more than five times what it was when Mr. Foster was Minister of Finance. This, and other figures introduced by my hon. friend in the debate are illustrative of the fact that he is utterly unre-

liable when he deals with figures. Later he was dealing with immigration, and said he had applied to the Immigration Department and obtained the information that for a certain number of years—I think nine years and nine months—ending 31st March last, the total immigration had been 1,453,391, made up as follows: From the United Kingdom 562,054, which would be 38·67 per cent of the whole immigration; from the United States 497,390, which would be 34·22 per cent of the total immigration; from other countries collectively 393,947 or 27·10 per cent of the total immigration, and he sums it up by telling us that the immigration consisted of less than 25 per cent of foreigners. Well, he who runs may read; from the United States alone there came in 34·22 per cent, and from other countries 27·10 per cent some of whom certainly would be foreigners, but taking only the immigration from the United States the hon. gentleman makes the palpable error of saying that our immigration comprises only 25 per cent of foreigners, and therefore that the process of assimilation is easy.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is the hon. member still referring to a previous debate?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It seems to me these figures are not being applied to the question before us, and are rather longer than I would feel at liberty to grant the hon. member permission to use, unless they apply in some specific way to the debate, and merely as a passing illustration.

Mr. LENNOX. I will not go into details.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Shall I have a chance to reply?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In the committee there is of course always a reply.

Mr. LENNOX. I may say that this is all illustrative of the fact that when my hon. friend is quoting figures I cannot follow him, much as I respect his judgment in some other matters.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the reason offered by the hon. gentleman, but it was still my duty to protect another hon. member and to enforce the rules of the House, so while I permit this reference to a previous debate for purposes of illustration, it is my duty to see that it is not prolonged.

Mr. LENNOX. I was in the middle of a table, I shall be at liberty to complete that?

Mr. FOSTER. Please let him out of the middle of that table.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman understands my mind in the matter, and will as rapidly as possible get through the reference to it.

Mr. LENNOX. Bringing the figures down to the date with which my hon. friend was dealing, he says the foreign population was only 23 per cent, whereas I find there were from the United States alone, 37 per cent of the population and of course, that was foreign. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), made a statement, directly attacking the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), that contrary to the statute as he understood it, the hon. member for North Toronto had, in 1896, failed to set aside a sinking fund to provide for the management of the public debt.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Is this from the former debate also?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Does the hon member rise to a point of order?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do. This is another reference to a former debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If that is correct, the reference to former debates have been rather prolonged, more so than is usually allowed. I hesitated to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but it has been prolonged to such an extent that I think he should confine himself more directly to the question that is before the committee.

Mr. LENNOX. I shall not attempt to argue that question. I shall take your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I think I could perhaps convince your Honour that inasmuch as this was a speech upon the address, when pretty nearly everything comes up for discussion, we would have a right to go into it. However, I shall not prolong the debate by insisting on it on this occasion, and I know there will be an opportunity of calling my hon. friend's attention specifically to this matter at another time, and as the charge against the hon. member for North Toronto is a significant one, I hope when he is challenged directly on the matter, he will withdraw the statement he made on that occasion.

Applying ourselves to the question of material prosperity, how will this affect the country? I have referred to the question of grain, but there is another feature of it, that if a large quantity of our grain goes to the United States without being converted into a more finished product such as flour, meal, food cereals and the like we will be losing all the advantage that results from the by-products, and that is a very important question in mixed husbandry such as we will have to practise in Canada. There is one feature of this tariff that I think will be invoked as being a source of profit to the farmers, that is hay. What

effect that will have in places where the farmer lives near the border, I am not prepared to say, I do not think it will have very much. It is not a question of course, of what the tariff is, but of what the prices are in the two countries, and if we do not want to ship hay into the United States, it matters not at all what the tariff may be. But having some practical knowledge on this question, as I always profess to have on agricultural questions, I would say he is rather a poor class of farmer who aims at selling his hay. The wise farmer, the progressive farmer, will not generally sell hay, he will convert it into the finished product by feeding and fattening his stock and thus getting an additional advantage. Further, he restores to the soil the fertility and the productiveness that has been taken temporarily from it in the production of this hay. So a wise farmer will not avail himself to any extent of this opportunity, and I would deplore it very much if any large quantity of our hay should go across the boundary line, because I feel it would be almost equivalent to transferring the fertility of our farms to the United States. Thus, after giving the Americans command of our fruit growing industry, we would be furnishing them with means to build up more and more their fruit industry and proportionately impoverishing that industry in our country. I have never been in the cattle business to any extent and so do not profess to be an expert on that question, but it seems to me the same argument applies to it in regard to by-products. From the hide which you take from the animal down to other less valuable by-products, all can be utilized in building up industries and promoting production in Canada, and we lose all this if we transfer the live animals to the United States.

By this arrangement, we rob the home market and we destroy our carrying trade east and west to a large extent. We will increase the cost of carriage and that is a very important matter. We have at enormous expense, built our transportation lines east and west. My hon. friend says that vast volumes of trade will flow north and south. It cannot flow two ways at the same time. If it is flowing north and south it will not be flowing east and west and in proportion as the volume flowing south increases, the volume flowing east and west decreases, and as you decrease the traffic on the trunk lines east and west, you will increase the cost of carriage to every farmer in the west and increase his expense in shipping his produce to the markets. It must be remembered that the Railroad Board cannot fix rates lower than what will enable the railway companies to live. My hon. friend says the railway companies have made no outcry. Well there are a good many interests in this country which do not like to make much outcry against the government. From a minister of the Crown, who resigns his position and turns against this government to the most insignificant servant who makes a complaint against them, those men are hounded down and can get nothing whatever at the hands of this government. The railway companies, which are very human, know perfectly well that they had consequently better keep quiet, until they see which way the cat jumps. But they will have something to say in the near future. That is not however, the point. The Railway Board will have to fix the rates at which the railway company can carry their freights, but how will that affect the farmers in the west? The rates will be increased on the farm products and thus will be indefinitely postponed the era when our farmers may expect reasonable rates from the railway companies.

It will also necessarily check railway enterprise in this country. One of the great sources which cause an active flow of money is the enormous expenditures on public works and railway building. Check railway building and there is no industry in Canada, from the little shop at the corner of the four roads to the biggest manufacturing establishment, from the market gardener to the largest farmer, which will not be affected, and certainly a halt will have to be called in the building of public enterprises generally if this policy be carried out. Why do we build our transcontinental railway? We do so to complete our system east and west, and it is beyond conception that, if this scheme be carried out, the Hudson Bay railway or the deepening of the Welland canal or the Georgian Bay canal can be proceeded with. It would then be perfect madness to go on with these works, and you could not borrow the money to build them. We want to be left in a position to build them.

That brings me to another point, and that is that we are going to impair our credit in Britain. We cannot repudiate our obligations, as we shall be doing by this agreement, and then go back to the British market and ask them to go on lending us money. Our hon. friends are no longer sane if they think they can go on with this scheme of theirs and then be able to finance any great enterprise in the markets of Europe.

Let me now call your attention to the message of the President of the United States to his government. The dominant note in that message is warning: That the Dominion of Canada has greatly prospered, that it has an active, aggressive and independent people, that 'they have come to the parting of the ways,' that the United States have repelled those people for 40 years, that the Canadians had been

looking to the United States for years for the development in their trade but had now turned their faces away from that country to Great Britain, that the United States had gone too far, and would have to act now promptly or Canada would escape altogether. Another note of warning in the president's message is this: We have wasted our natural resources, we have overrun half a continent, there is a rich half continent to the north of us in the possession of the Canadians, we need to be active now to take the opportunity of overrunning that other half. The Canadian people, he says, have now a definite self-reliant, safe policy, a policy which they have implemented by a magnificent transportation system, and which is calculated to work in harmony with the interests of Great Britain, and therefore now is the time for the United States to act. The tables are turned on us, says President Taft, the Canadians have taken stock. they are guarding their pulpwood and at any moment they may take means to safeguard their forests and mines and fisheries, so that we shall be cut out from these permanently unless we act without delay. How shall we meet them? We must meet them in the bond or semblance of friendship before their policy becomes too crystallized and fixed for change. That is the statement summarized of the President of the United States to his people. Well, I have a dominant note which I would like to put into my address to you this afternoon. I say also that we are at the parting of the ways, that this is a momentous crisis in the affairs of Canada and Britain. It is the most momentous crisis since the Boer war. What should we do? My reply is this: Stand firm by the policy which has made Canada, build up our own ocean ports, increase transportation, multiply and stimulate the avenues of communication, strengthen our interprovincial bonds, promote interprovincial trade, unite all Canada in commerce, in interest, in sympathy and in aspiration, foster the sentiment of Britisr-Canadian nationality, preserve at all hazards our British connections, and steadily and strenuously strive for imperial preferential trade.

Now I come to deal very briefly with the statements of my hon. friend the Finance Minister. You must have noticed, Mr. Chairman, that the Finance Minister was ashamed of himself when he came to this House to deliver his statement.

Mr. FOSTER. He ought to have been.

Mr. LENNOX. He absolutely was, and so was my hon. friend who followed him in the same line. Otherwise how did it happen that the Minister of Finance, who is always quite ready to take a reasonable amount of credit to himself, spent a dreary 20 minutes—during which we hardly heard a syllable from the other side, which is generally quite ready to applaud—in endeavouring to prove that we on this side were as much to blame for reciprocity as the other side. He went on laboriously to point out that mission after mission, and delegate after delegate, had gone to the United States, Conservative as well as Liberal, endeavouring to obtain reciprocity, and therefore he was not so much to blame for having gone in that direction also. Almost in the same words, my hon. friend from South Wellington went over the same ground, and showed to his own satisfaction, that the Conservatives had been desirous of the same thing.

I have read the statement of the president, and I have listened to and read the statement of the Minister of Finance in this House. I do not like the tone of the minister's statement—too much slobbering and 'brethren' in it for a business transaction. He starts out by telling us that the president acted so nicely, and goes over it again and again instead of treating this as a business transaction. 'Brethren, let us sit down and reason together'. It is 'brethren,' 'brethren,' until you get a little bit nauseated at this kind of thing in a big diplomatic matter. And, of course, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) would not be behind the Minister of Finance in that. 'Brethren' comes to him more naturally even than it comes to the Minister of Finance. So, if possible, there was more 'brethren' in his speech and less business. In contrast with that, we have the clear-cut diplomatic statement of the president to his people, and the contrast does not by any means heighten the dignity of Canada and her representatives. There is too much palaver in the statements of our representatives to suit me. 'Brethren,' forsooth! This is not a question of 'brethren.' The sons of Jacob were the brethren of Joseph, and if I remember rightly, that did not prevent them from putting Joseph in the pit, or leaving him to be destroyed by wild beasts, or, later, selling him into bondage to cover their crime. And so one gets a little tired of this palaver—that may be a rather dignified name for it, but let it go—about 'brethren' in this negotiation. Who are these 'brethren,' anyhow? Are they the people who interpreted the treaty of 1782? Are they the people to whom the entire United Empire Loyalists appealed and who interpreted that treaty in a manner that was not very satisfactory to those loyalists, and not very consonant, I should think, with the principles of justice and equity? That was a long time ago? True. Are they the same 'brethren' who entered into the Treaty of Washington and provided that there should be free fish all round, our fish to go into their markets free and theirs to

come into our markets on similar terms? And we let theirs in free and they let our fish in free—but taxed the cans and packages until our fish were shut out? Are they the same 'brethren' who, in the matter of navigation of canals and waterways, though ours were opened to them, by a subterfuge prevented our vessels from using theirs? I am not speaking this in condemnation; I am merely pointing out with whom we are dealing. These are the same people. And they are the same people with whom we dealt in that much-talked-of treaty of 1854. Do we want the kind of thing that arose in connection with that treaty repeated? A lot of people wh do not know much about the circumstance talk glibly about the treaty in force from 1854 to 1866. But those who have taken the trouble to read that up, and analyse the conditions, are not much in love with it. That treaty had not been long in force when the United States began to make complaint. It had not been long in force when we had bad times in Canada, so bad that our necessary public expenditure could not be met without additional taxation; and when we began to amend our tariff they began to kick. Will that occur again now? If we begin to amend our tariff, outside the articles covered by this tariff arrangement, shall we have just the same kind of commotion that we had then? On the equity of the transaction, on the broad, general view of the case, will they come and say: That is not fair, and you will have to take that duty off or give us additional concessions in some other direction? Will they say: The manufacturers think it very unfair that they are shut out from our markets, and you must let them in, too? Well, under this old treaty, they were not satisfied. You remember how, Mr. Chairman, they employed a gentleman named Israel Hatch, and he considered our situation from end to end. He found and reported that Canada was framing a policy of her own—that was wrong. He said we were aiming at being independent of the United States; that we were scheming—these were not his exact words—to employ our own ships and man them with our own people, and that was wrong. He said that we were taxing American imports in order to build our railways and canals, and these railways and canals were coming into competition with the United States, and that was all wrong. He said that we were endeavouring to build up our own cities, and the result of that was to prevent trade from drifting to American cities, and that was all wrong. And what was the result? They said: We cannot allow this state of things to continue; your tariff may be made in Canada, but if made in Canada it must be made to suit us; what you will have to consent to is either a zollverein or a customs tariff. And many of their public men spoke about that question, and I would like to take the time to read a line or two of what they said. The leader of the opposition, the other day, quoted the very eminent German, Prof. Von Schultz-Gævernitz, who said:

> A zollverein between the United States and Canada would be both politically and commercially the death of British dominion in North America. Political union must follow commercial union.

But let us take what was said by eminent Americans at that time. Mr. Seward was very clear upon the subject, in defining what a zollverein meant. Speaking of it in connection with what he wanted as a trade relation with Canada, he said:

> Under its influences kingdoms, states and principalities have been blended into one.

That is the kind of 'blend' they want now 'Blended into one.' Which is to be the 'one?' You know how it is settled between husband and wife; they are made one, and generally the wife is that 'one.' And the United States will be the 'one' if there is but one. Now, a Mr. Darby, a prominent American of that time, said:

> Is not America for the Americans? Are not Asia, Africa and Australia sufficient for Great Britain?

That is a reasonably clear proof of what they wanted. Mr. Wharton Barber declared:

> That for Canada free trade with the United States would be a final settlement of her continental sympathies, and a farewell to imperial aspirations.

So, as a consequence of the treaty of 1854, the Americans arrogated to themselves the right to dictate what our fiscal policy should be. Their declarations were reasonably clear on that occasion, but they were not at all so clear as they have been on this occasion, and as they have been upon many occasions in the meantime. The Finance Minister says that the National Policy was justified; that is, he says it was attempted to be justified on the ground of probably forcing the Americans into reciprocity. The National Policy has forced the Americans into an offer of reciprocity now. So when hon. gentlemen on that side of the House go into wild rejoicings over what these two estimable gentlemen have accomplished for us, without consulting the people of Canada, they should not forget that but for the National Policy which they defamed for a third of a century, and which, during fourteen years in office, they have villified yet retained—because they dared not abandon it—but for that National Policy, which was bequeathed to them by

the greatest statesmen of them all, Sir John A. Macdonald, they would have no offer of reciprocity to-day, for they would have nothing to offer in exchange.

Now the Minister of Finance says that Sir John A. Macdonald went to the country in 1891 upon the question of reciprocity in order to get a mandate from the people. If Sir John A. Macdonald went to the country in 1891 in order to get a mandate, it is in strange contrast with the action of these gentlemen at the present time. Now, it was not to get a mandate from the people upon the question of reciprocity that Sir John A. Macdonald went to the country in 1891; it was to stamp out the most dangerous proposition that was ever, until now, presented to the Canadian people, it was to stamp out the insidious treason of Erastus Wiman and his Canadian associates set in motion at that time; and if hon. gentlemen opposite want to know who those men were, I am prepared to give the names. Now the National Policy of Sir John A. Macdonald, summarized, was to develop interprovincial trade, to create a bond of interdependence and support, to protect our industries, and to build up Canada, close-linked in sentiment, in aspiration and in destiny, with the mother country.

I desire to trace a little further the reason for this offer from the United States. If we look into the causes we will probably be able to ascertain the motives at work. There were three important events occuring about 1893. There was the Chamberlain propaganda at the time, the idea of creating a closer bond of trade between the various parts of the British Empire. It had its beginning earlier, but taking definite form about 1893, it began to attract attention then. Then we had the launching of the National Transcontinental railway scheme. These two matters together had a very marked influence upon the opinion in the United States. Why? Because of the declarations made at that time by the right hon. gentleman who leads this House. It is true that before then there had been on our statute-books an offer of reciprocity. But at that time my right hon. friend came out distinctly and told the people of the United States, in effect, that he was in harmony with the movement in Britain, that whatever his leanings had been previously—and they had been a little wavering—whatever tendencies he had had to look to Washington previously, he had at last taken a definite stand, and was not going to bother any more about Washington, he was going to develop Canada upon the lines of British connection. At that time the American papers began to say that reciprocity with Canada would be a good thing. And why? Because they realized that they were losing their opportunity; they realized that there was a likelihood that a closer bond of union between the empire and Canada would be effected, and that if imperial preferential trade was ever accomplished, then goodbye to the chance of the United States having closer union with the Dominion of Canada. Well, now, just mark the sequence of events. The Chamberlain doctrine, the Chamberlain activity, the National Transcontinental railway, which was to render us independent of the United States, and give us a Canadian railway, every foot of which was to be upon Canadian soil, and the immediate growth of the reciprocity idea in the United States.

For forty years, or nearly, they had shown no disposition to trade with us. Then this laggard lover, Uncle Jonathan, comes in and begins to court Miss Canada. Gentlemen, on this side of the House, I appeal to you as guardians of Miss Canada, to stand up and say: We will investigate very closely and see whether Uncle Jonathan's 'intentions are honourable.' The meaning of this, summarized, is that the United States are all alert now to head off Britain. They see that there is a chance that the imperial preferential idea will shortly be accomplished. The right hon. gentleman says that there is not much indication of that in Great Britain. Forty eight per cent of the British electorate are in favour of a reformed tariff. The watchword over in the United States is: Detach Canada from the Empire. The agreement, says Austin Chamberlain, removes Canada out of the imperial orbit. That is a significant statement. But the policy with which hon. gentlemen opposite are agreeing, is to head off imperial preference, and to get back our manufacturers. Two hundred and fifty millions have been invested in Canada already and there are two hundred and fifty millions more awaiting investment say the American press, at the present time. If so, get the Canadian raw materials. That is an important point, but it is a secondary thought. It is the basis of industry. Get the timber, get the lumber, the grain, the minerals, the green fish, get the fruit markets for the perishable products of the United States, get the population, which necessarily follows industry, transfer the industry over to the United States, and the population follows the industry, get the finished product profit, get their fiscal policy made at Washington, get their business dislocated, the home markets destroyed, the transportation system paralysed, get Fielding and Paterson, get them to gulp it all down and after they have taken the dope and, when a reasonable time has elapsed after the obsequies, get Canada.

That is the meaning of it all. There is a great political combine in this matter. I have no doubt about that. Hands across the sea, say some people. Yes, and not only hands across the sea, but hands across the boundary line as well. This is a great political scheme, put up by my right hon. friend, concurred in by the government of Great Britain and promoted by President Taft and the government of the United States. Is there any doubt about what it means? My hon. friend the Minister of Finance was very much touched about President Taft having done the government the honour of coming to Canada, and this government did my hon. friend the Minister of Finance the honour of sending him down to Albany to work on Sunday. He was very much honoured. It is like the story of the lady of high rank who asked a common sailor to watch here while she jumped overboard, and then rescue her. He said: 'If you will excuse me, madam, it would be too much honour for the likes of me.' Well, my hon. friend was very solicitous about the honours—too much honour, too little sense. President Taft is an astute, able statesman, a gentleman for whom I have great respect, but he is acting in his own interest. When he came to Canada, when he fostered these negotiations, he was looking to conditions in the United States, and he was trying to tide over a great political difficulty that confronted him. When Mr. Asquith smiled beneficently upon this scheme he too had some interest in the matter from a political standpoint. He had the opportunity, he thought, of effectually killing the preferential trade idea in Great Britain and the evidence of it is, that the government in Great Britain were only a little behind the government of Canada in their rejoicings when they found that the matter was about consummated. That the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), had a great big political game to serve in this matter nobody in his senses denies or doubts. Why, Sir, not to speak of wanting to distract attention from the long array of scandals of this government, there is that last great big blunder that the right hon. gentleman would like to draw attention away from—his naval policy. So, we have this great triangle, this great trinity, this political combination at work, and it is a little hard for the people of Canada to assert themselves and get their rights under such conditions, but we are going to try.

Now I have to refer, I think, to only one matter more, and that is, the attitude of my right hon. friend the leader of the government. Already in this debate we have been reminded of the fact that on three different occasions the right hon. gentleman declared that he had ceased to look to Washington, that he had repented of the idea that we should shape our policy in harmony with the policy of United States. Aside from the three explicit declarations, which he made in this House on the subject of the tariff, he pronounced a definite war speech in 1903, with reference to the transcontinental railway scheme, and I shall, because it really reads exceedingly well in the light of events now, take the opportunity of quoting some of the hon. gentleman's observations on that occasion. He said:

> Why this expenditure? Why should parliament be called upon to assent to such a policy as is here indicated? We ask parliament to assent to this policy because we believe—nay, we feel certain, and certain beyond a doubt—that in so doing we give voice and expression to a sentiment, a latent but deep sentiment, which is to-day in the mind, and still more in the heart, of every Canadian, that a railway to extend from the shores of the Atlantic ocean to the shores of the Pacific ocean, and to be, every inch of it, on Canadian soil, is a national as well as a commercial necessity.
>
> To those who urge upon us the policy of to-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow; to those who tell us, wait, wait, wait; to those who advise us to pause, to consider, to reflect, to calculate and to inquire, our answer is: No, this is not a time for deliberation, this is a time for action. The flood of tide is upon us that leads on to fortune; if we let it pass it may never recur again. If we let it pass, the voyage of our national life, bright as it is to-day, will be bound in shallows. We cannot wait, because time does not wait; we cannot wait because, in these days of wonderful development, time lost is doubly lost.
>
> We consider that it is the duty of all those who sit within these walls by the will of the people, to provide immediate means whereby the products of those new settlers may find an exit to the ocean at the least possible cost, and whereby, likewise, a market may be found in this new region for those who toil in the forests, in the fields, in the mines, in the shops of the older provinces. Such is our duty; it is immediate and imperative. It is not of to-morrow, but of this day, of this hour and of this minute. Heaven grant that it be not already too late; heaven grant that whilst we tarry and dispute, the trade of Canada is not deviated to other channels and that an ever vigilant competitor——

What other channels? What other competitor?

> —and that an ever vigilant competitor does not take to himself the trade that properly belongs to those who acknowledge Canada as their native or their adopted land. Upon this question we feel that our position is absolutely safe and secure; we feel that it corresponds to the beating of every Canadian heart.

How is it now? Where is the heart now? Does it beat for that same national aspiration? It ought to. I hope it will. I will not predict anything with regard to this matter, but, Sir, let the result be what it will, as long as I have a voice in this House of Commons I shall raise it against

anything that will tend to disunite Canada from the British Empire. The next paragraph is not absolutely relevant, but it is relevant to another branch of the subject. My right hon. friend's propositions are so diversified they will adapt themselves to almost any condition of things. He said :

Sir, the men of 1867 built for the condition of things which they found in 1867; but we the men of 1903, have to build for the condition of things which exist in 1903.

How does that apply to the argument that we have to go back and root out the old tariff provisions of 1878 and 1879 to find out what we should do to-day. The men of 1879 built for the condition of things that existed then, and built well, as the history of Canada shows, but the men of 1911 have to build for the condition of things in 1911, and have to fortify themselves to-day against specific declarations of the people of the United States in 1911. The Prime Minister continued:

—and not only for that condition of things, but also for a condition of things we see looming up in the near future.

But, Sir, there is something more than that. When Sir Charles Tupper stated also at that time that it was essential to the welfare of the people of Canada that the terminus of any transcontinental railway that we might have should be in Canadian territory in Canadian waters, he simply voiced what is the conscience of the Canadian people. I am sorry that Sir Charles Tupper did not with equal firmness insist that not only should the terminus be in Canadian territory, in Canadian waters, but that the route itself should be in Canadian territory. When he agreed that the line should be in American territory, Sir Charles Tupper went back on the heart and conscience of the Canadian people.

Now, Sir, we lay it down as a principle, upon which we are to be judged by friend and foe, that we are to have a transcontinental railway, that its terminus must be in Canadian waters, and that the whole line, every inch of it, must be in Canadian territory. We say further that such a line is a necessity of our commercial independence.

Mr. LANCASTER. Whose commercial independence?

Mr. LENNOX. The commercial independence of the people of Canada. What does the right hon. gentleman say about our brethren at that time? He referred to what Mr. Carnegie and other prominent men said, and then used these words :

But what will you say when I bring to your attention the expressions of the highest in the land, of those in authority, of those who are in a position to speak for the American government and the American people? What will you say when I bring you messages of Presidents of the United States and reports from the American Senate? In the month of August, 1888, President Cleveland sent the following message to Congress asking power for executive to suspend the bonding privilege.

Mr. LENNOX.

This was the language, the peremptory language of the President of the United States. Now it is perhaps not out of place, nay it is exceedingly important, to make clear what was the cause which brought President Cleveland to hold such a threat over our heads. The cause was the fact that we would not agree—the Canadian government, the Canadian people, to the abrogation of the Fisheries Convention of 1818.

But, because we would not agree to give away our birthright, we were threatened by President Cleveland with the withdrawal of the bonding privilege.

Here was a fresh case of rank injustice. The right hon. gentleman said the Americans did this because we would not give away our birthright, and we were threatened by this dishonest and very unfair President of the United States, as the right hon. gentleman would have it at that time when it suited his argument. Then he said:

Nor is that all. A few years afterwards, in the session of Congress of 1892, a report was brought down to the Senate from the Committee on Interstate Commerce again dealing with the bonding privilege.

The American railways wanted to have certain privileges upon our territory which we were not prepared to give them; and because we would not give them these advantages, because we were not ready to make the soil of Canada, for railway purposes, part of the territory of the United States, again we were threatened with the removal of the bonding privilege.

Then comes another climax by my right hon. friend showing that these gentlemen, who have so frequently, but not very properly, been referred to as 'our brethren' by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, should be dealt with on a business basis the same as we would deal with any other nation, and the Prime Minister continued:

Even that was not all. In the following year, President Harrison again approached the subject, and again approached it in the same hostile spirit, and approached it, as the committee of the Senate had done, from the point of view of American railways. He made the following recommendation to Congress in a message dated November, 1893:

I need not read the message; I need only quote the right hon. gentleman's opinion in reference to it:

For my part—I have never made any secret of it—I have the greatest possible admiration for the American people. I have always admired their many strong qualities. But I have found in the short experience during which it has been my privilege and my fortune to be placed at the head of affairs, by the will of the Canadian people, that the best and most effective way to maintain friendship with our American neighbours is to be absolutely independent of them.

Well we have a pretty clear indication from the events which are of record during the

time that the treaty of 1854 was in force, and about the time of its abrogation, of the attitude of the American people at that time. We have, I think, a still clearer indication of what this proposal really means by the utterances of some public men and newspapers of the United States to-day. As to the general American attitude in reference to this question I will read an extract from a speech of Senator Sherman, and in doing so I want to make it perfectly clear that I have no attack to make upon the American people. They are a great people, we want them as our neighbours, but I want to treat this matter from the Canadian point of view and let them do what they like. What I call upon the government to do is what is in the interests of the Canadian people and of British connection at this juncture in our affairs. This speech of Senator Sherman's is headed 'By Friendly Overtures,' and reads :

The way to union with Canada is not by hostile legislation; not by acts of retaliation, but by friendly overtures. This union is one of the events that must inevitably come in the future; it will come by the logic of the situation, and no politician or combination of politicians can prevent it. The true policy of this government is to tender freedom in trade and intercourse, and to make this tender in such a fraternal way that it shall be an overture to the Canadian people to become a part of this republic.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, I think that if you cannot keep better order than this the committee had better rise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has a right to ask for order, but I think his method of addressing the Chairman is not in accordance with parliamentary usage. He asks for order. I shall certainly endeavour to obtain it, but his method of addressing the Chair is not the usual method.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was wrong with it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The method used was in addressing me, and telling me that if I could not keep better order it would be better for the committee to rise. I think that was not a correct form of address to the Chairman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I still insist that if you cannot have better order the committee ought to rise.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it would be just as well if order should be observed on both sides of the House. I notice hon. gentlemen opposite conversing with one another and usually the mere calling of order would at once bring order.

Mr. LENNOX. It did not bring order. Less than five minutes ago I called the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that he was turning around and talking to gentlemen beside him. I then endeavoured to continue the reading of the extract and the Minister of Customs resumed his conversation. If any people should set an example to this House and to the public it should be the ministers of the Crown.

Mr. PATERSON. I would at once apologize if it is true that I interrupted my hon. friend. I did not hear the hon. gentleman mention my name or allude to me.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not mention his name, I spoke of the minister.

Mr. PATERSON. I am very sorry if I interrupted, I did not intend to.

Mr. LENNOX. I accept the hon. minister's statement in the frankest possible way. While I feel that there is a certain amount of injustice to myself I am convinced that my hon. friend would not willingly disconcert me.

Mr. PATERSON. I would not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The reason I spoke somewhat abruptly was that five gentlemen were talking in their ordinary tones of voice while my hon. friend was endeavouring to continue his speech. That had gone on for some considerable time, and apparently had not been noticed.

Mr. FIELDING. On the other side I find hon. gentlemen not only talking but standing up while they are talking.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not heard anything of that kind.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend cannot see over there, I can.

Mr. LENNOX. I can see both sides of the House, and whilst occasionally when I make a particularly telling remark against the government there was some comment on it from this side of the House I was not disturbed by anything that occurred on this side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think I should remark that absolute order is apparently not obtainable, that is the standard that theoretically the rules ask for, and every hon. gentleman knows that he is in the habit of occasional conversation. Too much conversation interferes with the proper hearing of the gentleman who has the floor, and if at any moment there is any indication that it is either preventing him from properly speaking or preventing others from properly hearing him I shall at once interfere, but it is in accordance with the rules of the House to allow a certain quiet method of conversation. If this incident will call the attention of the House to it, it will aid the Speaker or the

Chairman very much in attaining and retaining the order that is proper and necessary to allow any hon. gentleman to address the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I quite realize that it is absolutely impossible to altogether prevent conversation in the House, and I do not object to that ; but I was objecting to at least five gentlemen talking in their usual tones of voice while an hon. gentleman on this side was endeavouring to proceed with his speech. If the conversation had taken place in the method usually adopted by gentlemen in the House, I should not have said a word but it got absolutely beyond endurance and beyond decorum at the time I spoke.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think I should not allow any further remarks on this matter as the hon. gentleman who has the floor wishes to conclude before six o'clock.

Mr. TALBOT. If we are called to order for conversing together sometimes what is your opinion of a gentleman who addresses the House with his back turned to us?

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to conclude before six o'clock. To continue the extract from Mr. Sherman's speech.

The settlement of the northwest territory, the Louisiana and Florida purchases, the annexation of Texas, and the acquisition from Mexico are examples of the adaptation of our form of government for expansion, to absorb and unite, to enrich and build up, to ingraft in our body politic adjacent countries, and while strengthening the older states, confer prosperity and development on the new states admitted into this brotherhood of republican states. . . . With a firm conviction that this consummation most devoutly to be wished is within the womb of destiny, and believing that it is our duty to hasten its coming, I am not willing, for one, to vote for any measure not demanded by national honour that will tend to postpone the good time coming, when the American flag will be the signal and sign of the union of all the English-speaking peoples of the continent from the Rio Grande to the Arctic Ocean.

And running through a recent editorial in the New York 'American,' I find the following:

On the opening day of the British parliament the Conservative leaders of both Lords and Commons forgot for the moment their critical and distressing domestic difficulties and uttered a loud cry of protest against trade reciprocity between Canada and the United States. Lord Lansdowne exclaimed in the House of Lords: The whole history of the British Empire will be changed if the great Dominion is encouraged, by agreement with the United States, to develop itself not on imperial lines but in accordance with geographical conditions.

In this outcry of an alarmed British toryism we have the strongest of arguments—strong because of its testimony against the interests of the speaker—for the unhesitating ratification by Congress of a momentous trade compact with Canada. Let Congress pass the Canadian reciprocity Bill and all the plans of the English reactionaries for killing American trade will crumble to the ground.

In ratifying this trade agreement we should understand therefore that we are settling a world problem, and settling it right. British imperialism will wane in consequence, but American trade routes will run along the lines that were ordained by nature.

Then as to the results upon the trade of Canada and the lines along which trade will flow the writer says:

When all is said the natural interchange between the United States and Canada is of immense scope, in spite of all artificial barriers. It will be something prodigious—like the sweep of tides—when a new reciprocity agreement shall breach the tariff walls and give disappointed nature half a chance to have her way.

This proposal to give nature a helping hand comes at a very significant time. Again Congressman Clark expresses the motive that lies at the root of this matter. I notice that it is said in the press to-day that he said it was all a joke.

Mr. FOSTER. He did not say so; others say so for him.

Mr. LENNOX. So, they say it was all a joke. Let me read exactly what he said, and the country can judge whether it was a joke or not:

Washington, D.C., February 15.—During the debate in the House yesterday on the Canadian reciprocity Bill, Congressman James Beauchamp Clark, the man who will be next speaker of the House of Representatives and whose party will be the majority in the next House, made this reference to the Bill.

Now comes what Congressman Clark said:

'I am for it, because I hope to see the day when the American flag will float over every square foot of the British North American possessions clear to the north pole. They are people of our blood. They speak our language. Their institutions are much like ours. They are trained in the different art of self government. My judgment is that if the treaty of 1854 had never been abrogated, the chances of a consolidation of these two countries would have been much greater than they are now.

I do not have any doubt whatever, that the day is not far distant when Great Britain will see all of her North American possessions become a part of this Republic. That is the way things are tending now.

Having said that much, I want to say another thing. I do not confine my support of reciprocity bills to this one. I am in favour of reciprocity treaties with the Central and South American republics, including Mexico. The intelligent farmers of America know

that the agricultural products of Canada are inconsiderable when compared with the agricultural products of the United States. To use a common phrase, they do not constitute a drop in the bucket. They also know that wages are as high in Canada in many lines as in America, and higher in labour pertaining to the production of lumber, so they know too much to be scared by the overworked cry of 'pauper labour.'

Mr. Norris—'I wanted to ask the gentleman (Mr. Clark) something along the line of universal peace. As I understand it, the gentleman favours this Bill, for at least one reason, that it will have tendency in the end to bring Canada into the Union?'

Mr. Clark, of Missouri—'Yes, sir; have no doubt about that.'

Mr. Norris—'Will that have a tendency to preserve peace with Great Britain?'

Mr. Clark, of Missouri—'Why, certainly it will. I do not have any doubt whatever that the day is not far distant when Great Britain wil joyfully see all of her North American possessions become a part of this Republic. That is the way things are tending now.'

Mr. Martin, of South Dakota—'Will the gentleman favour the abrogation of our tariff law entirely so far as Canada is concerned and making free trade with Canada on all products?'

Mr. Clark, of Missouri—'By taking Canada in to become a part of the United States. Yes.'

That is pretty clear language.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. And that is the language of one of the most prominent men in the United States, who will probably have more power in the immediate future than any other citizen in the great republic.

Just one word more. What I have said does not require any peroration. I have dealt with straight, clear and definite facts I had proposed quoting from Sir John Macdonald's address in 1891, but I do not think that is necessary, and I will conclude with a watchword: 'Hands across the sea; keep both hands on the Union Jack.'

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. B. WARBURTON (Queens, P.E. I.). Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the speech of my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) in which he outlined and defined the policy of his party not only along the lines which were taken by his leader and others, but on other lines as well, elaborating even to a somewhat greater extent than they did. I do not propose to discuss directly the remarks of the hon. gentleman at any great length, because a good many of the subjects that he touched upon—and touched upon so well—I propose to take up in the course of the remarks I had outlined for myself before he spoke. But I would like for a moment, to touch upon one or two of the points to which he referred. I do not say that in all cases I take exception to what he said, because he often says things with which I agree, but, often says things to which I cannot personally assent. As to the subject of a tariff commission, which the hon. gentleman brought up, I go so far as to say that the question is one that might well be discussed. I cannot say, however, that I personally agree with the idea of such a tariff commission as the hon. gentleman evidently had in mind. If you like to appoint a number of experts with whom the government or any one else can consult on tariff questions, well and good. But that course, I take it, the government can follow for themselves; they do not need any recommendations or any legislation to that end. No doubt, every minister takes good care, and especially, perhaps, the Finance Minister, to consult with experts on subjects with which he has to deal. But to appoint a tariff commission such as I understand to be proposed by the hon. member (Mr. Lennox), would be, I think, as has been said in this House, in effect, to alter the position of ministers as responsible advisers of the Crown; it would be more or less an abrogation of the principles of responsible government. I can quite understand that the Manufacturers' Association, that body of able, influential and talented business men, would like to have a tariff commission, particularly as it would be almost certain that that commission would be largely, if not entirely, composed of those who would, perhaps, be recommended by that association. Whether the great mass of the consumers, the farmers, would have an equal voice in such a commission I think open to question. When the people of this country send something over two hundred members to this House, and when, at the head of this House is a government responsible to the House, and to the people for what they do, I do not think it would be well to relieve the government or this House of the responsibility which they were sent here to assume.

Now, we are told 'let well enough alone.' That is a very good saying in its way, but, as has been pointed out before, it does not go quite far enough. Had we 'let well enough alone' in the past, there would have been no progress. This country must move on. In this I am only repeating what has been said before, but this idea of leaving well enough alone has been so pressed upon this House, and, by the press of the country, upon the people, that I think I am justified in returning to it. The Anglo-Saxon race is incapable of standing still. The French Canadian race and the various other nationalities which go to make up the Canadian people, and which will eventually

be fused into one race in this country, are incapable of standing still. If they tried to stand still, they would soon deteriorate, and then Canada would become a country that would be fit to be annexed to some other, because it would be unfit to take care of itself. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) announced somewhat oracularly that he hoped the common sense of parliament would not allow this Bill to go through. I shall have to plead guilty to great lack of common sense, if the hon. gentleman is right in assuming that common sense would be against this Bill; because my feeling has been and is to support this Bill to the utmost of my ability. And, in so doing, I know that I shall have the almost unanimous support of my constituency; and if, to-morrow, I had to run an election I would want no other question than this upon which to go before the electors. I trust the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) , in that oracular deliverance of his, did not arrogate to himself the right to say that there is no common sense to be found outside those holding the views that commend themselves to his judgment. I hold that there is common sense on both sides of the House; that neither side has the monopoly of common sense, though it is a much rarer thing than its name would imply.

One exception taken to the agreement was that, the United States and Britain, having been placed on a parity so far as concerns the admission of their manufacture into this country, Great Britain would be really placed in a worse position because of the long haul she has. There might be some small ground for that argument, but really the matter is so small that, when you remember that Great Britain has practically the carrying trade of the world and carries all the products in her own bottoms, and that this is mainly water carriage, which is the cheapest carriage there is, it is questionable whether the cost of bringing goods from Great Britain to Canada would be much, if at all, greater than the cost of bringing them across, for instance, from New York to Toronto. I know that, as a matter of practice, it costs more to bring English goods from Halifax to Charlottetown, than it costs to bring them from Liverpool to Halifax. That is one of the perennial subjects of complaint with us—that we pay so much for rail carriage when water carriage is so cheap.

In dealing with the various articles which have been made free, the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) referred to the article of hay. To a great extent, I agree with the remarks which the hon. gentleman made in regard to the way farmers should treat their hay. But as to the way farmers put up their hay or as to the way they dispose of it, that is a matter the government cannot very well control. It is only on the commercial side that the government and parliament can deal with it. I agree that the best course for the farmers to take with their hay, under ordinary conditions, would be to feed it. But it sometimes happens that there is a superabundance of hay. That is what happened in Prince Edward Island last year. While we had really a failure in what is usually our best staple crop, potatoes, the hay crop was fifty per cent higher than it had ever been before—an enormous crop. We cannot feed it, because we have so much more hay than the stock we have can use. There is no use sending it to Quebec or any of the other provinces, because they have plenty of hay. We have been shipping a little to England, but that is a long and difficult matter. If the hay is allowed to go into the United States markets in the spring, I think we ought to be able to do a good business with our surplus hay. And that is the best thing to do with it, as it cannot stay there forever, and we have not sufficient live stock to use it. But, even if the farmers do not adopt the scientific method of farming and feed their hay, working it up into the finished product of beef, why should we say to them: You have to do as we tell you to do; you must feed when we tell you to, and you must not ship until we tell you to? This is a free country, and we must leave them some judgment as to how they shall treat these matters on their own farms.

But, that is not the matter that affects this agreement most. The point is raised that the agreement will be apt to divert trade from the lines running east and west to the lines running north and south. I have not many fears on that score. I listened to the wail when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) tried to convince us that there was now no need for the Transcontinental railway, no need for the Hudson Bay railway, no need for the Georgian Bay canal or the deepening of the Welland canal. Individually, it would not affect me very much whether these public works were built or not, but as a Canadian it affects me very closely, and I desire to look at the question from the general standpoint of Canada. For that reason, though these things are no direct advantage to us, I believe they should be undertaken, and I do not think the agreement will militate against the completion of these enterprises. When this agreement comes into operation, the chances of these works being soon built will be greatly improved. With the great fertility of our soil, with Canada's enormous production in minerals, in lumber, and in the fruits of the field, I have no doubt whatever, but that our population is sure to increase, and, in a few years, we shall be able to provide traffic for all these roads whether they run north and south or east and west.

Not only that, but I believe the time is coming shortly when we will have to increase the number of our railroads, not only north and south, but also east and west. It may be that I am unduly optimistic, nevertheless I have a firm and abiding faith in the future of Canada, in our producing powers, and in the energy and ability of our people. I believe as firmly as I believe I am speaking to you, Mr. Chairman, that the superabundance of the produce of Canada of all kinds will afford ample employment for all these roads and canals, and you will even have to multiply them. The opposition of our Conservative friends is in line with the course that they have been pursuing for many years. I do not know whether it has become second nature to them to look upon every move that is undertaken as an indication of coming blue ruin, but certainly whenever a proposition is made to improve the condition of our people, if it means any advantage worth talking about, their course leads us to believe that they have no hope whatever for Canada, that they are pessimistic, even ultra-pessimistic, and that if we were to believe all they say we had better pack up and get out of Canada for some other country. I do not believe that this agreement is going to affect our credit in Great Britain adversely. When we see that since this agreement has been made public the stock of our greatest railway company, and the one most likely to be affected, the Canadian Pacific railway, has gone up several points within the last 48 hours, we must recognize that the shrewd men who manage that road have no fears of the effect of this agreement upon the money market, or upon the condition of affairs in this country. They have no fear that their great road is going to become a streak of rust for want of traffic. I saw, the other day, a statement from Sir Donald Mann, who ought to know something about railroads, that this agreement was not going to affect adversely his road. Now, I would take the opinion of Sir Donald Mann, aided by what little common sense I may happen to possess, to be that this agreement, instead of being likely to harm his road, is much more likely to do it good. Then there is the loyalty cry. Whenever a matter affecting the tariff or the position of Canada is brought up, we always expect to hear the loyalty cry raised, and I propose to discuss it at some length later on. Just here, however, I will say one or two words. My hon. friend points out to us that we should strive for imperial preference and preferential trade. Well, that is a nice thing, a pleasing thing to listen to; but within the last three or four years imperial preferential trade has been beaten out of its boots in Great Britain itself. Not long ago, in 1906, when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) went to Great Britain to stump the country in favour of preferential trade within the empire, preferential trade was defeated in the new House of Commons by a majority of something over 300, and the member for North Toronto did not deem it advisable to stay there long, because he was not making much impression. Again, a little over a year ago, in January or February last, the matter was again brought before the people of Great Britain, and again it was defeated in the new parliament by a majority of something like 120. Only the other day it came up again, along with other matters, when the leaders of the Tariff Reform party looked upon it as such an absolutely hopeless proposition that in his great speech in the Albert hall Mr. Balfour was obliged to throw it overboard, and to say that now all they were asking for was a referendum, in order to get their own followers into line. This shows that the big men of the party in Great Britain have lost confidence in the cry of preferential trade. Of course, if the people of Great Britain should offer us a preference in their markets we would be only too glad to take it, but that is a matter for them to decide, not for us, and already they have spoken very clearly and have said that they would have none of it.

We are just now hearing a good deal about the foolish remark made by Mr. Champ Clark the other day in the United States Congress. Well, we must always expect talk of that kind on the other side of the line; we have lots of it here, and we cannot expect that our people should indulge in talk about annexation, and this, that, and the other thing, impugning the loyalty of their opponents, and trying to make out that our lot is ultimately to be cast in with the great republic—I say we cannot expect to have a monopoly of that sort of foolish talk; it must spread to the other side of the line, they are men like ourselves, pretty much the same blood as ourselves, and they will talk. But I will tell you how it appears to me in reading newspaper extracts from time to time. It appears to me that a great part, I won't say all, of this filbustering talk in the United States has been manufactured for the purpose of defeating the Bill there, pretty much as I believe a great deal of the talk of a like character has been manufactured on this side of the line—I won't say all of it in the House of Commons—for the same purpose. If you find our own press throughout the country, or a large part of it—because there are noble exceptions on the Conservative side—if you find large and influential portions of our press taking the ground that this is going to lead to annexation, you can scarcely expect that it will not have some effect on our American friends, and that they will not think that perhaps there is something in it. But they

do not recognize as clearly as we do that it is simply a piece of political manœuvering, and that it is of small importance, as we know it to be. We also see a statement in the papers the last day or two that the right hon. the Prime minister went into this undertaking in concert with the government of Great Britain and President Taft; in other words, that the only meaning to be derived from this agreement is that the government of Canada, with the Prime Minister at its head, the Premier of Great Britain, and the President of the United States, have joined in a foul conspiracy in order to detach Canada from the British Crown, and to add it to the territories of Uncle Sam. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the mere statement of an agreemen such as that carries with it its own refutation. The idea of the Prime Minister of the British Empire intriguing with the head of a foreign state, and with the head of the greatest of the over-sea nations of the empire, to bring about a dismemberment of that empire, carries its own refutation with it, and I do not think it requires to be referred to at any greater length. I see in this morning's paper a telegram by the Canadian Press cable, an extract from a speech of Mr. Asquith, which I will read:

London, Feb. 15.—The American-Canadian reciprocity agreement came to the fore in the House of Commons again to-day. The government was questioned regarding the statement attributed to Henri Bourassa, Nationalist leader in the legislature of Quebec, to the effect that the home government had encouraged the Canadian government to conclude a reciprocity trade understanding with the United States.

Premier Asquith replied: 'The statement is entirely without foundation in fact.' The premier also denied that Ambassador Bryce has been engaged actively in the process to bring about the agreement.

Now, Sir, I would again point out, as it cannot be too often pointed out, that off and on for forty or fifty years past, some form of reciprocity has been advocated by both parties in Canada.

They have differed from time to time as to the method by which that policy should be carried out but it was recognized until recent years by this country and this parliament as the policy of one party as well as the other. In 1891 Sir John Macdonald made his last appeal to the electors of Canada, and he appealed to them on this very question. Although the language used by him on that occasion has been quoted more than once, as it is necessary in order to connect what I wish to say, I propose to read it again. He said in his manifesto to the people of Canada:

We said to the Americans we are perfectly willing to trade with you on equal terms. We are desirous of having a fair reciprocity treaty; but we will not consent to open our markets to you while yours remains closed to us.

That was a very laudable position to take. That was the position I would expect Sir John Macdonald to take. He was an astute statesman. I was not a follower or a supporter of his, but I always recognized his great ability.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that on natural products only?

Mr. WARBURTON. He does not say. Now, Mr. Chairman, at that time I remember that reciprocity was in the air. The National Policy, as it was called, was not doing the good to this country which its advocates have ever since claimed that it did do. The country was not in a prosperous condition, and the people were looking for reciprocity if it could be obtained. That was the feeling which permeated the air at that time. Sir John Macdonald, perhaps as astute a political leader as Canada has ever seen, saw the lay of the land and he at once adopted reciprocity as the cry upon which he would go to the country, and he went to the country upon that question and won. What was the result? Without intending the slightest disrespect to the memory of Sir John Macdonald or to his followers in this House, or to the party which still reveres his name, I may say that at that time there was a very general belief that while the government went to the country on the question of reciprocity because they felt they could not succeed unless they did, so they were really not sincere in their desire to bring reciprocity about. That was the belief that the country had at that time, and I remember also that when the delegation went to Washington after the government was formed it looked to the people, and that belief seemed to be borne out by the course which they adopted there, as if they were trying how not to do the thing which they ostensibly went there to do. The opinion that I, myself, and many others held was that while they went there ostensibly for the purpose of getting reciprocity they tried really not to get it.

But, I wish to call your attention to another fact in connection with that appeal to the country. Sir John Macdonald at that time was prepared to go in for a reciprocity treaty not an agreement such as we have now, but a hard and fast, entangling treaty, and that was adopted by the great Conservative leaders of the time as the keystone of their policy. It is true that they have wandered far afield since then, but, when Sir John Macdonald led them for the last time in his life, they adopted that as the keystone of their policy. It was a treaty. Of late, and before this agreement was brought down to this House, or before the measure was

known the great objection taken to the negotiations with the United States was that we are going to form a treaty, an entangling alliance and that sort of thing. Had a treaty been made I have no doubt that the changes would have been rung upon that, and possibly there might have been some little ground for taking exception to a treaty because if you agree to a treaty you cannot vary it for the term of years for which it is intended to be in force without the consent of both parties or without a breach of the agreement. You would be bound, hard and fast. There would be some ground for an argument in that case. I do not know myself that the ground would be sufficiently strong to justify this House in throwing out an arrangement if it had been brought down in the shape of a treaty because if the treaty were in itself good such little entanglements as might come about would not be sufficient to justify its rejection.

Now, Mr. Chairman, under the old treaty the maritime provinces prospered amazingly. Of course, I cannot speak from personal memory, but, having been brought up as I was in the country there, and knowing from my people what had gone on, I know that the maritime provinces, and my own little province among the rest, did increase and prosper amazingly. They increased in population very largely, a thing that they have not been doing of late. They also increased in wealth ; in fact, the farmers were getting to be well off. It is almost a tradition to this day in the maritime provinces that the reciprocity treaty of 1854-66 had been the best thing that the producers and people of these provinces ever had, and it has been handed down—I was going to say—from father to son, as something to be sought for.

I have said, Mr. Chairman, that before the terms of this agreement were known the opposition in the press, wherever we met with it, was largely based upon the supposition that this was going to be a treaty. In connection with that, I would like to read a short extract from a speech delivered by Sir George W. Ross on Nov. 3 of last year, in which he directs as strong an argument as he could make against reciprocity. But he assumed, and the argument throughout is based on the assumption, that the arrangement to be made with the United States would be a treaty. He says, on page 12 :

> If they were anxious for better trade relations with Canada let them negotiate through their own Congress at Washington and reduce their tariff as it may suit them, and let us reciprocate if we deem it expedient through the parliament of Canada.
>
> Theirs is the first move on the commercial chessboard. We gave Great Britain a preference without any treaty or even negotiations. Why should we treat the Americans with greater formality? At the same time let us receive their representatives with the utmost courtesy. They have proposals to make, we want to know what they are. They should be made as openly as if they were submitted to parliament. Public opinion should be heard upon them, and there the matter should rest until the United States Congress had given its sanction and approval to the action of its representatives. It would then be the duty of the parliament of Canada to take similar action if in the public interests so to do. Only in this way can we preserve perfect freedom from the possible entanglements of a treaty, which, no matter how carefully drafted is liable to be misunderstood and misinterpreted.

The arrangement brought down has entirely done away with the basic principle upon which that address was delivered. Sir George Ross is a man that the people of Canada, especially the people of Ontario, the Liberals of Canada and, I think, I might say, the Conservatives of Canada, greatly respect. He will always be listened to with respect and attention. Whether we always agree with him or not is another question. But I imagine that when Sir Geo. Ross saw that his speech had been sent all over this Dominion in pamphlet form by the Manufacturers' Association and others in order to create a prejudice against reciprocity that he must have wondered and asked : What have I done to deserve this? He had not always got these encomiums from the people of Ontario or from those who are now lauding his utterances.

My recollection is that he had a pretty hard time of it with those Ontario people who are now lauding him. Nevertheless, Sir George Ross is a great man, but so many years has he been working for the province of Ontario that he scarcely has eyes to see beyond the boundaries of that province, especially so as his political vision would seem to be largely circumscribed by the city of Toronto. However, as I say, Sir George Ross is one of the great men of Canada to-day. Recently I had sent me a pamphlet written by Mr. E. B. Bigger, of Toronto, in favour of reciprocity, and in it the same ground is taken, so that, of course, the same answer can be given to it. Speaking for myself personally, even though the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs had brought back from Washington a treaty, which in my opinion would not be as good as the present agreement, I would have supported it on the ground that the good in it would have been infinitely greater than any harm it could do. The present arrangement, not being a treaty, is much more elastic, and it leaves us free to change as conditions change. One of the strong points is that with experience of its operation, if it commends itself to the people of both countries as

mutually beneficial it can be continued, and if it fails in this respect then it can be put an end to. Some hon. gentlemen on the Conservative side hold up the British preference in this debate and express great fears that it may be militated against by this agreement. True, a few articles are placed on the free list of which we import a comparatively small quantity from Great Britain, but it is equally true that the great bulk of the articles we import from Great Britain will still remain under the preference. The people of Great Britain are not alarmed, because they recognize as we do that it is in our power to increase the British preference at any time we wish. On this point I might quote from an authority for whom every member of this House will have the greatest respect; I refer to the Duke of Argyll. According to a despatch published in the 'Citizen' on the 4th of February, His Grace said:

The Duke of Argyll, who is probably better versed in Canadian conditions than all the rest of the politicians now voicing their opinions in the British press, does not, however, overlook the main point and the point Mr. Fielding emphasized when introducing the agreement to parliament, namely, that the arrangement guards preference to Britain which may be increased by Canada without violation of the reciprocity arrangement.

If the Duke of Argyll, whose loyalty will certainly not be questioned, has no fear, I do not think that we need worry our heads much about it. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was very solicitous about the preference, and he wished to take it under his fostering care. He quoted, as is his habit, a little nursery rhyme which he said was illustrative of the position the Canadian commissioners found themselves in in Washington; he said they had had the wool drawn over their eyes, that they were deluded by President Taft and that they practically gave away everything to his blandishments. This is the rhyme the member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) quoted:

Come into my parlour said the spider to the fly;
A prettier little parlour you never yet did spy.

I wonder why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has such a hankering for nursery rhymes, but perhaps it is because he was present at the birth of this British preference and was one of those who tried to strangle it before it got into its swaddling clothes. But, if he wished to quote poetry about the British preference, the following parody on his nursery rhyme, which has been sent to me, would be more appropriate in his mouth:

Come into my parlour, said the strangler to the child,
It is the prettiest little parlour that ever you did spy.
I will not go to your parlour, to the strangler, said the child,
I bear in mind that parlour in my baby days of yore,
When you vampired o'er my cradle, and sought my infant gore.

Mr. HENDERSON. Very bad poetry.

Mr. WARBURTON. I submit it with all its infirmities and imperfections, and, while it may be bad poetry, it gives a very clear idea of what would happen if the British preference fell into the hands of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). Then, for fear the cry of the British preference would not be enough, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have on this, as on many other occasions, raised the cry of loyalty. During the course of my career as a public man in Canada, I can recall no occasion of this kind when an important public measure was advanced by the Liberal government, that the cry of loyalty was not raised by our opponents. Indeed, so often has it been raised that like the cry of 'wolf, wolf,' the people of Canada pay very little attention to it. At best it is an absurd cry. The loyalty of Canadians, whether they be Liberals or Tories, is too robust to be destroyed by any question of our trade relations with the United States. I do not think that any man can honestly and sincerely say that he believes in his heart of hearts that a single Canadian citizen will have his loyalty impinged in the slightest degree because we have freer trade relations with the United States or with any other country.

If it were not that I personally know so many of the hon. gentlemen on the opposition side of the House, and so many of their supporters throughout the country I would almost feel that they had lost confidence and belief in the robustness and virility of their own race, I would feel that they had almost lost confidence in their own loyality; but knowing them as I do, knowing them to be as loyal as we are, no more and no less, I feel that they are doing themselves a great injustice when they put before this country for political effect this matter of a possible want of loyalty. It is unworthy of them, unworthy of men of their class. If we were a lot of hoodlums or if we were to be bought and sold perhaps they might be justified in taking that ground, but if we were that class of people it would not matter much what country we belonged to. But we do not belong to that class of people, the people of this country are of an entirely different class. Nor do the people of this country think, as our hon. friends seem to think, that everything is going to the bad. Still, if one were to judge by their uttered words,

he would almost be inclined to think so. Sometimes when I hear these hon. gentlemen talking of loyalty and annexation, that we are going to be annihilated as a nation, and I do not know what else, I look around; I see that if you take their words literally these men have lost faith in their country and I am inclined to say : Oh ye of little faith. I believe, however, that they have a better faith than that, that their belief in the country is strong and robust and that when we get this reciprocity agreement fairly under way we will find among them among the strongest of its true and loyal supporters.

I used to belong to a vestry where we had one fine old gentleman who opposed everything proposed, no matter what it was. He was a very fine old man, and a generous supporter of the church, and when we got to know him we simply let him talk a little and then went ahead with what was proposed in spite of his opposition. When he had opposed whatever was suggested, he felt he had done his full duty, and always supported what we had done by his money and his efforts, and if you wished to repeal next week, what he had opposed last week, he would oppose the repeal. Just so with our opposition friends and the British preference. If you attempted to repeal the British preference now there would be as strenuous an opposition from the hon. gentlemen as there was to its enactment. One of the evils of the protective system, and I have no belief in protection myself and never had, is that it has the effect of destroying a man's self-reliance, he will rely more on the assistance of a high protective tariff than on his own exertions. I would like to test the loyalty of the hon. gentlemen in another way, and I hope and trust the government will see their way to make the test, although I do not know that they have any intention of doing so. I would like to see the British preference increased to 50 per cent, and I for one will assure them of my strong support; I will work for it, and do the best I can for it, I will hail it as a further and greater exhibition of our loyalty, and I am sure from what we have heard since the discussion here that hon. gentlemen opposite will support the government with both hands in anything of that kind.

Mr. PATERSON. You think so?

Mr. WARBURTON. And I would be very much interested, I would not leave my seat for one moment when that matter came up, as I would love to listen to the cries of loyalty that would then be uttered by them.

Turning to the question of annexation, I would say and I have no doubt I speak for many others here that it is humiliating for a loyal subject of the empire, such as I am, to be placed in a position where it is necessary to defend any section of this country or to have to denounce even the suspicion that this great country of ours has the slightest inclination or intention or could be induced to go into annexation. I believe there is a way, by a long course of treatment, in which you might force this country to go in for independence, but never for annexation. I do not want to see either independence or annexation, I think we are remarkably well off where we are. But we had talk about reciprocity many years ago. Conditions and times may change, but the effect of similar principles is always the same although conditions may divert them somewhat. Before 1854 it was notorious that there was an annexationist sentiment in this country. I do not think it got down to the maritime provinces, but there certainly was such a sentiment in the present provinces of Quebec and Ontario. That sentiment was voiced by a number of very able men, and I think they were not confined to one side of politics—although some one said yesterday that they were all Conservatives—young men and very able men, of whom a remarkable number on both sides of politics later came very much into the limelight and rendered good service to their Queen and to their country. After a few years of weakness when they entertained annexationist sentiments—it was the hot blood of youth, I fancy more than anything else, they perhaps were benefited by having gone through the annexation fever just as patients are sometimes better after suffering from certain fevers—they held high place in the councils of this country, and their names to-day are deservedly held in honour as those of loyal, manly subjects of the British Empire, none more loyal than they. I read in this pamphlet opposing reciprocity that was sent to me a very good summary of the history of that annexation sentiment. If we are to believe what we are told of that period, that annexation sentiment was stopped by reciprocity. I quote:

> Though reciprocity Bills had been defeated in Congress in 1848 and 1849, it was seen by the southern representatives.

And here is how we came to get it.

> That the idea was not only favoured by Great Britain and Canada, but was gaining ground in all the northern states, and, when the agitation for annexation began to develop, leaders of opinion in the South took quiet note of it, and foresaw that the alternative to a reciprocity treaty might be a complete union of the Canadian provinces with the States, in which case the separatist movement in the southern States would be swamped by a new union element in the North. Then the southern senators yielded and withdrew their opposition to the treaty, and thus in the decree of Providence, the motive which determined the southern States to secede, and which brought on the terrible civil war,

gave to Canada her desires without the sacrifice of her British connection, and, the economic waste of the same war bringing up at its close new revenue problems, cut Canada off from her dependence on the trade of the States, and thus confirmed her against her wishes, in the path of a separate existence as a nation.

Again the same writer, at page 13, says:

In the northern States political opposition to reciprocity yielded partly to the pressure of commercial needs on both sides, and partly to the belief that the new commercial relationship would lead to political union. The south, believing with most Canadians that reciprocity alone would satisfy the provinces, favoured the treaty to keep them out of the union, fearing their influence on the secession movement. The intuition of the south was correct, for, as soon as the treaty was negotiated, the annexation sentiment, which was never very deep, died out.

I would like also, although it has often been quoted before, to read you an extract from Joe Howe's speech at Detroit. It cannot be quoted too often in Canada:

In my own family and person I have suffered not a little by this unhappy rebellion. I have five boys, and one of them took it into his head to enter your army. He has now been nearly two years in the 23rd Ohio Regiment, and has fought in all the battles of that regiment during this period. He was in both the great battles under Sheridan, in which General Early's forces were scattered and the Shenandoah valley cleared. All the personal benefit that I have derived from the reciprocity treaty or hope to derive from its renewal, will never compensate me or that boy's mother for the anxiety we have had with regard to him; but when he produced his certificate of his commanding officer, showing that he had conducted himself like a gentleman and had been faithful and brave, it was some consolation for all our anguish to know that he had performed his duty. (Enthusiastic applause. As the applause subsided a gentleman proposed 'Three cheers for the boy,' which were given with great heartiness.) I have heard it said since I came to the convention that if the reciprocity treaty is annulled the British provinces will be so cramped that they will be compelled to seek annexation to the United States. I know the feeling in the lower provinces, and I believe I am well enough acquainted with the Canadians to speak for them also when I make the assertion that no considerations of finance, no question of balance for or against them on the interchange of commodities can have any influence upon the loyalty of the inhabitants of the British provinces, or tend in the slightest degree to alienate the affections of the people from their country, their institution, their government and their Queen. There is not a man who dare. on the abrogation of the treaty, if such be its fate, to take the hustings and appeal to any constituency on annexation principles throughout the entire Dominion. The man who avowed such a sentiment would be scouted from society by his best friends. What other treatment would a man deserve who had turned traitor to his government and violated for pecuniary advantages all obligations to the country that gave him birth? The very boy to whom I have alluded as having fought manfully for the stars and stripes would rather blow his own father's brains out that haul down the honoured flag under which he was born. If any member of the convention harbours the idea that in refusing reciprocity to British America they would undermine the loyal feelings of the people of those colonies, he is labouring under a delusion....I sincerely hope that all thought of forcing annexation upon the people of Canada will be abandoned.

Mr. Howe's speech was throughout received in good spirit, and it is worth noting that at this convention a resolution was unanimously passed in favour of a reciprocity treaty between the two countries, and of extending its scope so as to include British Columbia, the Selkirk Settlement and Vancouver Island.

For my part I say 'Amen' to these words of that perhaps one of our greatest Canadians. In that connection I would like also to read a short extract from a report in the 'Citizen,' a Conservative paper, which does not support the government in many things, but does, I am glad to say, in this matter:

The New York Sun declares that annexation is 'a dead issue,' and continues:—

The reciprocal trade relations of 1855-66 did not weaken the tie with the mother country. They set Canada up in business and gave her confidence in her own resources. With their development that confidence has steadily grown.

And in reference to the situation as it exists to-day it is worthy of note that a condition parallel in almost every particular obtained over half a century ago in our trade relations with the United States and Britain. But remarkable as it may appear in view of the interpretation placed upon such negotiations to-day, the modification of tariff duties was at that time considered the only possible salvation of Canada and the only method whereby annexation to the States could be prevented. In 1849 Lord Elgin, then Governor General, wrote that if Britain 'did not make the sacrifices which are absolutely necessary to put the colonists here in as good a position commercially as the citizens of the United States in order to do which free navigation and reciprocal trade with the States are indispensable, the end may be nearer than we wot of.' And Lord Elgin followed this up some time afterwards with another communication in which he was even more outspoken. 'If,' he declared, 'things remain on their present footing there is nothing before us but annexation. No measure but the establishment of reciprocal trade between Canada and the United States or the imposition of a duty on the produce of the States when imported into England will remove it.'

The reciprocity treaty of 1854, which resulted from Lord Elgin's representations, was followed by an almost complete cessation of annexation talk both in Canada and across the line. The fact became apparent then that the annexation spirit had had its origin in Canada in dissatisfaction with the commercial indifference of the mother country to her only North American colony, and that even

the slightest consideration in this respect was sufficient to dispel all such sentiment. Yet to-day we are told by political gospellers that the effort to promote friendlier trade relations with the United States is a menace to the imperial tie.

Now what took place before, may take place again. If there were any annexation sentiment in this country—and I have never seen the slightest sign of any—I believe the best cure for it would be freer trade relations. We are told by a very great authority Adam Smith:

> That to prohibit a great people from making all they can of every part of their own produce, or from employing their own stock and industry in the way that they judge most advantageous for themselves, is a manifest violation of the most sacred rights of manhood.

This reciprocity agreement, which we are now discussing, is an effort made to allow the great mass of the people to make the best use of their own produce. It is to enable them to dispose of the produce of their fields and orchards, &c., to the best advantage absolutely in conformity with the principle laid down 100 years ago by Adam Smith and warmly approved of very recently by the most profound of modern historians Lord Acton. But, as I said a moment ago, there might be one possible way in which by a long continuance of a certain treatment our people might gradually be led to look for independence, although I am convinced they will never want annexation. Let me call attention to what was the real cause of the revolt of the North American colonies against Great Britain. We are so accustomed to hear about the Boston Tea Party that we perhaps do not often go as far back as the real origin of this trouble which caused a dissatisfaction in the New England colonies that grew until it became an overwhelming force and resulted in a severance of those colonies from the British Crown.

> The real foundation of discontent which led to the American revolution was the effort of Great Britain, beginning in 1750, to regulate and control the occupation and business of the colonists. The final cause before the attempt to tax without representation was the effort to enforce the navigation law.

In other words, the effort to cramp and restrict the trade of these colonies was the underlying, the active, the effective cause of their separation from the motherland. Now, I do not think that even that would bring about annexation with the United States. I think we are too big a country; we have room enough for a nation. While we believe and hope and pray that we may ever remain a nation, one of the great congeries of nations which make up the British Empire, still, if, by any extraordinary concurrence of events, we should ever separate from Great Britain, it would be as an independent nation. We have a vast country; it is a northern country, and northern countries send out the best breed of men. And, if there is any other destiny open to Canada to which she is likely to attain, it would be independence and not annexation. And God forbid that it should be either.

But let us ask ourselves the question: Why should we join the United States? We here sit on opposite sides of this chamber—we do not know how long the parties will occupy their respective places; it may be fifteen or twenty years, perhaps only half-a-dozen years—but, though the sides oppose each other on the questions that come before us, I think we all agree that we have a much better form of government than the United States have. I do not think there is any dispute about that. Ours is a really responsible form of government. It can scarcely be said, if you examine it at all critically, that the United States government is really a responsible government. When you find that the members of the cabinet have not places on the floor either of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, that they are not directly responsible to the people, that when Congress changes its complexion the government still remains in office, it does not appear to me that that is, fairly speaking, responsible government at all. Ours is responsible government, and, on the whole, a better form. I believe, also, that we have a better country. In saying that I recognize the fact that we have a colder country, but the colder climate is the more bracing. We cannot raise the same great variety of products as can be raised in the United States, but those which we do raise are of the best, including men. I think we agree that we can raise in this country all that we really need. Even if we could have that country under the British flag, and if I were given my choice, I would not be willing to change countries. I believe, owing very largely to our northern latitude, the individuals in this country, taking them on the average, taking them man for man—and I am not underrating the greatness of many of the men on the other side of the line—are better than in the United States. Why, then, should we want to change? I could understand our American cousins, sometimes, when they are sick and tired of their form of government, wanting to join us, but I cannot imagine our wanting to join them.

Now, I have quoted passages from several writers and speakers. I would like to quote the opinion upon the general scope of the treaty of a man now living in Montreal who is very highly thought of as a thinker and writer. I refer to Dr. Andrew Macphail. I have here an interview with

Dr. Macphail. He was asked his opinion of the present agreement. And this is what the newspaper says:

Amongst the Montrealers who expressed their views on the reciprocity proposals, Dr. Andrew Macphail said that these proposals were so important that no man could foretell the results. One fact stood out clearly—that the proposals were not of the nature of a treaty of reciprocity, and so were free from the objections inherent in that form of agreement. He had always contended that reciprocity was the most vicious form of protection, because it was a surrender of fiscal independence, and prevented people from dealing freely with their own affairs. These lowered duties were proposed in what was conceded to be in the interests of Canada. The duties in the United States were proposed to be lowered in what was conceived to be in the interests of the United States. If they worked to the mutual advantage, so much the better, but each community was left free to lower them still further, or go back to the original arrangement.

The people of the United States appeared to want certain Canadian products, and they were free to decide what duties they shall pay to themselves. The people of Canada appeared to want certain products from the United States, and they were about to decide what duties they will pay to themselves. No identification of interests has been made with an alien country.

The only fear he had was that interested persons would raise the cry that freer commercial intercourse with the United States would lead to a lessened loyalty to British ideals and institutions. That allegation could be left to disprove itself. He felt that the people at large would accept these proposals with enthusiasm, especially in the Maritime provinces, where, for thirty years, they had borne the full force of the protective system, and profited the least by it. If these proposals were put in force he believed a new era would be opened for these provinces, especially for Prince Edward Island, which he expected would double its population in this generation.

The only objection he had seen was that this was a farmers' tariff. This he thought, its chief merit, especially in a community of which farmers form 65 per cent of the people. He thought it quite possible that hardship might result to special persons, but these should comfort themselves by reflecting upon the benefits which they enjoyed for the past thirty years.

We have had much discussion over the question of the home market. And when this subject is discussed it always looks as though the speakers and writers thought we had only one home market. We have not one but two home markets, and both good. The only one usually spoken of is that which is provided in manufacturing centres. But we have an unprotected as well as a protected home market. If the unprotected home market, that is the market afforded by the farmers and other producers to the manufacturers for their wares, can, by means of this agreement or in any other way, be enabled to obtain higher prices for its wares, and if it gets richer its people will live better and will buy more goods. That market will grow enormously if you give to the people who control it and live in it and own it a chance to increase their receipts by better trade relations, as I firmly believe this agreement will enable them to do. As that market grows real prosperity of all classes grows with it. If the profit on any single article be reduced, the larger market will more than make up for the loss. I believe, further, that, while our population is increasing rapidly, largely by immigration, it will increase in a much more rapid ratio under this agreement. I have reports from the maritime provinces in which they assure me that, if this treaty comes into force it will add materially to the value of farm lands there. We are losing population there. The maritime provinces are standing still, or actually going back, as regards population. Yet we have great wealth, not only of farm, forests and minerals, but of the sea as well. The province from which I come unquestionably increased enormously in population and in wealth during the time when the old reciprocity treaty was in force.

In 1871, four or five years after the treaty was repealed, the effects of the repeal had not yet begun to be felt by our population. In 1871 our population was 94,021. We went on under the old low tariff from 1871 to 1881, when our population increased to 108,891, or an increase of 13 per cent. In the next ten years, our population had increased to 109,078, a gain of 187; and in 1901 it fell to 103,252. In the earlier period the people used to leave the maritime provinces and go to the United States, but I am glad to say that in late years the stream of emigration, though it still flows outward, has been diverted to the Canadian west, and our people now still remain under the British flag. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the movement of population is shown by these figures:

NOVA SCOTIA.

1871..	387,800
1881..	440,572—gain of over 50,000.
1891..	450,396—gain of 10,000.
1901..	459,574—gain of 9,000.

NEW BRUNSWICK.

1871..	285,594
1881..	321,233—gain of 35,000.
1891..	321,263—gain of 30.
1901..	331,920—gain of 10,000.

So you see that Prince Edward Island, one of the most fertile parts of the Dominion, with fisheries surrounding it, suffered severely, our little manufactures were crushed out, and people left the country in considerable numbers. Nova Scotia, with

almost unlimited natural wealth, between the two last censuses only gained 9,000; and New Brunswick was in a similar position.

Now I believe that this agreement, when it comes into effect, will do away to a large extent with the exodus from our provinces. I believe it will give our farmers better prices for their produce, and our fishermen better prices for their fish than they now get, and an improvement in those respects will tend to keep our young men at home on the farms. Much has been said in this House, and in the country as to the meaning of the balance of trade. I never had much confidence in the balance of trade theory, when I saw Great Britain, a free trade country, getting on so well, and Russia, a protectionist country, also showing a trade balance in its favour. During the last fiscal year we bought from the United States to the amount of $223,000,000, and they bought from us $113,000,000. Now that, as has already been pointed out, was largely due to the enormous quantity of raw material brought into this country for our manufacturers, and putting a number of articles on the free list. I think that the best way to encourage manufacturers is to put their raw material on the free list. But one reason especially why we have not sold a corresponding amount of goods to the United States, is owing to the high tariff that country has imposed upon our goods. We are accused of selling to our best customer, England, and of taking her money and spending it in the United States. There may be some truth in that, but it is not our fault, it is the fault of the high tariff in the United States.

I have said that we ought to look upon these matters rather from a broad and national point of view, than from a sectional or provincial point of view. I believe that every member of this House ought, as far as possible, to disassociate himself from all narrow views, and try to ascertain what will be for the greatest good of the greatest number in Canada, and I believe that that greatest good will be secured by the removal of these restrictions on trade with the United States. I have been informed by those who know, that while many farmers in the western provinces are becoming wealthy from the splendid crops they raise. there are many others, of whom we don't hear so much, who are heavily involved in debt, and have been obliged to mortgage their farms in order to find money to pay for the machinery they use. In this way the profit that they make upon their crops goes largely to pay the interest on loans. It is well known that the loan companies in Canada, and probably the same remark will apply to the United States, have large amounts invested in the west that have been taken by farmers. Now it takes the farmer some ten or fifteen years to place himself in a good position, and as so much of his money has to go in payment of interest, he has an uphill road to pursue. He will get through all right if he is a man of vim and vigour, but he has got a terrible fight to put up in the meantime. Now I cannot see why, if these men, by selling their grain south of the line, can get a better price for it, they should not have the privilege of doing so. I for one, have a great deal of sympathy with the western farmer, who is struggling to make a start in life, and I say if he can get a few cents more for a bushel of wheat, it means a big relief for him, and will help him to get out of debt sooner. I think it is true that this agreement will bring about a relief to the consuming population of Canada. It means a reduction of the tariff, perhaps not to a great extent. But to my mind, a substantial reduction has already been made by the British preference, as well as by the treaties we have made with other nations, and the numerous articles put upon the free list. Still, with all these reductions, I am free to confess as an old Liberal, that I would like to see a still greater reduction in our tariff against foreign countries. To my mind, it does not render this agreement less valuable, because incidentally it takes in some other nations with which we have favoured nation treaties, I think it makes it so much the more valuable.

Now let us see what we give and what we get by this agreement. We place a considerable number of articles on the free list, and we reduce the duty upon a number of others, and the United States does the same for us. How do we come out from the point of view of revenue ? I will read an extract from the 'Citizen' of the 9th inst, in which this matter is well put:

The 'Citizen' says:

> The total production on Canadian products going into the United States is $4,849,933 under the terms of the new agreement. Of this sum the gain to Canada under Schedule A, which wipes out all duties, is $4,236,988; under Schedule B, which admits articles to the United States at the same rate at which they enter Canada, the gain to this country's exporters is $234,984, while under Schedule C, which calls for special rates, our gain is $377,961.
>
> In other words, the reciprocity agreement means in dollars and cents that Canada is getting the long end of a bargain, which will prove to the advantage of both countries concerned, to the extent of the difference between $4,849,930 and $2,363,763. Disregarding the advantages that must ensue for the consumer, the producer and the exporter the agreement is one that should appeal even to those who consider the financial aspect of such matters first and the effect upon the general prosperity of the country only when such an argument serves to support the original premise.
>
> Nothing in the agreement would seem to

justify the statements made in opposition to it that 'it will weaken the imperial tie' or 'result in Canada's annexation by the United States.' In the last analysis these statements are reflections on the loyalty of the people of this country.

So that, in the matter of revenue, upon the articles placed on the free list, or upon which the duty is reduced, we have made, it seems to me, a remarkably good bargain. I believe it is one that is good for both sides of the line. What are the articles which affect us particularly? The arrangement takes in all classes of cereals. We do not, in the maritime provinces, grow much wheat for export, but we grow other articles. We grow a sufficient quantity of wheat for our own use, or largely so, but we do not pretend to be an exporting people in so far as wheat is concerned. Then we grow potatoes. Last year with us the potato crop was almost a failure. It is a very rare thing for it to be a failure in Prince Edward Island. It is usually our staple crop, but last year it was only half a crop, and I am not sure that it was even half a crop. There were produced last year in the maritime provinces:

—	Potatoes.	Turnips and other roots	Hay and clover.
	Bush.	Bush.	Tons.
Prince Edward Is..	4,915,000	4,155,000	495,000
Nova Scotia.....	6,432,000	7,012,000	1,284,000
New Brunswick...	7,486,000	1,417,000	1,261,000

The hay and clover in all these provinces was a remarkable crop. Turnips and roots were good, but potatoes were practically a failure. These potatoes were formerly shipped very largely to Boston by water, but the duty of 25 cents a bushel practically shut us out from the American market. We largely now supply Sydney, St. Pierre and Miquelon, Newfoundland, and some other places, but our natural market is Boston. While our shipments to the United States were at one time enormous, they have dwindled to very little. If that duty of 25 cents a bushel is taken off, is it conceivable that the shipment to our natural ports by water will not again be resumed and be as great a success as it formerly was, if not greater? If we can get that market for our potatoes and turnips it will add enormously to the wealth of our farms, and our farmers, as it is, are a pretty well off class.

Then again, we have fish. We scarcely realize the value of the fisheries of Canada. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), occasionally brings up the question of the fisheries in the lakes of the west, and I myself, once in a while, say something about them, but I do not think that we realize the enormous value that our fisheries are to the country. Last year the total catch of fish was worth $29,629,169.68, divided amongst the provinces as follows:

Provinces.	Value of Fish.	Increase.	Decrease.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
British Columbia	10,314,755 50	3,849,717 50	
Nova Scotia	8,081,111 56	71,272 63	
New Brunswick	4,676,315 25	.....	77,982 00
Ontario*	2,177,813 00	77,733 37	
Quebec	1,808,436 65	.....	73,380 35
Prince Edward Island	1,197,556 59	.....	181,067 56
Manitoba	1,003,385 00	402,989 00	
Saskatchewan	173,580 00	20,785 00	
Alberta	82,562 20	33,316 20	
Yukon Territory	113,653 93	54,698 93	
Total	29,629,169 68	4,510,512 63	332,429 91
Net increase	.....	4,178,082 72	

*Estimated.

We have had to contend with great difficulties owing to the fact that our fish—and this applies to all the maritime provinces—have been practically barred from the United States market by their duties. We have shipped largely to the West Indies, to South America, to Spain and to some of the other European countries, which use large quantities of fish, but the near-by market we are, to a large extent, barred out from. If we get free entry of fish and fish oils into that near-by market it is inconceivable that a trade will not spring up as it formerly did, because we are right on the ground, transportation by water is cheap and there is an enormous demand for the fish that we put up—mackerel, for instance, and that sort of fish. Then, we raise a considerable

amount of poultry, which now we send very largely to Sydney, Newfoundland, and other places down there. We also produce dairy products. Up to now, we have sent these dairy products elsewhere than to the United States, although the United States would be our great market. We have been practically barred out from there. It happened by accident, in making up the schedules of the last tariff Bill of the United States, that they put cream in at five cents a gallon, although I believe the intention was to put it in at five cents a pound. But, however, it does go in at five cents a gallon, and already a large business in the exportation of cream has sprung up between Prince Edward Island and the United States. It began with only a few gallons, because people did not realize what it meant, but it has grown very largely and it will be a very important trade in another year. I hear that in Ontario the same thing has happened. Then again, we have large resources in live stock. We ship, as it is, large numbers of lambs to the United States. They come down and buy lambs in great quantities from us, because Prince Edward Island lamb is noted for its peculiar excellence. But every lamb has to pay 75 cents, and every sheep, I believe, $1.50. Then we come to the question of fruit, which has been so much discussed by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell), and others. We have no dread whatever of the duty being taken off fruit. We are quite prepared to meet the Americans in their own market or anywhere else, we believe that the quality of our fruit will carry it anywhere. Our fruit comes in later in the season than the American fruit. Our strawberries are sent to the Boston market, after other supplies have failed, and we get a good market there. Our apples and pears are better than theirs, the flavour is better, and we are quite prepared to put our apples and our plums and such other fruit as we raise, in competition with theirs in any part of the world.

Mr. BURRELL: What is the acreage under fruit in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. WARBURTON. Speaking from memory, about 8,000 acres. It is notorious that the fruit growers in the Dominion are not united in this agreement as the following interesting letter published in the Toronto 'Globe' will make clear:

To the editor of the 'Globe': It is interesting and very amusing to read the articles of the various interests for and against, specially against, the proposed new tariff with the United States. The Niagara district fruit growers would have us believe that they will be terribly hurt. I cannot agree with them on that point. There are only three or four months that they can supply the market anyway, and there is no need to fear competition from the States during that time, to any great extent as the American is somewhat in advance. For example, we have had many inquiries in September for carloads of plums from such cities as Cincinnati, Baltimore, Washington, New Orleans, New York, and Chicago. This would go to show that by that time their season was over. Then the Niagara people have the advantage in freight rates. This alone should give them all the advantage they require to make a profitable business.

It would certainly be to the advantage of consumers at large to be able to get supplies at reasonable prices when our own growers cannot supply them. Mr. E. D. Smith said at the hearing given to the Ottawa deputation that during the time they cannot supply the market it would be the rich that would have to pay the duty on American supplies coming in. Is there any reason or fair play in a policy which would hold up prices so that only the rich could afford to buy? I have no sympathy with any dog-in-the-manger policy that would almost compel the ordinary consumer to do without supplies until such times as ours are ready for market.

Mr. Smith also stated that the fruit growers of Canada were a unit in regard to the opposition of the proposed new tariff. When he says that, he is either not candid or he does not know it all. Now in regard to apples; generally speaking, the best apple men are favourable to the tariff. In view of the proposed changes there is more interest taken in the apple industry in this Georgian bay section than for many years. Hundreds of acres will be planted with varieties specially suited to both the western and American markets. We ourselves have in view the planting of five hundred acres. When I say I am satisfied with the tariff proposals I am voicing the sentiments of a great many apple growers, representing many thousand acres of orchards.

J. G. MITCHELL, General Manager,
The Georgian Bay Fruit Growers, Clarksburg, Ont., Feb. 11.

Although I am not very well acquainted with the Niagara Peninsula, I have travelled through it, and it seems to me that those who live there, are a most favoured people. They can grow almost all fruits and of the finest flavour, and it does seem to me their natural advantages ought to enable them to compete advantageously in the markets of the world. It may be that the Americans would interfere with their trade in the earlier variety of berries, but I should think that in the end the excellent quality of the Niagara fruit would give it pre-eminence in the American market so that in a few years even the Niagara fruit growers would not want to see the tariff barriers raised again. The Niagara peninsula is one of the most favoured countries in the world, and it is not a bad test of its prosperity to see what land costs in that district. I was informed that land producing fruit, runs from $500 to $1,000 an acre, and the fruit growers certainly have beautiful homes and well ordered grounds which can only be possessed by a prosperous peo-

ple. If land be worth $1,000 an acre an the fruit growers can live in fine house and luxurious surroundings, they certainly must make large profits which could not be cut into very much by the removal of the duty. Although I do not know much about British Columbia, I am told that fruit land there is worth $50 an acre in a wild state, that when it is cleared it costs $250 an acre, and when planted and growing fruit $500 an acre. When people pay such prices for property it is reasonable to expect that experience has taught them that it is a profitable investment, and I don't think they need fear the reciprocal agreement. While possibly British Columbia may not be benefited as much by this agreement as we in the maritime provinces are, yet the pacific province is not left out in the cold. There is free coke, and coke is a valuable product in British Columbia, and there is free fish, which, when the National Transcontinental railway is built and the port of Prince Rupert equipped, must be a very valuable asset to that province. At present, it is two or three days sail from the most productive fishing grounds in the world, to the point of shipment, but when the Transcontinental line is completed it will only be a few hours sail to Prince Rupert, and as Canadians have a monopoly of this fishery the removal of the duty on fish must be of enormous advantage. Mr. Speaker, it is only the importance of the subject now before the House, that justifies my having spoken at such length. I presume that our friends in the opposition will vote against this measure, as they have a right to, if they wish, but, when I heard the Minister of Finance on the 26th of last month introducing the measure, and when I saw the very general applause which greeted him, I thought to myself that on this occasion if never before, we would have unanimity in this parliament.

After the resolutions introduced at various sessions, seeking to do away with the duty on different lines of manufactured goods, after the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) undertook the impossible task of reconciling the cutting off of an important part of the duty on certain lines with a policy of high protection, I cannot see how he can vote against this. I cannot see how the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) or the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) having the interests of their constituents at heart, in that wheat growing country, can very well vote against this measure which will be of such manifest benefit to their constituents, and I will not believe that they can do so until I hear the names called out. I might go further and point out that many of these western gentlemen have shown signs by the resolutions they have introduced into this House in the last few years that the free trade sentiment that is now growing in the west is getting hold of them, and the fact that they have introduced resolutions at various sessions in the past, and this parliament tending to a reduction of duties shows that they are being impregnated with the revenue tariff or free trade bacillus. They are in contact with their people ; they know what their people desire. They saw the enormous delegation that came here in December from the west and know how the members of that delegation spoke, with no uncertain sound. I thought that delegation put the case very well although in some respects they perhaps asked rather more than they could reasonably expect to get, but still they made a good case and showed the trend of opinion in the west. That opinion has to be considered and dealt with by any one who runs up against this reciprocity agreement. It would be interesting to me to know how my genial friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) can vote in this House against the removal of the duty on Nova Scotia fish going into the Boston market, and then go to Halifax and tell them why he did so.

In conclusion I desire to quote from the 'Globe' several extracts from Conservative papers, showing that this matter has been fought in different ways in different parts of the Dominion, it is not opposed in the same way in all places, they have one story in one place, and another in another. The 'Globe' says :

CANNOT BOTH BE RIGHT.

The following editorial extracts from the Toronto 'News' and the Victoria 'Colonist,' the chief Conservative organ of British Columbia, indicates the sort of thing that is going on in every province of the Dominion in regard to the reciprocity agreement. The 'News,' three thousand miles away, predicts disaster for the British Columbia lumbermen as a result of freer trade. A representative British Columbia lumberman induces the 'Colonist' to say editorially that it does not know what will happen, and hopes for the best:—

The News (Con.)—"The British Columbia lumberman has developed a large trade with Alberta and Saskatchewan, and has been able to compete on satisfactory terms with the products of the American mills, but with the reduction of the tariff as foreshadowed in the agreement made at Washington the mills of the United States will monopolize the lumber trade, and the British Col-

The Colonist (Con.) —"Mr. Cameron of the Cameron Lumber Company writes us a letter on the effect of the reciprocity agreement upon the lumber trade of British Columbia. The examination which he has made of the schedule prepared for President Taft leads him to the conculsion that British Columbia merchants will be under no greater disadvantages in the Canadian market, whereas they

umbian will be forced to send his rough hewn timber to the United States to be prepared for the market of the middle West, instead of doing it in his own mills in British Columbia. The greatest need of the Pacific province at the present time is a larger white population. The new trade arrangement cannot have any but a retrograde effect on immigration."

may gain very considerably by reason of the opening to them of the markets of the United States. This is certainly very interesting, and if the agreement is going to be brought into effect will be a source of local satisfaction. . . . . While opposed on principle to the negotiation of any reciprocity agreement with the United States, we very sincerely hope that, if the agreement is consummated, the most sanguine expectations of its friends as to its beneficial effect upon Canadian business will be more than realized."

Which view is the more likely to be correct—that of the man on the spot or that of the critic three thousand miles away?

I think I can assure my hon. friend who is now leading the House, (Mr. Paterson) that he will receive a strong and enthusiastic support from the very bottom of their hearts as well as from their lips of the gentlemen who sit about me. I believe that this is the best measure that has been brought before this House or any other House in Canada in the last 50 years in relation to its benefit to the province from which I come. If there is any difference in the benefit it affords to different places it is perhaps possible that we may benefit most because there is not one thing in which we are injured while we are benefited by every thing. I do not believe that many of those in other parts of the Dominion, who are complaining are hurt, they are crying before they are hurt. But with us it is a benefit in every respect, and I hail it with delight, and I congratulate the two ministers who negotiated it on the important work they have done.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Chairman, the question now before the committee is one of the most important that has been before parliament since confederation. The hon. member from the Garden of the Gulf has taken the position that he is very strongly in favour of reciprocity, and also of free trade with any nation on the face of the globe. But I venture to say that his good people, and the hon. gentleman himself, after he investigates this question more thoroughly will come to the conclusion, unless he and his people are taking a provincial view of the matter, considering only what is best from an island standpoint that we are facing a crisis in the affairs of this country. These people are big enough, and patriotic enough and have sufficient national pride, I am sure, to say that even if they are going to get a few cents more for a bag of potatoes or some other commodity, and are thereby going to injure some of the other large industries in the different parts of this country, they would be willing to forego that slight advantage and work for the best interests of all.

My hon. friend does not believe in a tariff commission. He says that 220 men are sent to this House to look after the tariff and should be able to do it. Well, what about the measure now before the House? Does he not know that it was submitted to us by two ministers of the Crown on behalf of the government, and that they are practically forcing their followers to line up and vote for it. Talk about 220 men having the right to decide this matter, I am not exaggerating when I say that every man on the government side is compelled to support this measure under penalty of seeing the government go down to defeat. This agreement is the work of two men, who are two of the strongest free traders and commercial unionists the country has ever known. Go back to the history of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and you will find him going up and down the highways and the byways of his province in the early days urging the people to secede from confederation and join their fortunes with the country to the south. And as to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) we have heard him on the public platform throughout the cities of Ontario with that splendid voice of his crying aloud for free trade as it is in England. These are the two men who went to Washington and entered into a pact with the American people in order to bring about free trade between the two countries.

My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Warburton) says: Keep the hay on the farm. Yes, I would like to voice that sentiment. I would like to say to him that if he will get up in this House and condemn the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) for either his lack of knowledge or lack of interest in the agricultural industries of this Dominion during the last 15 years, owing to which our agricultural interests have been seriously interfered with, he will be doing something worthy of his election to parliament. If we had had a good, live, active Minister of Agriculture during the last 10 or 15 years, our farmers would not want to trade with the country to the south, but would be independent of any such necessity.

My hon. friend referred to the statement of Sir Donald Mann, which has also been referred to by other speakers on that side as supporting this agreement. The other day the hon. member for Wellington (Mr.

Guthrie) read the whole of that statement. I propose to quote the last paragraph of it, which reads as follows :

Personally I would prefer to have a preference between the United Kingdom and the Dominion and between the Dominion and other colonies. This preference should be increased from time to time, until, say in 25 years, the cost of production would reach a common point throughout the empire. Then we would be able to have free trade within the empire, and protection against the non-British nations.

Does that statement indicate that Sir Donald Mann is strongly supporting the government on this question? I should say it indicates the very opposite, and that if he had his way he would take an entirely different course.

My hon. friend talks about a mutual preference, which, he says, would be a splendid thing for this country if it could be brought about. Let me go back to the days of 1896, just before this government came into office, and read what the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said in London, Ontario, and again in Massey hall, Toronto, and a little later I propose to read what the right hon. gentleman said at the Colonial Conference in old London. In London, Ontario, he said:

Now, the statesmen of Great Britain have thought that the governments of the colonies have come to a time when a new step can be taken in their development. What is that? That there should be a commercial agreement between England and the colonies. That practical statesman, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, has come to the conclusion that the time has come when it is possible to have within the bounds of the empire a new step taken which will give to the colonies in England a preference for their products over the products of other nations.

He said further:

What would the possibilities of such a step be if it were taken? We sell our goods in England; we send our wheat, our butter, our cheese, all our natural products, but there we have to compete with similar products from the United States, from Russia, and from other nations. Just see what an advantage it would be to Canada if the wheat, cheese and butter which we would send to England should be met in England with a preference over other products of other nations. The possibilities are immense. England does not expect that we should take her own system of free trade, such as she has it; but I lay it before you that the thing the English people would expect in return is that instead of the principle of protection, we should adopt a form of revenue tariff. Those are the conditions on which we could have that boom.

In closing he said:

My hope is—nay, my conviction is, that on the 23rd of June the Liberal party will be at the head of the polls. Then it will be the Liberal party, with its policy of revenue tariff, that will send commissioners to London to arrange for a basis of preferential trade.

Now, I would like to ask my good friend from the island (Mr. Warburton) what did the Prime Minister do? Did he send the commissioners over to old London? No one knows better than the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) what the Prime Minister said on this matter when he landed in Liverpool. In the first speech he made in that city on that question, the right hon. gentleman spoke as follows:

I claim for the present government of Canada that they have passed a resolution by which the products of Great Britain are admitted on the rate of their tariff at 12½ per cent, next year at 25 per cent reduction. This we have done, not asking any compensation. There is a class of our fellow-citizens who ask that all such concessions should be made for a quid pro quo. The Canadian government has ignored all such sentiments. We have done it because we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain. We have done it because it is no intention of ours to disturb in any way the system of free trade, which has done so much for England. What we give by our tariff, we give you in gratitude for the splendid freedom under which we are prospering. It is a free gift. We ask no compensation. Protection has been the curse of Canada, and we would not wish you and we would not see you come under its baneful influence, for what weakens you must weaken us.

This speech no doubt won for the hon. gentleman the Cobden medal.

Follow up the ministers of the Crown from that day to this, follow up the men on the other side of the House, and what do you find ? You find the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), for instance, rising in his place and practically condemning the proposal of the men on this side, who were working for a mutual preference. Man after man on the other side has condemned in the strongest kind of language the position that a mutual preference would be of benefit to the Dominion of Canada. We should have a mutual preference, and I firmly believe we will have it before many years go by. And, if it were not for this stumbling block of reciprocity, which these men put in the way, mutual preference would come all the sooner. Let me tell my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Warburton), that 48 per cent of the men who voted in the last general election in Great Britain, voted in favour of a mutual preference. It is idle to say that this idea is dead in the old country. It would increase the value of every farm in the Dominion, it would bring immigration to her shores that would fill our lands with a population worthy of our nation.

My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island talks about being a free trader, and

is anxious to take a step nearer to free trade. But I notice that the men who are such pronounced free traders, are not satisfied with the step; no sooner is one step taken than they want a further step. And what would free trade mean to the Dominion of Canada. One hundred and fifty millions of dollars per annum is collected for the purposes of this Dominion from our people. Assuming our population at 7,000,000, this means $20 per head or $100 per family. I only wish that, for a single year, the people of Canada had to put their hands into their pockets and pay out that $100 per family. They would watch where the money was going; and, instead of the government being allowed to squander, as they have been squandering, for the last fourteen years, the people would see to it that honest and clean administration was the rule in this country. My hon. friend wants free trade with the United States. That means that he is going to the most highly protected country in the world, and he is going there, because he can buy there cheap goods. He tells us about his potatoes. Why, what is he going to gain by having access to the United States markets ? If he had read the Canadian reciprocity book, which has come to us from the Washington government, and printed by them, he would have found among the 'articles included under the reciprocal trade agreement imported into the Dominion of Canada from the United States in the fiscal year ended, March 31, 1910,' the item of 215,288 bushels of potatoes valued at $179,000 and paying a duty of $43,000. (And the government is doing away with that $43,000.) The hon. gentleman would have found that of sweet potatoes and yams we imported from the United States, 37,000 bushels, valued at $33,000. And before I get through, I will be able to show to my hon. friend that as to the farm products, which he is boasting of as being in so much demand among the people of the United States and of such increased value to the people of Canada by reason of this arrangement, the United States is not only a large exporter of these goods, but is not paying any extra price worth speaking of for any of them.

The hon. member referred to the British preference and told what a splendid thing it was for this country, but he did not take the figures into consideration. We imported from the United States within the past six years, $581,000,000 worth of goods, of which $502,000,000 were free goods. We imported from Great Britain during the same period $542,000,000 worth of goods, of which $113,000,000 were free goods. The rate on dutiable goods from Great Britain was 24·78 as compared with 24·26 per cent on dutiable goods from the United States; and the rate on the total imports from Great Britain was 18·64 per cent, while the rate on the total United States imports was only 13·4 per cent. Yet we hear these gentlemen boasting throughout the length and breadth of Canada of the splendid advantages which, under this preference, they have granted to Great Britain. Our exports to the United States in the last six years amounted to $506,000,000, of which a large proportion was raw material, while our exports to Great Britain amounted to $726,000,000. During the past six years, Great Britain bought $300,000,000 worth more from us than we bought from her. During the same period, we bought from the United States, nearly $600,000,000 more than they bought from us. The British importer is paying higher duties to the revenue of the country than the man importing from the United States. Yet these gentlemen would lead us to believe that we are dealing with Great Britain to such a wonderful extent, and are, according to her many advantages.

My hon. friend (Mr. Warburton), spoke of annexation, and deplored the fact that the people of Canada were even discussing the subject. But when you take into consideration the prominent position that this great question holds in the United States to-day, you cannot but feel that we should, at least take it into our serious consideration in this parliament. Hon. Champ Clark, the leader of a triumphant party, which swept the country in the United States elections last November, led his followers in the House of Representatives, in support of this reciprocity arrangement. Only three of his followers bolted this vote. He is the most prominent man in the Democratic party to-day. And we find that hon. gentleman making use of the words: 'We are preparing to annex Canada'—making use of them three times in his speech in the House of Representatives, on the subject of this agreement. He said further, 'One flag, the Stars and Stripes, from Central America to the North Pole.' And we find prominent men in the United States backing him up in this. I can give quotations from the statements of many prominent men in that country. I do not give many, because I do not wish to take up time. Senator Jones, of Washington, stated:

> Canadian annexation is not an impossibility. It is remote, much as I would like to see Vancouver and British Columbia an integral part of the American Union.

Senator Smith of Michigan:

> Champ Clark spoke in prophetic vein, and I am not surprised at his deductions. Mr. Clark's views, as expressed by him on the floor of the House on Tuesday, almost carry as much weight as if the Prime Minister of England had spoken. No doubt the jingoes in England will do all in their power to use the Clark incident to defeat the Canadian re-

ciprocity pact, if for no other purpose than the fact that reciprocity between Canada and the United States probably will shatter the well laid plans of England's statesmen to create a central parliament in London—a parliament that would make its purpose to secure advantage over trade relations between all countries flying the Union Jack and the world. Mr. Clark's utterances are bound to cause uneasiness in Europe, and are a blow at the English scheme of centralization, the feasibility of which is apparent to any one who studies the wonderful resources of the British Empire.

Can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, a stronger statement than that coming from one of the prominent senators of the United States? Then Senator Cummings, of Iowa, says:

I am for the annexation of Canada. I have always been, and if it were generally understood that Canadian annexation was the purpose of the pending pact, it doubtless would help the measure in becoming a law here. Mr. Clark's speech may have some effect on the outcome of the measure in England and Canada, but surely not in this country.

Senator McCumber, of North Dakota:

Canadian annexation is the logical conclusion of reciprocity with Canada. Once the Canadian farmer has tasted the advantages of our market he won't want to withdraw. It would be a signal for a universal demand for annexation.

These quotations are from the utterances of leading statesmen at Washington. They undoubtedly voice the general idea in the United States with regard to this reciprocal agreement. Let me read a paragraph from a paper that serves a large district in western Ontario, the Detroit 'Free Press.' On February 2 it made this statement:

Its (the reciprocal agreement) principal merit is political and social. . . . It will, it is hoped, and confidently hoped, be the beginning of the end of the stupid separation of two halves of a continent which is inhabited by substantially one people.

Then, what do we find President Taft of the United States saying at Champaign, Illinois:

What we ought to look toward is the general effect on the social and business relations of the two countries. We have no forts along our borders; we have no battleships: we are able to live at amity with them. Why not then take down the only thing that separates us in our business relations?

Then at Springfield he said:

The plank in the platform of the last Republican convention, carried to its logical conclusion, would lead to substantial free trade with Canada.

He further said:

It will give the United States much greater control of the wheat market than it ever had before. It will enable its milling plants to turn Canadian wheat into flour and send abroad the finished product, and it will stimulate the sale of manufactures and other things that we have to sell in Canada.

Now let us inquire why the old treaty was abandoned:

The New York 'Sun' reviews the causes which led to the cancelling by the United States of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, and says:

The treaty lasted about eleven years, dying of various causes on January 18, 1865. Among them was the charge that Canada in bad faith had raised her duties on manufactured goods (she has been acquitted by impartial commentators), a belief that Canada had the best of the bargain, the dissatisfaction of the American farmer and lumberman, and toward the end a general feeling of hostility toward England on account of her attitude toward the north during the civil war.

Can you imagine any arguments more trifling than those used for denouncing the reciprocity treaty in years gone by? And is it not possible that within the next few months, or the next few years, these same men may bring up like arguments when the Minister of Customs goes to change his tariff? He will find that the United States will hold the big stick over him as they did over the Finance Minister last year, when he had to withdraw from the position he had taken in reference to the French treaty, when he led us to believe that the United States had no resource against the French treaty? He was told on the floor of parliament that he would have to yield to the United States, and he did yield by giving a number of concessions. Now you can depend upon it, that when you come to change your regular tariff from time to time, you will have to go over to Washington and consult with those men, and they will tell you plainly that they will withdraw from this reciprocity agreement unless you allow them certain privileges for their manufactured goods.

In a few weeks' time I believe the destiny of Canada will be fixed; we will either decide to be masters of our own future, or we will enter a path which can only lead to annexation. In 1866 Canada set her face towards welding together the British Empire. During all the years since, the United States has never held out her hand to help us, but on the contrary you find her building up against us a tariff wall forty-two rails high, while our wall is only twenty-six. To-day we are asked to take the first step towards turning aside from our beaten path. For fifty years we have gone on increasing in prosperity. Canada should have an ideal, and that ideal should be to become a great nation, while at the same time remaining a daughter in her mother's house. Everything a nation needs is produced in the

British Empire. Australia has the meat and the wool, Canada has the grain, the raw material and the lumber, Great Britain herself is the great manufacturing centre, and the clearing house of the world. Canada and Egypt can grow more and better cotton than the United States. Surely this is a world combination that cannot be beaten. To-day this government asks us to take the first step towards the disintegration of the empire. Does the government realize that the United States has precious few raw materials left compared with her needs? Let them go to the libraries in the United States and investigate the facts, and they will find that if the United States were compelled to use only her own pulpwood, in fifteen short years her supply of pulpwood would be consumed. Many of her coal mines and minerals have already struck rock bottom. Why is President Taft so anxious to carry out this agreement? Why is he going up and down that great country and gaining political prestige at every step? He realizes the need of prompt action on this agreement. He tells the people that it will conserve their resources, it will open up new markets for their manufactures. He says Canada is at the parting of the ways. Until the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs went to Washington, President Taft was politically a defeated man in the eyes of the people of the republic. To-day he can be elected easily on the ground that he was able to get this treaty from the hon. gentlemen; there is no question about it.

Why are the prominent men in the United States supporting this measure? Because they believe and know that they have the best of the bargain, and that it will lead to annexation. In so far as this reciprocity deal is concerned our representatives have been buncoed, and they have come back to this country with a gold brick. The premier's hands are tied with regard to this matter and the Minister of Customs has helped to tie his hands. The hon. gentleman knows full well that the hands of the Premier of Canada are tied and that he cannot change one jot or tittle of this important measure. We have the premier of this young Canada sitting in parliament with an important measure before him, his hands tied, and simply saying: In so far as I am concerned I will not be able to change any part of it, and my followers will have to vote with me. Hands tied by whom, may I ask?—tied by the American diplomats, by the Yankee diplomats, by the men who got the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs to go over there. After treating them no doubt in the most royal manner possible our representatives were invited in and finally, when the measure was placed before them, they thought it was of great advantage to Canada, no doubt, owing to their free trade ideas, and they brought it back in the shape which it is presented to the House. No use for delegates to come to Ottawa! The Liberal press says to the manufacturer: Don't you grumble about the government's position on this question or they will hit you with the British preference. That position has been taken over and over again by the Liberal press. It is the same with the transportation companies—if you squeal your stock will be hit, and the important transportation companies of this country are in a most serious position, because should they condemn this measure, as they want to condemn it, and as they believe it ought to be condemned, that report will go abroad and it will be practically impossible for them to sell the stock of their railway or transportation companies. Canadians on this question like all others, ask for a square deal, but I cannot believe that this is a square deal. This government are the servants of the people, and not their masters. Instead of their bringing this measure down and forcing it through this House in the manner in which they are trying to force it through they should have given the people time to think over the matter and consider it properly. They must feel at least that they are taking an unfair advantage of the people in this regard.

We have had a great many treaty deals. We have had bungling mismanagement of our trade relations with many countries. When this government came into power in 1896 they granted a preference of 12½ per cent to the mother land. When they granted that preference Sir Charles Tupper stood up on the floor of parliament and said distinctly and emphatically that they would have to grant the same concession to many other countries and Germany was one of those countries. But the Finance Minister said: No, we are not going to do anything of the kind. The outcome of it was that in 1898 he increased the preference to 25 per cent, and finally to 33⅓ per cent. Germany said: You are hitting below the belt, you are taking an unfair advantage of us in reference to our position as a favoured nation in our treaty relations with the mother country—and rightly so. The outcome of it was that Germany put this country under the maximum tariff. This government turned around and put German goods under the maximum tariff. Germany said that this was another slap in the face, and placed a surtax on our goods. Our government placed a surtax against German goods coming into Canada. The result was a tariff war and that tariff war was carried on year after year for twelve long years until the trade that we had with Germany which should have amounted to $50,000,000 a year had dwindled down to a paltry million or two. Who was the cause of

this trouble? This government. We find these hon. gentlemen coming down last year and removing that surtax, but not placing us back in the position that we were in in 1896. Our position with the German Empire is not anything like as favourable as it was in 1896. The Minister of Customs knows full well that in regard to many of the items they are not on the minimum tariff as they were in 1896. What about the German market? Germany with 62 million of people, Germany that imports two billions worth of goods, Germany that imports a billion worth of food products and 300 millions worth of just such products as we are producing on the farm offers us one of the best markets in the world. The market of the United States is an exporting market, and I will prove to you before I sit down that instead of the United States being a great consuming market like the German Empire it is a market that is exporting large quantities of the very products that we are asked to send into the United States. On the other hand here is the German market which is the best market in the world, but one, and we are not in anything like the favourable position that we were in with regard to that market in 1896, a condition of things which was brought about by the present government. What about the Japanese Treaty? I have not time to go into this question, but the hon. gentleman knows what the outcome is of the Japanese Treaty. Then, take the French Treaty, and I ask what good has it done to us? Look up the trade and navigation returns, and find the different kinds of things we are sending into France and see what little advantage this country has derived from the French Treaty. It was brought about in a manner that must have been humiliating to the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance. We remember the boastful way in which it was given to the people of Canada in the first place, and then we remember those hon. gentlemen coming down to the House, and having to take back, for instance, the entry of cattle into the French market. As a result of the position in which these gentlemen were placed they were only able to get into that country a very small amount of goods from the Dominion of Canada in return for the splendid concessions they gave to France. What was the outcome of it? Last year the United States held the big stick over them with reference to the French Treaty and obtained large concessions the ultimate outcome of which was our friends going over to Washington and entering into the present commercial arrangements. We have now a Yankee agreement, but the Yankee agreement opens the door to many other countries as well, and when these gentlemen on the government side of the House argue in favour of this agreement as regards dairy products, like my good friend from the island, (Mr. Warburton), they want to take into consideration that last year in the month of January 5,000 boxes of butter came from Argentina into the Montreal market, and the price of butter dropped from 25 to 19 cents a pound in a few days. What about the fact that within the last ten days, in this very year, 2,000 boxes of New Zealand butter came into British Columbia? What position is our country going to be in when the door is open to all these lands to ship their dairy products in? If you investigate this question you will find that in opening our doors to these countries, as you are compelled to open them now, you are going to make of Canada a dumping ground for butter, cheese and dairy products from other countries.

Not only that, but Australian mutton will supply the western market to a very great extent. Under the most favoured nation treaty Canada will have to extend the same tariff advantages she gives to the United States to the following countries: Argentine, Austro-Hungary, Bolivia, Columbia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela, and in addition, by special arrangement with Canada, France and Germany must also share in the concessions. We are opening the markets of Canada to make them a dumping ground for the products of these countries. My good friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Warburton) spoke of the wonderful advantages the people of Canada would have in farm and dairy products by this arrangement. Does he know that we imported into Canada from the United States last year $52,597 worth of poultry, and that we exported only $3,576 worth to the United States; does he know that our imports of potatoes from the United States were valued at $213,554, and our exports to the United States $36,770. Does the hon. gentleman know that $177,577 worth, or 750,000 dozens of eggs came last year from the United States to Canada, and that we were only able to send back there 39,910 dozens valued at $12,596? Let the hon. gentleman remember these figures and perhaps he will not have such a high idea of the advantages we will receive in the matter of dairy and farm products. We would expect a large quantity of wood pulp go to the United States, but we must remember it is manufactured to some extent here, and last year 30,627 pounds came into Canada from the United States while 4,224,000 went from Canada to the United States. Of newsprint 234,000 pounds came to Canada while 1,600,000 pounds went to the United States, and the people of the United States buy it simply because they can't help themselves. Then, I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) that the horse men of western Ontario are deathly opposed to this reciprocal arrange-

ment, because they know it will take away from them the northwest market which is very profitable, and it will allow a class of horses to be imported into this country which should never be allowed to come here. I know my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) is big enough and broad enough, when he knows the facts to admit that he is wrong, and to vote against this reciprocal arrangement, and I think he will be ready for that admission when I tell him that 6,604 horses came from the United States last year, and that Canada sent only 2,615 in return. Then again, gentlemen who support the government have told us of the wonderful advantage the cheese men are to have from this reciprocal arrangement. Let them remember that a couple of years ago the Dominion produced over 300,000,000 pounds of cheese, and that our exports of cheese to the mother land were valued at $25,000,000, we supplying 60 per cent of the British market. Let them remember the danger there is to our trade in that market from this reciprocal arrangement, and then perhaps they will not have such a high opinion of it. The Minister of Customs knows that the United States is a large exporter of dairy products—

Mr. PATERSON. Does the hon. gentleman remember that the dairy associations of eastern and western Ontario unanimously desired that this treaty should go into effect?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When?

Mr. PATERSON. They should know their own business.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When did they express that desire?

Mr. PATERSON. I read the report of their meeting when I was in Washington.

Mr. BLAIN. So do the fruit men know what is wanted.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. They did not know then the position their industry will be placed in. This agreement was not before them.

Mr. PATERSON. They wanted what they have got.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am satisfied the Minister of Customs is making a statement which is wide of the mark. I have no doubt that when these men investigate this question and see the loose cheese and the cheap salt butter coming into Canada and filling the market they will realize that their industry has been injured. You can depend upon it that the bacon hog industry in Canada will be ruined by the bacon products of Illinois and the hog-raising states, and depend upon it Mr. Canadian Farmer that if you allow cheap United States cheese to come into Canada and be shipped out to England as Canadian this reciprocity arrangement will be an expensive luxury for you. I believe it will be found that the salt butter, flabby pork, and cheap cheese of the United States will be entered into Canada by thousands of tons and shipped to the British market as a Canadian product, thus depreciating the reputation of our Canadian goods.

Mr. PATERSON. Do not scold them too much ; they did not have the benefit of your advice before they pronounced themselves.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No, nor the ministers brainless agreement to look at. While the farmers of Canada are looking for a market in the States, the States will be stealing the splendid position which Canadian produce holds in the British market. We find last year that 215,681 pounds of cheese came into Canada from the United States.

Mr. DANIEL. Did biscuits come with that cheese?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No, the Minister of Customs as a biscuit manufacturer would look after that. As one hon. gentleman said the other day, he sat tight on the biscuit box as his colleague sat tight on the coal scuttle. Canada was able to get only 163,000 pounds of cheese, or $27,000 worth into the United States. Of timber of all kinds $4,156,000 came into Canada while timber of all kinds went into the United States to the extent of $22,000,000. But remember that these men paid the duty. You can depend upon it that when that duty is wiped out as far as the farm products are concerned, the cheaper products will come in here in greater quantities. While the world's market fixes the price, the purchaser in other countries has to pay the duty and you must remember this fact that Liverpool and London are the world's markets. We have created new markets, we have established them at a very great expense, and now we are asked to revolutionize all our trade arrangements. Let us develop these markets and perfect our transportation and cold storage systems to get our goods to the markets of the world in proper and safe condition, and depend upon it the price we will receive will be in advance of what we get on the other side of the line. The British market is easier of access to-day than the United States market was fifty years ago. If our tariff needs arranging we can surely do it ourselves without the Yankee. Think of the humiliated position in which Canada is placed to-day, Canada with an area greater than the United States including Alaska, almost as large as Europe, eighteen times as large as France, eighteen times as large as Germany, thirty times the size of the United Kingdom, thirty-three times the size of Italy; Canada whose farm crop in 1910 amounted to $507,000,000, her

mineral production to $90,000,000, her timber cut to $62,000,000, her fisheries to $30,000,000, her manufacturing output to over $900,000,000, and who borrowed last year over $200,000,000 from the mother country. Is this not a heritage to be proud of? Is the credit of Canada not worthy of consideration in this question? To my mind that is one of the most serious facts in regard to the whole question. You can depend upon it that the British investor is looking to-day to the position that Canada is taking in regard to this important question. Who has built up the great railroads of this country? The British people have invested in Canada to-day over $1,800,000,000 and yet——

Mr. PATERSON. What for?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Let the hon. gentleman go into the bond market, let him take our railways, our transportation facilities, let him go on west into Winnipeg and see the magnificent blocks of buildings and the street railways in that city. Who are getting the bonds, who are buying the bonds from the Finance Minister of this country to build the Grand Trunk Pacific and increase the debt of this country?

Mr. PATERSON. Who is getting the interest?

Mr ARMSTRONG. Who is paying the interest, that is all right. But you must have a higher rate of interest if you are going on with your reciprocity deal because you will interfere with these transportation companies, with these great cities in the west; and instead of them building up and becoming the great manufacturing centres, you will have the people of the west fixing their eyes on the city of Chicago or New York and doing their trading in that direction, because you can depend on it if our wheat and cattle and other farm products go to Chicago these cars are not coming back empty. These cars will come back filled with manufactured products to supply the people of our great west and these supplies will not come over the Canadian railroads. The Minister of Customs knows that he can go on to Regina and will find that the bonds of the street railway there are held in the old land. In Calgary practically the whole city is owned by Britons and run largely by them. Whose money is it that is building up Vancouver? Is it United States money that is building up these great enterprises in our western cities? No, it is the money of the mother land. Come to Toronto, Montreal, Quebec or Halifax, and you will find British capital invested everywhere.

Prominent men of the United States have already distinctly and emphatically said that this step is in the direction of annexation and no other. They are entering into it with that consideration in view apparently and I have heard some men go so far to say that the Minister of Customs and even the Minister of Finance had some vague messages of this kind put up to them while they were in the United States. But let me tell the Minister of Customs that as far as British capital is concerned, there is great agitation about this important question. British capitalists have invested in our railways and financial institutions and undertakings to an enormous extent.

We also find that in the last few years 225 American firms have invested $320,000,000 in Canada. Does the Minister of Customs expect that these gentlemen are going to continue to invest in the Dominion of Canada if you are taking steps towards free trade? Where is the manufacturer who would leave a market of 90,000,000 people for a market of 7,000,000 and expect to improve his position unless the seven millions market was protected for him? The Minister of Customs knows that and by this Bill he has given a serious setback to the bringing in of American capital for investment in the Dominion of Canada. If the manufacturer established on this side he would live in fear of the 90,000,000 market being taken away from him. So the only hope of permanence for this arrangement lies in political union. Do the people of Canada want it? They do not. The United States has a tariff of 42 per cent against us, while we have one of 26 per cent against them. Let them lower their tariff so that it conforms with our own before they start to talk of trade arrangements. When the United States abrogated the reciprocity treaty Sir John Macdonald enunciated his policy, that policy which to-day gives us the home market for 80 per cent on our products. That national policy is still the trade policy of Canada, it has been the policy for the last fifteen years and the Minister of Customs knows full well that were it not for that policy the splendid prosperity and advancement that we have had in this Dominion would not have been brought about by anything that the present government have undertaken. The free trade Liberal in Canada, it is true, has been told that the tariff has been revised downwards, but the men who make such statements know better and the Minister knows better. $33,000,000 of the goods of our country go free into the United States and $104,000,000 of goods from the United States come free in to the Dominion, and yet the United States are said to be giving us a square deal The Americans were convinced that they would have to make a change in their tariff and to make it downward. A dying congress gave them the opportunity. They offered to open up negotiations with this government and this government, which had been in power fifteen years and was pretty near the jumping off place, joined with the

United States government, which was in the same position, for the purpose of keeping the two in power. Our government said: We must do something to draw the people's attention away from the graft and the corruption which has been rampant in this country during the past fifteen years and from our abortive naval policy. On the other side President Taft was practically a defeated man before he made this reciprocity agreement, but now he is able to go boasting throughout that country of having the advantage over Canada and there can be no doubt that he will be re-elected on this measure.

Mr. PATERSON. What about us?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Let me tell the Minister of Customs that when the people of Canada come to thoroughly understand the workings of this scheme, they will never forgive the government for having put it into execution. The government are making themselves servants to the men at Washington. They are taking away our right to making our own tariff. Let the Minister of Customs listen to the utterances of some of the prominent men of his own party. Why did he not listen to the Hon. G. W. Ross who said that reciprocity would be the ruin of Canadian industry? Had I the time I could quote statement after statement by prominent Liberals against this agreement. Take again the position assumed by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) with regard to this deal, and also that of Senator McMullen. Go to your banks throughout the Dominion, and I understand there is only one general manager of a bank in the whole country who is in favour of this proposition. The others are distinctly and emphatically opposed to it.

The motto 'Leave well enough alone' has been quoted here to-day, and it is one well worth keeping in mind. The United States are the most aggressive competitors we have, and yet we are entering into a pact with them. We have had gentlemen from the west say: Let us sell in Chicago and New York. But what then would be the use of our building the Hudson Bay railway at a cost of $50,000,000 or the Georgian Bay canal at a cost of $100,000,000 or the new Welland canal, or the Grand Trunk Pacific? Why should we pledge the credit of the people to the extent of over $300,000,000 to build that great transcontinental railway, if the producers in our great west are going to send their products to Chicago and New York? What is the good of our improving our transportation facilities east and west, or of our building the Hudson Bay railway if we are to deal with Chicago and New York?

Mr. PATERSON. But the leader of the opposition wants the Hudson Bay railway built at once.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If you will alter this reciprocity deal we can assure you that as far as we on this side are concerned, we are ready and willing to build the Hudson Bay railway under government control and management.

Mr. PATERSON. Read his speech.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Our Canadian ports will be side-tracked. Let us see what has been our expenditure on railways up to 1910. The federal government has expended $427,000,000; the provincial governments, $36,000,000; the municipalities, $18,000,000. Or the total cash expenditure taken out of the public treasury since 1878 and invested in railways is nearly $500,000,000. But that is not all. The federal and provincial governments have besides guaranteed bonds for railway construction in Canada to the extent of $27,000,000 more. In addition the various governments' federal and provincial, have granted in aid of railway construction no less than 55,000,000 acres of the public domain.

Then there is no permanency to this arrangement. The Finance Minister said it was not a binding agreement, and if after reasonable trial it was found unsatisfactory we could change it. But if you pass this agreement and have it in force even for only a short space of time, you will do untold injury to our people. Our financial institutions do not want it; our transcontinental railways do not want it. If this deal goes through our great transcontinental railway will be but a sink hole for the wealth of our country. Our trade and shipping will be done by the Yankees because the cars and boats which carry the wheat south will not come back empty. We were a happy and contented people before this tariff matter developed, our cities were alive with prosperity, but to-day Canadians and the Canadian press are appealing to the premier to stay these arrangements. They are appealing to him to restore confidence in our industries, to restore confidence in the old land from which we borrow money in large quantities, to restore confidence in the money market, to restore confidence in our railways and transportation lines. Canadian enterprises and corporations must borrow abroad. They do not borrow from the United States. You are injuring the credit of the loan companies and financial institutions of Canada. The insurance companies take the same position. Railways and transportation companies declare, as far as they dare without prejudicing their stock against it.

Our policy should be closer trade relations between Canada and the whole empire, because the 450,000,000 people in the British Empire are the greatest consumers of our natural products. We have the best granary in the empire, and it is to be taken away and handed over to the Americans. Our trade will go through American instead of Canadian ports. By drawing nearer to the United States, Canada will set her foot on the road to separation from Great Britain.

Let us look for a few minutes at our trade from 1856 to 1866 under the old reciprocity treaty. I have here the figures, showing Canada's trade from 1856 to 1866, under the old reciprocity arrangement. Canada's total imports in 1854 amounted to $40,529,325. These dropped in 1858 to $29,078,527. Canada's total exports in 1854 amounted to $21,249,308. In 1858 they amounted to $22,029,565. In 1865, the year before the abrogation of the treaty, Canada's aggregate exports were $39,607,919 and her total imports amounted to $44,620,469. Two years after the abrogation of the treaty, in 1868, Canada's exports were $44,000,000, and her imports, $57,000,000; in two years an increase of $5,000,000 in her exports and of $18,000,000 in our foreign trade. During the life of the treaty we sacrificed our St. Lawrence ports and route. Shipments to and from Great Britain were sent and received by Oswego, Buffalo, and New York. The exports from Montreal and Quebec fell 33 per cent in one year. And what are the figures to-day? Our exports amounted in 1910 to $301,358,529, and our imports to $391,852,692. Why not leave well enough alone. The hon. member for South Wellington said that this would open the door of the United States to our trade in agricultural products. What does that mean? What does Mr. Hill, the head of the great Transcontinental road in the United States say, speaking of wheat?:

For the year ending December last the average price in California was 84 cents a bushel, 12 cents a bushel higher than the price in Oregon.

And he says further:

The average price for wheat per bushel, in 1909, in the North Atlantic states, was $1.12; in the South Atlantic states it was $1.17½. What made the difference between the two? Was it the tariff? But there is no tariff whatever, so you have to seek for some other cause to account for the difference. The average value per bushel on the farm, in 1910, for Iowa, was 72 cents; for Missouri, 78 cents; for Tennessee, 90 cents; for Alabama, $1.02; for Oklahoma, 73 cents; for Arkansas, 85 cents; for Oregon, 72 cents; for California, 84 cents; for North Carolina, $1.01; for South Carolina, $1.14. Now will some one explain that great difference in price? It is not due to the tariff.

These are statements by one of the prominent railway men of the United States, which go to show that when hon. gentlemen opposite state that opening the door of United States trade, will increase the value of our wheat, they do not allow for these differences in price in different sections of the States. You can depend upon it, that when that door is opened, we shall be placed in a very different position from what hon. gentlemen opposite would like us to believe.

Consider, for a moment, the exports of the United States in different kinds of animal and agricultural produce. In 1909, the United States exported $18,000,000 worth of cattle. And yet we find men from the Northwest who will tell you of the wonderful advantages to be gained by getting into that market. If they will only look at the statistical year book of the United States, they will find that the United States itself is an exporter of cattle. Of horses, the United States exported in 1909, $3,386,617 worth. The total value of animals exported from the United States in that year was $22,645,438. I wonder if the Minister of Customs saw these figures before he entered into that arrangement at Washington? I venture to say he did not take these into consideration. Here is a statement of the breadstuffs exported from the United States in 1909:

UNITED STATES BREADSTUFFS, EXPORTS, 1909.

Barley	$ 4,672,166
Oats	804,759
Corn	25,194,466
Rye	1,049,809
Wheat, bushels 66,923,244 valued at	68,094,447
Wheat flour, brls. 10,521,161 valued at	51,157,366
Total breadstuffs	159,929,221

If the Americans could use our wheat for home consumption, that would be a redeeming feature of this arrangement. But they do not need it. And when men talk of receiving a wonderful addition to wheat prices, they will find that the Liverpool and London markets regulate the prices of these products.

Now, let us look at some other exports of the United States:

UNITED STATES MEAT AND DAIRY EXPORTS, 1909.

	Valued at.
Eggs, 5,207,151 doz	$ 1,199,522
Butter, 5,981,365 lbs	1,268,210
Cheese, 6,822,842 lbs	857,091
Condensed milk	1,375,104
Lard, U.S.	52,712,569
Pork, pickled	4,599,431
Ham and shoulders, cured	23,526,307
Bacon, U.S.	25,920,490
Beef, fresh	12,698,594
Beef, salted and pickled	3,438,048
Total meat and dairy products in 1909	$166,521,949

In view of these figures, what about the butter industry in Canada ? Did the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), take into consideration the fact that the United States exported nearly 6,000,000 pounds, valued at about a million and a quarter of dollars ? Surely, that should have been taken into consideration.

Mr. PATERSON. It was, by the dairy associations that passed resolutions in favour of the arrangement.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. minister seems worried about what the dairy associations say. I think he will find, when these associations take this matter into full consideration, there will be a different story. And here are the figures of the fruit exports:

UNITED STATES FRUIT AND NUTS EXPORTS, 1909.

	Value.
Apples, dried, 33,474,634 lbs..	$ 2,339,936
Apples, green, 896,279 barrels..	2,782,007
Total exports, fruit and nuts..	$16,568,080

Yet, the minister is trying to make the fruit men believe that their industry will not be hurt by this arrangement.

UNITED STATES SEED EXPORTS, 1909.

Clover seed..	$1,706,780
Flax seed and linseed..	1,092,539
Timothy seed	1,009,557
Total seeds..	$5,256,623

Then our good friend from the island told us the advantage it would be to the fish industry of the eastern provinces. If he will consult the statistical year book of the United States he will find that $6,000,000 worth of fish were exported from the United States to other countries; so there may not be all the advantage to his island that he expects. What is the position of the meat packing industry? If this Bill passes, the pork packing and dead meat industries will be practically ruined, the meat trust will be in the saddle, and the Minister of Customs knows it. The farmer, in the long run, will not be benefited. Let me read to the hon. gentleman a statement in regard to the meat trusts of the United States:

The United States public pays the six big packing concerns of Chicago the colossal sum of $945,000,000 a year for meat. The net profits of these concerns which are being prosecuted by the government as a monopoly in restraint of trade, amounts to $25,000,000 a year. Such is the light thrown on the present high cost of living, as seen in the enormous profits made this year by the big beef barons.

Of the gross annual business of the packers the following is from authoritative sources:—

Armour & Co..	$275,000,000
Swift & Co..	260,000,000
Morris & Co..	125,000,000
National Packing Co..	100,000,000
Suizberger & Sons..	100,000,000
Cudahy & Co..	85,000,000
Total..	$945,000,000

The net profits are as follows:—

Armour & Co..	$ 9,808,305 69
Swift & Co..	8,000,000 00
Morris & Co..	2,171,339 00
Suizberger & Sons..	1,600,000 00
Cudahy & Co..	1,700,000 00
Total..	$23,379,644 69

HOW FIGURES WERE GOT.

For years the profits of the packers were known only to themselves and the public had no way of ascertaining whether the profits were unduly large. Since the packers, to raise money to extend their business, began to offer bonds and other securities for sale to the public, they have been compelled by rules of stock exchanges, in which the securities are listed, to make an annual statement of assets and liabilities. Swift & Co. have made statements for several years, but the Armour and Morris Companies only began last year to give the public a bookkeeping view of the packing business.

BETTER THAN GOLD MINE.

The Armours have a surplus capital investment of $74,000,000 which represents their gigantic profits of past years. Morris & Co., show a profit around 50 per cent annually, last year 69 per cent being earned on the stock. Boasting of their vast business recently, President Suizberger said the packing business was one of unusual stability, the profits being rarely subject to wide fluctuations. In declaring the annual business of his house to be $100,000,000 annually, he said it was exceeded only by the gross earnings of two railroads, the Pennsylvania and Southern Pacific.

In face of these facts, is it not reasonable to expect that when you open the door of the United States to the products of Canada you are opening the door to the Yankee trusts to come in and to swallow up the stores we have in this country? Is it any wonder that the Minister of Customs is visited by delegations of meat packers and exporters begging him not to open that door? But in spite of that, we find him ready and willing to do it. What about the flour milling industry? In Ontario we have over 300 flour mills, and they are all opposed to this agreement. They believe it will, to a large extent, transfer the milling industry to the United States. There is no question that it will transfer the large mills to the United States. Take into consideration the fact that a mill grinding 5,000 barrels of flour a day, and with flour going into the United States at 50 cents a barrel duty and free wheat from Canada, that mill, by moving over the line, would make $2.500 a day. The milling industry will, therefore, be transferred largely to the United States. In the western

provinces the people will not long buy from a market to which they sell nothing. The United States will run that business. They will buy our wheat for high grade flour, and take our market for low grades. The American miller will have a better market for his offals. Did the minister take that into consideration? Thousands of carloads of offal from the mills are distributed throughout the province of Ontario, a splendid food for animals on the farms, largely from the fact that they are able to get this offal from the mills grinding grain from the northwest country. What do you find to-day? Some of the men in the west boasting because that offal will be fed in the United States, and the United States will be placed in a better position in that regard than the Canadian farmer by feeding their cattle on the coarse grains and offal from mills. What about our manufacturing industries? Food prices will be raised to the working men through the trusts and the corporations that will control the food of the people who consume them. The reduction on manufactured articles is an important one to many of these industries; thus it will stop the American manufacturers from locating in Canada to a great extent. You must remember that labour in the United States is, on the whole, much cheaper than Canada, on the whole. In the city of New York to-day you will find 50,000 men crying for bread. In the city of Pittsburg you will find 30,000 men working at $1.25 a day, wages that our working men would not care to accept. We place the making of our tariff in the hands of the American Congress. Take the salt industry. The minister has had salt deputations waiting on him, and they have said to him: You are wiping our industry out of existence by these tariff regulations. How do you do it? The salt industry in Sarnia last year consumed over $6,000 worth of coal, on which they have to pay duty. They have to pay a duty on the bags coming in, and in many instances on machinery and the products that they use to manufacture salt. What about the cattle industry? The United States is exporting $18,000,000 worth of cattle, and with their cheap food coming over from Canada, what chance would our farmers have of competing?

What about the butter industry? I told the minister of the large amount of butter coming into the Dominion from New Zealand and other countries, lowering the price of our product. Cold storage and the transportation of these products will be demoralized. It is my privilege to be president of one of the largest butter factories in the Dominion of Canada. Last year, if we had made all the cream into butter that we received, we would have made over 350,000 pounds of creamery butter. But we only made 185,000 pounds, because, during a portion of the year, we shipped the cream to the other side and got a good price for it. But that good price only continued for a small portion of the year, and we found that we could make more money for the farmers by making that 185,000 pounds in our own factories. You can depend upon it that the butter industry of the Dominion of Canada will be seriously interfered with if this arrangement goes into effect.

You will find the salt and cheap butters of the United States coming into Canada, and filling our market and supplying it to a very great extent. Oleomargarine and the process butters of the United States have full sway in that country, and there is no doubt that if this government will allow all sorts of cheap butters in the Dominion of Canada they are going to undermine the great butter industry of this country. If you undermine it here you undermine it in the markets of the world, because our butter sells for a good deal more than United States butter on the British market. Our cheese and dairy products command a higher price than United States exports of these same products in the markets of the world. Take the fish industry of our great lakes; the Americans own to-day the great fishing boats and Canadians will continue to eat the small fish, pike and whatever is left as we have in the past, and our choice fish will go to feed the Yankees. The Canadian bacon hog has gained a record which it has taken years to bring up to the market standard will disappear and this arrangement will leave the market open for the American animal. There are few constituencies in the older provinces that are not directly interested in these industries. Take my own riding; you have seriously interfered with two salt industries, two wagon works, six flour mills, ten cheese factories, twenty miles of fruit land along the south short of Lake Huron, six evaporator works, two canneries, besides many other industries. Cheese and butter factories were built up under British connection. The government assisted them by cold storage and transportation to the extent of something like $600,000 or $700,000. We stand higher in the British market than the Americans in these products. The vegetable industry pays a duty on its coal, glass, fertilizers, implements, &c., and it is asked to compete with the man outside who has all these things at his disposal free. There have been millions invested in this vegetable industry all over Canada. In fruit and vegetables it is always harder for a northern country to compete with the south. American fruit will arrive several weeks before ours is ripe and by the time the Canadian fruit is ready the consumer has tired of that certain fruit and will wish

some other kind that the United States will supply; so, the Canadian farmer will walk at the tail end and get the glut prices for the fruit if he can sell it at all. With regard to early vegetables the same condition obtains. In Ontario there are 57,000 acres given up to the growing of vegetables, 250,000 acres to fruit and 500,000 in the whole Dominion. It requires years to develop a fruit farm. Fruit men are developing our natural resources just the same as any other line of industry and the industry is one which is launched on the sea of doubt. Fruit men are compelled to pay tribute to every other industry. Our western trade will be demoralized if we cannot ship into that country. From the Niagara district in 1904 a sample car was sent. It was followed in 1905 by 25 cars, in 1906 by 264 cars, sent from one shipping point, and in 1910 by 600 cars. It is expected that 1,000 cars will represent the shipment of fruit this year to that western country. For every dollar that United States people spend on Canadian fruit we spend $22 on theirs. There is an investment of $150,000,000 in the fruit industry of Canada, and there are 30,000,000 bearing trees. It takes from eight to ten years to get returns and ten acres of orchard will employ as much labour as one hundred acres of wheat. Even with the present duty the United States have made a dumping ground of our markets. The fruit growing industry is a great natural asset, it gives a large amount of traffic to the railroads and consumes the product of box, barrel and basket factories besides supplying canneries, cold storage plants, &c. The prices that the fruit men receive for their products depend upon the time they can be marketed. You will turn the fruit men over to the American trusts to handle their goods and you can depend upon it that in so far as the consumers in Canada are concerned they will not get cheaper fruits. Canada imported from the United States last year $4,634,268 worth of fruits of which $3,428,722 were free. I would like to place a few statistics with regard to this fruit industry on 'Hansard' because I come from a district that is developing into a most important fruit producing country. At the little town of Forest 55,000 trees are sold to be planted this coming spring. At another place they will plant about 30,000 trees, a large number of them peach trees. This is rapidly developing into a fruit district, from a farming district, and remembering the position in which it is to-day you cannot help but feel that the government have dealt most unjustly with the fruit industry up in that country. When you consider that there are 50,000 acres of fruit land in that district alone you cannot but realize that the government have taken a most unfair advantage of the fruit men located there.

Let me examine for a moment the international trade as it applies to the fiscal year of 1909-10 in both countries. There was imported into Canada an amount of fresh fruit, not including those already on the free list, such as bananas, oranges, &c., made up as follows:

Apples (duty 40c. per barrel), 59,071 barrels, valued at	$261,792
Peaches (duty 1c. per lb.), 200 cars (12 tons)	155,139
Grapes (2c. per lb.), 267,000 baskets (81 lbs.)	112,218
Plums (½c. per lb.), 198,587 baskets (201 lbs.)	158,756
Pears, apricots, quinces (averaging ½c. lb.), 247,000 baskets (20 lbs.)..	170,346
Cherries (2c. per lb.), 31,860 cases (10 lbs.)	40,376
Cranberries (25 p.c.), 40,854 bushels.	91,754
Berries (2c. per lb.), 2,503,594 lbs...	210,796
Other fruits	4,309
Total	$1,205,546

As to the importations into the United States, the returns are not itemized so fully, but for general purposes the comparison will be found sufficiently clear:

Apples (duty 75c. per barrel), 14,800	$ 29,323
Grapes	2,800
All other fruits..	200,653
Total..	$232,776

The United States fruit-grower then sends into the markets of this country, under present conditions, from five to six times the amount that the Canadian grower sends into his markets. What will be the effect of the abolition of the duties? Undoubtedly a lessening of the producer's prices in these markets.

Let us look at this question from the farming standpoint. Shipping hay from the farmers' standpoint is a suicidal policy. We need our hay to feed our own cattle and we should sell them on the hoof. Cheap feed will go to the south. You would enrich the United States farmers by reciprocity and cheap feed for their cattle. The United States lose made moist cheese and their high coloured salt butter would go to England as Canadian butter. The sheep industry, the cheese industry, the butter industry, our cattle industry have been declining under the present Minister of Agriculture and the hog industry as well. The production of grain per acre has also been declining year after year. Our Minister of Agriculture is wrong on this question as he almost always is. He should leave our farmers to send their products from the farm not as grain, but on the hoof, We do not want to send our grain to the United States to feed their cattle but that is exactly what this agreement will do. The United States have unlimited resources; with a thrifty, intelligent application of intensive farming they can double their output.

We may expect the tariff fence to go up

again any day, and we will have to look elsewhere for our markets. It has been said that trade follows the flag, but it may come about in this case, that the flag follows trade. For years Great Britain has been ready to purchase anything we had to sell, the British market was ours when no other market was open to us, and were it not that the United States government find themselves at present in an embarrassing situation they would not offer us their trade now. How soon the United States market will be closed to us nobody knows. The Finance Minister cannot give us an idea of how long we may expect it to remain open and then when we want to get back in the British market, we will find it occupied by others. It is the duty of this government to place the Canadian farmer on the same footing as the American farmer. The Minister of Customs knows well that the agricultural industry in the United States is assisted generously by the federal government and by every state government, and that millions of dollars are spent where we spend only hundreds of thousands, on experimental farms, and experimental stations, and agricultural colleges educating the American farmers to a high standard of intensive farming, while we are away behind in that work. The time has come when this government will have to take a more active interest in educating Canadian farmers along new lines of industry, when they will have to establish four times as many experimental farms as they have now, and when they will have to assist the colleges of our great west to educate newcomers in the proper cultivation of their land. Twenty million farmers in the United States have the benefit of rural free mail delivery while we have not even made an attempt worthy of being called rural free mail delivery. In telephonic communication by independent lines the American farmers have far greater advantages than ours. It is encumbent on this government to give to our Canadian farmers better transportation facilities, better cold storage, better freight rates, to remove the embargo on cattle, and to encourage by money grants, some of the local governments in the splendid work in which they are engaged in assisting the farmer. When the Liberals came to office they found a united Canada ; they found the Canadian Pacific railway from ocean to ocean, they found the Canadian Pacific railway boats plying to China and Japan, and ships trading from Canada to the West Indies and South Africa, they found the Canadian Northern, under MacKenzie & Mann, developing at a wonderful rate; they found our canals on which the Conservatives spent $80,000,000 ; they found the Ste. Marie canal and an improved water system to the Atlantic which made us independent of the States. When the Liberals came to office they found in their desks a fast Atlantic steamship contract which they threw out and they attempted to give us bottle nosed steamers and turtle back ships both of which failed. The Liberals when they came to office, found in our factories 300,000 workmen, paid $100,000,000 per annum in wages, and with an output of $600,000,000 worth of manufactured goods. The Liberals had fought the establishment of these industries and the undertaking of the great national railway. They have tried to build a railway to the Yukon between two ice-bergs, for which they offered 4,000,000 acres of land and in respect to which they afterwards had to pay MacKenzie & Mann $347,000, out of the treasury of the country. Now the Liberals propose to disrupt this happy Canadian family and to deliver to the United States our natural products. In 1776 the United States objected to taxation being levied from London and what followed is a matter of history. Canada has been independent up to the present time, but now she goes to Washington to arrange her tariff. The Liberals have given us a tariff in which there is no stability ; we have a maximum tariff and a minimum tariff, a medium tariff and a preference tariff, a French tariff and now we are to have a Yankee tariff. I trust the day will soon come when we will have a maximum and a minimum tariff, and a mutual preference between the colonies and Great Britain.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would not that interfere with the argument against New Zealand butter coming in ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman must remember that under these circumstances, we would have a preference in the British market, for our products, and that would more than compensate for the small amount of New Zealand butter that might come in. Let the hon. Minister of Railways who is interested in Transportation remember that 77,000,000 tons of freight passed down the River St. Clare last year, and let him remember what the result of this policy will be, our shipping industry will be crippled on the Atlantic ports, on the ports of the Great Lakes and on the Pacific coast. To-day Canada stands at the parting of the ways. For years we have spent our energies towards developing our markets and our tariff has been framed with that object in view, but just as everything is going along smoothly, there comes the cry: we must trade with the United States, and not with Great Britain. It is proposed to dam the trade and commerce of Canada so that it will flow through American ports and channels, break up our commerce with the old land and divert our great trade which

flows east and west to north and south. There are few citizens of Canada, who are not affected adversely by this arrangement entered into by this government to sell our heritage and endanger our national existence. The Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs who made the agreement, after 14 long years of office without any apparent effort or change in the fiscal policy of the country, have at last found the opportunity to open the door to continental free trade. A tottering government in the United States has entered into an arrangement with a government tottering to its fall in Canada. I believe, Sir, that this is the first step towards the dismemberment of the British Empire. We possess a country so vast and so rich in grain producing and mineral wealth and so advantageously situated that of all the lands on the globe we offer the most favourable outlook of any nation. This land belongs not only to us, but to our children's children, and it is our duty to preserve it intact for their heritage.

We are building a nation and building it our own way and according to our ideals to-day but what of to-morrow?

Our neighbours to the south say: Come in with us, we will help you but you must build as we desire. We answer: Canada is not for sale—our laws are firm, yours are lax. Our marriage vows are sacred, yours are lax. We can control our trusts if our government will only go about it in the proper way while yours are running rampant. We were kicked out of the American market in 1866. Who will say that we cannot be kicked out in 1912? In 1867 we started a system of interprovincial trade, the development of our natural resources, the creation of home industries, and the disposal of our surplus products in the permanent market of Great Britain.

The government of that day opposed unrestricted reciprocity. They advocated national development, and opposed continentalism. They were right and time has proved it. The United States ignored us then, they are courting us to-day. In 1891 this country registered the course it would follow. This government registered its protest against reciprocity in 1897 when they came back from Washington. The power rests to-day with the United States to cancel this agreement, unrestricted reciprocity means free trade, free trade means direct taxation. Using the words of Sir John Macdonald in 1891: 'Shall we endanger our possession of the great heritage bequeathed to us by our forefathers, and submit ourselves to direct taxation, for the privilege of having our tariff fixed at Washington with a prospect of ultimately becoming a part of the American Union?

Canada is sure of her future, if she remain free, Canada has to-day a trade for her goods outside the United States, Canada has to-day a market for her goods outside the United States, Canada is independent of the United States, Canada would not be independent of United States if this treaty went into effect. Our infant industries have had a struggle and have survived without the United States tariff. In 1910 we sold the United States $100,000,000, they sold us $223,000,000. The Canadian tariff is 26 per cent; the United States tariff 42 per cent. This is a sample of Yankee fair trade. I am opposed to this arrangement because it is not consistent with the policy of conserving our natural resources. Are Winnipeg, Toronto, Vancouver, Montreal and other leading cities and towns throbbing with life and activity to be content, with the left over trade of the United States.

Quebec, Halifax and St. John cities which the Grand Trunk Pacific were to help will be sidetracked and the trade go and come through the United States. Why disrupt our general business conditions, disturb the activities of our cities, lessen the earning power of our trunk lines of railroads if we are to be a united people with common political ideals and aspirations? Let us throw out this measure.

As a people we are only emerging from childhood; let us leave well enough alone. As Canadians for Canada let us guard well the political destiny of our future.

There is no use offering amendments to the deal, any change would nullify the whole agreement. Canada by adopting this policy will bid a long farewell to her greatness, and as the handmaid of the American trusts, contribute the 51st Star to the flag which will control the continent. It is the work of little Canadians. I belong to a nation to-day that is full of hope and prospect. In a few weeks if this measure passes the future of this country will be fixed. The wealth of our forest are the heritage of our workingmen and capitalists alike.

The labour interests of our cities and towns are vitally affected. You send the raw material to United States to be finished instead of at home. Let us keep the raw products at home and employ our own men in preparing them for the market. Taft cannot wait. The United States government say 'Canada dig your ore, send it to us and we will refine and perfect it. Canada give up your raw materials, and we will finish them and export the finished product.'

If you pass this Bill you will lead us back to pre-confederation days when the eastern provinces traded with the eastern States, Ontario with New York and the western States and British Columbia traded with the States on the western coast. You have sold the salt men, meat men, the fruit men, the manufacturers, the financier, the railroad, the lake freighter, labour man and farmer. These men

live in Canada, they pay taxes, they are good citizens; they pay duty on almost everything they buy. The Yankee would take your last salmon, your last stick of timber, your last barrow of ore. Trade invariably follows the line of least resistance. The American tariff has been the means of developing our exports to the mother country. It has taken years of time and much money and energy to bring this trade to its present importance.

The great forests of our western provinces are open to exploitation, the Dominion government is in control of them and should guard them. If it is a good thing for Canada to send her natural products to United States why not send our pulp wood from Ontario and Quebec.

Surely our loyal Canadian people will not allow this agreement to become law without being given a chance to vote on it. This is the thin edge of the wedge. How can we as Canadians who have received all that we possess, all that we hold so dear, insult the country from which our fathers came. Great Britain for years has purchased all we had to offer and is willing to do so yet. We had no other market a few years ago, the German market was closed the United States market was closed and who knows how soon again it will be closed. Many of our forefathers left their homes and surroundings in the United States so they might live and die under the British flag. Others have taken up arms to protect their country against the Yankee invaders. We look to Great Britain for our support, for our defence. The Canadian people are loyal to the core. Let us stand to our guns and fight this deal with every energy we possess and forever end that Yankee cry, one flag, and that the Stars and Stripes, from central America to north pole.

On Motion of Mr. Paterson, House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 17, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DAMMING OF THE ST. LAWRENCE.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask a question with reference to the proposed Long Sault dam, and before doing so it is necessary that I should read a letter that I have received from Washington. The letter is as follows:

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Washington, February 13, 1911.

Dr. J. D. Reid, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Dr. Reid,—I am taking the liberty of writing you at length, advising you of the position I have taken in opposing the 'Long Sault Development Companies Bill,' now pending in both Houses here.

An investigation of the Bills pending in the interest of the Long Sault Development Company discloses the fact that the company is endeavouring to get legislation that will enable them to develop power south of the International boundary line entirely independent of and without the consent of the Canadian government. The original Malby Bill, introduced December 14, 1909, contained a provision that the authority thereby vested in the company would not be operative until the consent of the construction of the dams, canals and locks and other works of the proper authorities of the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada was obtained. This Bill was submitted to General O. H. Ernst, the chairman of the American section of the International Waterways Commission, who has devoted about six years to the consideration of this great International waterways, for his opinion. He, with the other members of the American section, joined in the opinion that the co-operation of the two governments was essential and necessary and recommended a section to be attached to the Malby Bill, for the purpose of accomplishing that result, reading as follows:

'This Act shall not become operative until the government of the Dominion of Canada shall signify to the Secretary of State of the United States its consent to the construction of such dam and other structures; provided, that if said consent be not given within two years from the date of this Act, then this Act shall be null and void.'

Notwithstanding this proposition of the original Malby Bill and this specific recommendation of the American section of the International Waterways Commission, the Bill finally reported by the Rivers and Harbours Committee and the Bill now pending in the Senate, both being identical—entirely omits any provision requiring the consent of the Dominion of Canada. It does contain a section which provides that the Long Sault Development Company shall be subject to the provisions of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain relative to boundary waters, proclaimed May 13, 1910.

An examination of the treaty discloses the interesting fact that article IV which relates to dams, is subject to approval in accordance with the provisions of article VIII. Article VIII provides that a majority of the commissioners shall have power to render a decision and further provides that in case the commission is equally divided separate reports are to be made on each side by the commission to their own agreement and in that case, the governments are to endeavour to agree. But it is obvious that if they do not agree no result is reached, the result of which is that, if dams proposed to be built by the Long Sault Development Company are not approved by a majority of the commission equally decides, that as far as the Interna-

tional Waterways Commission is concerned the situation of the company is not in the slightest degree changed, because the provisions of the treaty with reference to the approval of the commissioners will have been exhausted without any definite result.

The pending Bill evidently anticipated this situation, because it not only omits all provisions requiring the approval of the Dominion of Canada to the construction of the dams, but expressly provides that the company is 'authorized to construct, maintain and operate for navigation, water-power and other purposes for a period of ninety-nine years, a dam or dams in so much of the St. Lawrence river as lies south of the International boundary line between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada near Long Sault, Barnhart and Sheik Islands either independently or in connection with like works now erected or to be erected in so much of said river as lies north of said International boundary line.'

It discloses the specific and deliberate purpose of authorizing the Long Sault Development Company to build its dams south of the International boundary line without the consent or approval of the Dominion of Canada.

I strongly urge upon you to lay before parliament the above facts, and oblige,

Yours very truly,
J. WESLEY ALLISON.

I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he has any further information in connection with this matter. If the facts as contained in this letter are as he understands them to be with reference to the situation at Washington, and if he has instructed Ambassador Bryce to protest against the Bill now before the United States Senate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have heard only a part of the statement of Mr. Allison. For my part, I do not agree at all with some of his conclusions. We have made representations to the government at Washington and the correspondence will be brought down as soon as completed.

PELAGIC SEALING.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether the treaty now being negotiated with the United States regarding Pelagic Sealing will require to be ratified by this House before it goes into operation or whether it will take effect without the concurrence or assent of this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This treaty will take effect without the concurrence or assent of this House, but it is our intention to bring down the treaty as soon as received and if parliament desires to express any opinion upon it it may do so.

SUPPLY—CORRECTION OF 'HANSARD.'

FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I would like to call the attention of the House to an error that occurred in some of the figures I presented yesterday. In doing so I think it is right that I should say that I expect it is my own fault, because I turned my back literally, not figuratively, upon the 'Hansard' reporters when speaking. I was addressing my particular friends on this side of the House, and so I did not give the members of the 'Hansard' staff a fair opportunity of hearing what I was saying. The first is in reference to the product of Ontario farms in which I am made to say that it increased in two years $250,000,000. What I did say was that the annual product of Ontario farms now amounts to some $250,000,000. Then again there is an error in reference to the amount of American capital invested in Canada. I mentioned distinctly that there was $250,000,000 invested in Canadian industries by American manufacturers. In that connection, in the course of two or three sentences there are several errors. I will read what I said and as I have revised it now. Otherwise, as far as I have gone through the report it is satisfactory, but I have not got through it all yet. This is what I said:

Since 1868 we have doubled in population, we have enormous American industries planted in Canada representing $250,000,000, we have more than that number of millions of dollars capital wanting to come to Canada, and halted by reason of the attitude of the government at the present time. The area of Canada under cultivation is ten times what is was in 1868; banking capital is ten times what it was; deposits in the banks are nearly thirty times what they were; our railway mileage is about twelve times what it was; and the freightage is about twelve times what it was in 1868.

I hope it will not be said at any future time, if it should turn out that in the figures later on in the course of the report of my remarks yesterday there should be an error, that I adopt them because I do not refer to them now. As I have said, I have not had time to go over the whole of my speech yesterday and there may be errors later on, but these are important, and I desire to call the attention of the House to the correction.

DUTY ON FRUIT.

Mr. BURRELL. I have to-day received from Vernon, B. C., the following telegram which with permission of the House I shall read :

Vernon, B.C., Feb. 16.

Mr. Martin Burrell, M.P.,
Ottawa.

The humble petition of the ratepayers and residents of the district, municipality of Coldstream, Vernon, British Columbia. Whereas the Dominion government is about

to introduce a Bill providing for reciprocity with the United States of America on certain commodities under which are included fruit. And whereas the inhabitants of the said district municipality of Coldstream are dependent entirely on the fruit industry for their subsistence and the future prosperity of the district, we your petitioners desire to lay before the House of the Dominion parliament the views of the fruit growers of this district as hereunder set forward. Opinions may and do differ as to the relative merits of protection and free trade, but there can be no difference of opinion in the point that if protection is given at all it should be given equally to all interests according to the requirements. It seems to be accepted that manufacturers are entitled to protection especially during the early years of any industry. So far as need of protection to the building up of an industry is concerned fruit growing stands in much greater need of protection than any manufactory as must be plain on the face of it to any one conversant with the conditions of this particular industry.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman reading a telegram or a petition?

Mr. BURRELL. I am reading a telegram bearing on a matter of importance.

Mr. SPEAKER. The matter has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BURRELL. I was going to read this as a petition, but there are not a sufficient number of names on it for a petition.

Mr. SPEAKER. Petitions cannot be read in the House.

Mr. BURRELL. This is not a petition inasmuch as the technical conditions have not been complied with, there being only two signatures to it. I thought it was in order to bring it up on a motion to go into supply.

Mr. SPEAKER. The matter has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and cannot be discussed.

Mr. BURRELL. I am in the hands of the House, and I would like to have an opinion on it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no objection to allow the telegram being read, but the matter cannot be commented on now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think it is the intention of the hon. gentleman to discuss the matter.

Mr. BURRELL. I have no intention of discussing it ; I simply wish to read the telegram :

A manufactory can start production as soon as the plant is completed, an orchard after being laid out has to be tended for quite a number of years at a considerable outlay of capital before any return can be hoped for. The newer orchards of British Columbia planted in recent years and comprising an immense acreage are just now coming into bearing and the owners look to current conditions for marketing their fruit to advantage. No worse time as regards the fruit industry in this province could have been chosen to remove the duty on imported fruit. In ten years the fruit industry of British Columbia which is now in its infancy should be in a position to carry the battle of competition across the border having used the interval to build up its connections in the home market with the hope of the very moderate protection hitherto afforded. At the present time the home markets are mostly in the hands of the American producers who have the advantage of many years start, have organized thoroughly for the fight and have admittedly a distinct advantage over us in the cost of production. Even with the present protection it will be a long and uphill fight to get the home markets out of the hands of the Americans without it, the fight will be so long and uphill that many British Columbian producers will go under. Handicapped in this way in the home markets, our efforts to develop sufficiently to invade foreign territory are certain to fail for many years if not altogether. An enormous amount of capital has been invested in orchards in British Columbia during the past six years, the period during which the fruit industry has been strenuously promoted and the fruit growers looked to a continuance of the current conditions to enable them to realize interests in their invested capital out of which up to the present time it has been practically impossible to obtain any returns. We unanimously consider that the Dominion Houses of parliament should refuse to sanction the removal of the duty on fruit at the present time. There is no justice in sacrificing the interests of an infant industry for the benefit of a full grown industry which is in a very prosperous state under present conditions, and your petitioners are in duty bound will forever pray, &c.

JOHN KIDSON, Acting Reeve.
E. HENDERSON, Clerk.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. Yesterday a question was raised which could not be disposed of with reference to my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and a statement he made in the debate on the address. His statement referred to the Public Accounts, and as it was brought up yesterday and questioned, I thought that perhaps it was worth while to take the time of the House sufficiently long to rise to a solemn question of privilege, and just simply note the statement and make a remark with reference to it. The member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in his address on November 22, said in reference to me :

He would not let the militia go out to drill; he saved several hundreds of thousands of dollars in that. He would not grant any money for the necessary repairs to public works, which from year to year go down, so that a dollar spent this year in repairs

may save ten dollars next year; he saved hundreds of thousands of dollars there.

Now, this is the part I particularly refer to :

Contrary to the statute, as I maintain, he did not that year provide a sinking fund to meet the national debt, saving hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of dollars there. That is the way he squared his accounts for the election year.

Some days afterwards the member for South Wellington on November 24, had his attention called to his error in figures in reference to the trade of the country, and he corrected that error. I then rose and said :

Mr. FOSTER. While the hon. gentleman is in a correcting mood, I will call his attention to page 96 where he is reported as having said:

Contrary to the statutes, as I maintain, he——

That is, myself.

—did not that year provide a sinking fund to meet the national debt, saving hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of dollars there.

If my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) will look that up he will find that he is quite mistaken.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have no correction to make there.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Willing to let the statement go uncorrected.

Mr. GUTHRIE. So far as my knowledge goes, the statement is correct.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) does not follow the other side in refusing to correct even wrong statements.

I thought it was better to settle this question between the member for South Wellington and myself by getting a statement from the Finance Department, and I, therefore, put upon the Order Paper the following question :

What was the amount legally required to be invested in the sinking fund for the fiscal years 1895 and 1896 respectively, and what was the amount actually invested in each of these years?

The answer given by Mr. Paterson for the Finance Minister was:

In 1895, amount required and actually invested in sinking funds, $2,002,311.36; in 1896, amount required and actually invested in sinking funds, $2,005,287.52.

The answer of the Finance Department being of course that the amount required by the statute was so much, and that the amount invested was so much. I do not want to debate the question, but it is rather a grave charge against a Finance Minister to say that he tried to square his accounts by juggling with the sinking funds, a thing which under the statute he could not do; it would be an impossibility for him to do it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I noticed the question that was placed on the Order Paper some time in November in regard to this matter, and the reply that was given by the Finance Department. I thought that the matter would probably have been brought up then, and I had a memorandum in regard to it which I cannot place my hand upon at this moment. I am satisfied that the words which I used in my remarks, 'contrary to the statute', were not the appropriate words to describe what I meant. I find that the statute applies only to sinking funds on what are called guaranteed imperial loans. The sinking fund prescribed by statute is one per cent to be laid aside annually. There are other loans besides these, but I cannot give the amount of them now, nor the years, not having the memorandum. I can recollect one of them, of which the particulars were furnished in a return to this House—the loan of 1884 for $24,000,000. There was no statute, so far as I know, providing for a sinking fund on that loan; but it was the custom of the government to raise such a sinking fund. There were a great many other loans, negotiated by the late Conservative government. They finally decided for some reason best known to themselves to stop the sinking funds altogether on the new loans. They discontinued—through what I should have said instead of 'contrary to the statute', was unbusinesslike methods or some such words, which would probably have better described the situation, as the statute applied only to the loans guaranteed by the imperial government. Now, my statement, in that aspect, is not so far wrong, because I think the saving by not having a sinking fund on all the later loans made by the Conservative government was from $500,000 to $700,000 a vear. This government also did not provide a sinking fund for a long period, but latterly I believe they have provided a sinking fund with all their loans. If the matter has caused my hon. friend from North Toronto any anxiety, or if he thinks I intended to cast any reflection upon him personally, I take this opportunity of entirely disavowing any such idea or intention. I now find that there was no statute applicable to the later loans. It was a mere custom to provide sinking funds, which I think should not have been discontinued, as it certainly resulted in a great saving of money.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps I may be allowed a single word. There is a great difference between criticising a man for issuing a loan without providing for a sinking fund along with it, and criticising a Finance Minister for failing, contrary to the statutes, to invest a sinking fund, in order to cover up a deficit. There is not a single word more to be said on my part in that respect. My hon. friend would have oc-

cupied a more frank position if he had at once said that he was wrong in that, and had done me an injustice. I have not been bothering about it, but such things are just as well not said. Now he is wrong again. He acknowledges that the Finance Minister whom he supports issued loans without putting on sinking funds. Has he been, 'contrary to the statutes', juggling with funds and thereby covering up his deficits? My hon. friend then made the statement that the Finance Minister had since taken wiser advice and that with his later loans had sinking funds. He is mistaken there also.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have been so informed by the Finance Department.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I may advise my hon. friend to get good information before he makes charges of that kind. They are not nice.

Mr. FIELDING. Does that rule work the other way too?

Mr. FOSTER. I think my right hon. friend would be well advised if he would not try to buoy up and boost his supporters in bad practices.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. Several days ago we laid on the table a small sheet of supplementary estimates for the current year, containing several items of urgency to which I now call the attention of the committee. The items are four in number—one for Agriculture and Statistics, one for Immigration, one for the Naval Service, and one for the Department of Labour.

Exhibitions—further amount required, $100,000.

Mr. FISHER. I am asking for this vote because of our participation in a Festival of Empire which is to be held at the Crystal Palace in London during the coming summer in connection with the coronation ceremonies and the colonial conference. This festival originated last year, and it was expected to have been held last year, but not nearly on so large a scale, as is now proposed. In consequence, however, of the death of His Majesty King Edward it was stopped and was postponed until this year. In view of the coronation and the colonial conference, the gentlemen in charge of this exhibition and festival have greatly enlarged their plans, and are proposing a most imposing and splendid celebration at the historic grounds of the Crystal Palace at Sydenham. We were invited to take part in it, and I went over the matter in London last spring, and formed a plan for a worthy representation of Canada at such an important event. When I returned home I submitted it to my colleagues, and they approved of the suggestion that Canada could hardly be absent from such a festival, and that if we took part in it we should do so in a manner worthy of the country and worthy of the occasion. My exhibition commissioner has been proceeding with the plans. We had a little money to spend from the vote for this year, but we are now being dunned for obligations which we have incurred, and I am therefore obliged to ask for a prompt passage of this item to meet the obligations which we have already incurred or which will be incurred before the first of April next, when next year's appropriation will be available.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the minister propose to expend part of this money for which obligations have not already been incurred? The minister is now asking $100,000 and some money has already been expended.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, not voted specifically for this exhibition, but out of the general vote for exhibitions for the year.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister is using money voted for exhibitions for this Festival of Empire?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, it comes under the head of exhibitions. The vote of $120,000 is for exhibitions generally. Some of the money left over after we had done most of the work connected with the Brussels exhibition has been utilized for the preliminary work in connection with this exhibition. There are still some outstanding accounts in connection with the Brussels exhibition which have not been paid, as those rendering the accounts did not furnish sufficient information about them. Usually the accounts for different exhibitions overlap to a certain extent. As a matter of fact, during the current fiscal year we still have some accounts to pay for the Seattle exhibition of 1909-10.

Mr. FOSTER. What has the Brussels exhibition cost so far?

Mr. FISHER. About $125,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Apparently the minister has used money for another purpose than that for which it was voted, and has given the explanation that the government decided to take some of this money for another purpose other than that for which it was voted. If this policy were pursued there would be no limitation to the minister's power to spend money.

Mr. FISHER. This vote for exhibitions is like a vote for running the Intercolonial railway or anything of that kind. We mention exhibitions generally, and if there is a new exhibition after the vote is given we hold ourselves free, if in the

judgment of the government it is thought best to take part in it, to utilize to a certain extent that money.

Mr. BLAIN. Was this exhibition in contemplation when the vote was taken last year?

Mr. FISHER. The Festival of Empire of last year was under consideration and was provided for by this parliament. It was not proceeded with on account of the death of the King but was postponed until this coming summer. It is now being gone on with on a much larger scale. We intended taking part in the Festival of Empire last year and as a matter of fact spent $4,000 or $5,000 in preliminary work on it.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). If I understand it correctly, this $100,000 for which the minister is asking has all been spent, or will be spent, between now and March 31? How does it come that, though we voted $120,000 last session, he has exceeded that, and has spent $100,000 more?

Mr. FISHER. The money has not been spent. We have not had it to spend. We have incurred obligations, I confess. The festival of last year was a small affair as compared with what is now proposed. We have been invited to take part in an affair planned on a much more magnificent scale at the time of the coronation of His Majesty the King, and the holding of the Colonial Conference. We feel it necessary that Canada should be worthily represented, and so have arranged to spend this $100,000 before the end of this fiscal year. This was not contemplated when the vote of $120,000 was asked last session.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). How does the minister intend to spend $100,000 between now and the 31st March?

Mr. FISHER. I have here full details. As I explained to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), these accounts of exhibitions lap over one year upon another, because we are not able to close up the accounts within the year. The following items are included in this proposed expenditure of $100,000:

On account of freight charges from Seattle to Brussels	$12,166.67
On account of London Exhibition, 1911	5,420.22
On account of Edinburgh & Seattle.	60.00
Balance due T. Meadows on account of additional freight charges ..	12,167.67
Humphreys & Co., building at Brussels	6,746.17
Due on account sale of building at Shepherds Bush	661.50
New specimens for ensuing exhibition, London	9,000.00
Account due on London building for ensuing exhibition	24,333.33
Amount due to be paid on account of building, due 1st April	14.600.00
Various exhibits of agricultural products	3,500.00
Contributions to the general expenses of the Festival of Empire in view of rental of land which we usually pay at exhibitions	9,733.33
Total..	$98,394.89

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Practically every dollar of this $100,000 has been spent?

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact, none of it has been spent, for we have not the money.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). But debts have been contracted, so that practically the money has been spent before parliament has voted it. Might as well have no parliament and let the ministers spend what money they like, for they spend it and then call on their supporters to vote it.

Mr. FISHER. I explained all that. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that, if we had waited until this session opened to decide whether we should take part in this exhibition, it would be a physical impossibility to get ready for it. We had to assume the responsibility, and we ask parliament to support us in that action. I venture to think that hon. gentlemen opposite who have seen the work done on the part of Canada at these various exhibitions will uphold us in deciding to take part in this festival at the heart of the empire on the coming auspicious occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. It would help us more if you would tell us what you are going to do.

Mr. FISHER. That is what I am trying to do. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) interrupting, I shall be glad to go on. But my explanations are too satisfactory, ap-.ny explanations are too satisfactory, apparently—hon. gentlemen opposite do not want to hear them. I want to go on with the explanation—

Mr. FOSTER. Get at it.

Mr. FISHER. I am not going to let hon. gentlemen opposite have the pleasure of asking for explanations without giving them the answer. Does my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) wish me to read again these figures that I have given?

Mr. FOSTER. I understood that these were mere details of boxing and housing. But what is it going to be? Tell us so that we may know where we are.

Mr. FISHER. The Festival of Empire is an organization started on a comparatively small scale last year under the auspices of

a committee authorized by the King and under the patronage of the British government, and with Lord Plymouth as chairman. That organization planned a festival of empire for last year, in which the overseas dominions were invited to participate. They planned a great pageant of the whole empire under the management of Mr. Lascelles, well known in Canada as the successful director of the pageants in the Tercentenary at Quebec. While the arrangements otherwise were on a comparatively moderate scale, the pageant was a large one. This year they invited us to undertake exhibition work on a much larger scale, to do what we have done at many international exhibitions—put up a special Canadian building and display in it a thoroughly representative exhibit of Canada's resources, industries and institutions. That we propose to do. We intend to have a building on the grounds at the Crystal Palace, to take the form of a facsimile of these parliament buildings, to show to the world the parliament buildings of Canada as a part of our exhibit.

Mr. FOSTER. And have the members there?

Mr. FISHER. Those who will visit the place will be made very welcome, and I think it will be well that many of them should be there. I am glad to know that many members on the other side of the House who have seen Canada's exhibits at different foreign exhibitions have, in unstinted measure, praised the work done by the exhibition commissioner of Canada and his staff, and have recognized the value to the country of these exhibits of our progress and industry.

Mr. FOSTER. You are getting away off. Confine yourself to the Crystal Palace.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) need not be so captious. We know how jocular and facetious he can be, but I think that he might give serious attention to this important part of the country's business.

Mr. FOSTER. That's what we want—

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman wants it, then let him allow it. He is the first man in the House to resent any interruption himself when he is on his feet, and he should have a little more regard for the rights of others. Hon. members are aware that the exhibit at the Crystal Palace will be visited by hundreds and thousands, probably millions, of people, and that if Canada is going to be worthily represented, we must have a complete assortment of her products, her industries, and something to show her progress. This cannot be done without a considerable expenditure of money. I am willing to take the full responsibility of asking parliament to grant this money, because I have seen year after year the beneficial effects of these exhibits abroad, and am sure that the money will be expended to the advantage of Canada. I understand from my hon. friend that the other self-governing dominions are taking part, and are contributing; I hope so, because I am confident that Canada will be able to shine in comparison with any other part of the empire. That is one reason why after a good deal of hesitation and consultation with my exhibition commissioner, I authorized him to proceed to build, as nearly as possible, a facsimile of this central parliamentary block. We are all proud of our parliament buildings, as an example of Canadian architecture and construction. I think that everybody who comes to Ottawa is charmed with the appearance, with the magnificence and with the site of our parliament buildings here; and consequently, strangers who visit that festival in the Crystal Palace, will admire the Canadian building. The building will be so arranged as to contain the exhibits inside, these exhibits will be a modification and augmentation of what we have had at Brussels and other places, and will be renewed so as to be entirely up to date. We will transfer a considerable part of the exhibits from Brussels to the Crystal Palace, and others will be added.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the minister to say that the proposed building will be a facsimile of the parliament buildings. In that case, does he propose to have a restaurant installed in it, with all the other conveniences ?

Mr. FISHER. No, we never have a restaurant in our exhibition buildings; we leave that to other contractors, and people who get privileges to establish restaurants on the ground.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Will there be a bar ?

Mr. FISHER. No bar there. I may inform hon. gentlemen opposite, that if they go there to find a bar, they will have to go elsewhere. The grounds are laid out so as to form practically a circle occupied by the buildings. The grounds are very extensive, covering, I think, some seventy or eighty acres of land. They are to be laid out so that the buildings of the different parts of the empire will form a circle; and the proposition is to have a railroad track going around these grounds, and touching at the buildings of the different parts of the empire.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that be a mono rail ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister is going to make the illusion perfect with a facsimile

of this building, I would suggest that he make a mound or something like our parliament hill, and have some streams of water on each side to represent the rivers. It would not cost much, and it would make the illusion perfect.

Mr. FISHER. We have not the control of the grounds of the Crystal Palace; we have a certain space given us on which to erect our building, but the general commission will manage the laying out of the grounds in general; we have no control, outside of what is given to us. But I can assure the House that the building will be so placed as to give a good impression of its grandeur, and its architectural beauty. In connection with the festival, there will be a great pageant of the history of the empire, for which there is provision on the grounds of the Crystal Palace, and which is to be managed by Mr. Frank Lascelles, who managed the Tercentenary celebration of Quebec, and who has just returned from South Africa, where he managed the celebration in connection with the opening of the South African parliament. The whole exhibition, as I have said, is under the control of this commission of which Lord Plymouth is chairman, and is under the immediate patronage of the King and of the imperial government. I believe the occasion is one in which Canada ought to be well represented, and I think that from the skill and well known capacity of the exhibition commissioner for Canada, who has now had twelve years experience in this work, he will be able to make a good representation of Canada and one which will be a splendid advertisement for this country.

Mr. SPROULE. Usually when we vote money, the object is stated and the money is specifically voted for that purpose. In this case, before there is comparatively any money voted, the money has been expended, or contractd for, although it could not be regarded as a case of emergency requiring a Governor General's warrant. Yet the minister goes on and expends money or contracts to expend the money and commits the country to obligations, and then comes and asks parliament to vote the money. I could not understand at first the meaning of the term 'Festival of Empire,' or what was the nature of this great pageant about which the minister has spoken, whether it was a kind of mardi gras procession, or a great feast. We do not know whether the greater part of this money will be consumed in pageantry, and very little in the exhibition.

Mr. FISHER. We make no payment for pageantry at all, except one payment of £2,000 to the general expenses of the whole festival, and which takes the place of a rental for the grounds. We get the ground free for our building, and we pay £2,000 for general expenses.

Mr. SPROULE. That is $10,000 for the grounds. Now, there is another feature of this case, it is something which must have been foreseen, therefore it should have been provided for, by a vote, instead of by Governor Generals warrants. The minister admits in his own explanation that it was not a thing that could not be foreseen. Therefore, it ought to have been provided for, and if it was not provided for I respectfully submit that there was no justification for spending the money and therefore radically wrong. The minister says that we have from year to year voted money for exhibitions. This, according to his own showing, is not an exhibition ; it is a festival, a pageant, a show, but I presume that a few exhibition attachments have been tacked on to give it the semblance of an exhibition, so as to provide some justification for what would otherwise have been an improper and illegal expenditure of public money without that money having been voted. I am afraid that somebody is going to have a hippodrome as we have had them at Quebec, in South Africa, and in London. I am afraid this is a kind of a hippodrome business that the minister is trying to get up, and that he is going to carry on under the name of an exhibition. We are asked to vote $100,000, but whether it is worth the money I am not prepared to say. I would be better prepared to say if I saw it but I presume I will not have an opportunity of seeing it. It seems to me that we will get very little return from this expenditure of this money ; we keep a number of people who would otherwise be unemployed by the government, and who would, therefore, be obliged to resort to some other device for making a living. I do not think we are justified in going so far. We give these things high sounding names to make it appear that they are different from what they are. Is this a festival or is it not? If it is a festival it is not an exhibition. It is a mere pageant, it is not an exhibition, where there is likely to be a large number of people gathered together, but it is going to be given the semblance of an exhibition in order that we shall have some justification for the expenditure of this money. I think it is rather that than the usual expenditure of public money upon an exhibition where people will be benefited by what they see, and where their attention will be likely to be attracted to Canada and her industries. If I am correct we have an exhibition going in London all the time at which there are exhibits from all portions of the empire. Do we require a half a dozen of them, or is

this an addition to that, or is it something different from it? It must be something different or otherwise we would hear something about it. But it seems to be another device to keep an army of the unemployed spending the country's money, making displays, or exhibitions or festivals, or gatherings, or pageants, or something of that kind for which we must pay a lot of money, and from which expenditure it is very questionable whether we are getting anything like an adequate return. It seems to me that we are not very likely to get a proper return for this $100,000.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman at all. I am sorry that he has not attended any of these foreign exhibitions. He tells me that he has not, and I can, therefore, forgive to a certain extent what he says. I have heard most appreciative words with reference to these exhibitions uttered by many people, but not by Liberals alone, but by many foreigners and by several hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I remember that the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) spoke in most glowing terms of the use to Canada of these foreign exhibitions.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like the minister to make a distinction. This is not a foreign exhibition, but a festival of empire. How many have been held, and what beneficial result has come from them?

Mr. FISHER. The work we propose doing there is exactly the same as that in connection with the Franco-British exhibition three years ago in London, the exhibition in Brussels last year, Milan a few years ago, and Dublin a few years before that. The work will be exactly the same. The festival of empire includes an exhibition from all the different parts of the empire, the wonderful resources, progress and industries of the empire. It is true that in addition to that there is this pageant that I spoke of. My hon. friend seems to think that is something in the nature of a circus. I do not know whether he saw the pageant at the Quebec Tercentenary, or if he is familiar with the work of Mr. Frank Lascelles the originator of these pageants whose reputation is world-wide. A pageant of this character is as far removed from the ordinary wandering show as the work of a great artist from that of an ordinary person, who knows nothing about such things. This will be an exhibition of the marvellous history of this empire and an incitement to the people of to-day to remember and to honour the achievements of their forefathers as represented in a most magnificent way, not by a lot of hirelings but by volunteers, many of them from the best families in the empire. I have had letters from people in Canada asking the privilege of taking part in the pageant at the Crystal Palace. Last year there were many applications when the question was first brought forward for the privilege of taking part in it, and I am informed that, as a matter of fact, there are some volunteers taking part in that pageant who are going to the expense of supplying their own dresses and everything connected with their appearance as well as spending their time in going there without our hiring or engaging a single individual. That was the case at the Tercentenary celebration at Quebec. I think I am within the mark when I say that there was not a hireling who appeared in that celebration at all ; so that my hon. friend in that respect is entirely wrong in his estimate of what is going to occur. He asks if this pageant is a festival or an exhibition. It is both combined in one, and it is to be upon the grounds of the Crystal Palace which is one of the best resorts in the neighbourhood of London ; celebrated the world over as a place of resort for people who wish to enjoy and instruct themselves and where we will have an opportunity of making a representation of the great historical events of our empire and will at the same time be able to present the fruits of the labours, industry, progress and enterprise of the to-day people of the empire. This is an opportunity that I do not think the people of Canada would like Canada to omit being present at, and I think we would be derelict in our duty if we did not see that Canada took advantage of it. Above all my hon. friend who has a high opinion of the value of our position in the empire, and of our connection without it—

Mr. BLAIN. Who will represent Canada? Will my hon. friend tell me if he is going over next summer himself?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think I shall, as a matter of fact. But it is a matter of no consequence because I will not appear in the pageant. I would not appear particularly in any capacity if I did go over. The people who will represent Canada in the pageant will be the people who volunteer to do so. My hon. friend may if he chooses, and I have no doubt that they will be very happy to put him in. Those who will represent Canada in the exhibition will be the exhibition staff and they will be so busy with their work that they will not have time to take part in the pageant. As for this not being an unforseen expense ; the pageant of empire was intended to have taken place last year and a vote was taken, but in consequence of the death of the King it was postponed, and the idea being renewed when parliament prorogued we had to decide whether we would take part in it or not without consulting parliament, be-

cause had we waited for parliament it would be too late to make the necessary preparations.

Mr. SPROULE. When was the money voted?

Mr. FISHER. Last session.

Mr. SPROULE. That would not lapse before the end of this year.

Mr. FISHER. The proposed pageant last year was to be a comparatively very small affair and although the King expressed his approval it was not under his patronage. On this occasion, in view of the coronation and the colonial conference the scope of the coming pageant has been enormously increased and the vote of last year would nowhere nearly meet the necessary expenditure. We took $5,000 or $6,000 last year and spent $3,000, while now I am asking for $100,000 and I expect that the total cost will be between $250,000 and $300,000. Last year the intention was to have Canada have a little court in the Crystal Palace building, but this year we intend to erect a great building on the grounds and to show our products as we have been in the habit of doing at great international exhibitions. I venture to say that never before has there been a better opportunity for advertising to the people of the world, and especially to our fellow subjects of the empire, the glories and the greatness and the progress of Canada.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The minister stated he would be glad if my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) would volunteer for the festival of empire. What class would he put him in? I hope not amongst the mules, because he is a chronic kicker from the minister's standpoint.

Mr. FISHER. I do not believe there will be any western bronchos in it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the minister does not send my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) there, he will be missing the best Canada produces. I notice amongst the expenditures for this festival of empire last year a charge of $40 for a map made by Joseph Aube, Ottawa, and $1.50 for a book, The Cradle of New France, written by A. G. Doughty. What is the explanation?

Mr. FISHER. I think the map was a map of Canada, and the book is a well known book by Dr. A. G. Doughty the Dominion archivist.

Mr. BLAIN. How will you select the products of Canada for exhibition purposes?

Mr. FISHER. The staff buys them as best they can.

Mr. BLAIN. What do they consist of?

Mr. FISHER. Everything we can find in Canada. We have a permanent exhibit of minerals which we are adding to all the time, and which was one of the most magnificent exhibits at Brussels last summer. We have a timber exhibit, agricultural exhibits, fruit exhibits, fish and animal exhibits.

Mr. LALOR. Does the minister think that an expenditure for an exhibition of the agricultural products of Canada will be necessary in England, if we are to secure the American market for all our Canadian produce?

Mr. FISHER. I have no doubt there will be an immense number of Americans at that exhibition, and they will be able to come and buy.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will our old friend William Hutchison be the commissioner?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am somewhat surprised to see how Mr. Hutchison figures in the Auditor General's Report, and it will be of great interest to the farmers of Canada to see how their money is being wasted in that direction. William Hutchison was commissioner at the Brussels exhibition at a salary of $250 per month for one part of the term and $375 per month for the other part. In addition he got a living allowance for 144 days at $12 a day, and in addition his fare and transportation and sundry expenses and cab hire and everything else was paid by the people of Canada. Mr. Hutchison was also at the Alaskan Yukon Pacific exhibition, and there he got a salary of $250 a month and a living allowance of $20 a day for 214 days in addition to his travelling expenses, cost of sleepers, transfers, and everything else. That is a most ridiculous allowance to give to an official who is paid a salary of $250 a month. I notice that for his services at the Pacific Yukon exhibition he was paid up to the 31st of October, 1909, and on the 1st of November his salary commenced at the Brussels exhibition at $250 a month and just a week later, certainly before he had time to get to Brussels from Seattle his salary was raised to $375 per month. I would like the minister to explain how he juggled in order to get our friend William Hutchison from Seattle to Brussels inside of a week.

Mr. FISHER. The exhibition branch and its work go on all the year around. It is true, when one exhibition closes another may not be officially opened for a few months; but the work of the commissioner and of his staff is just as arduous outside of exhibition times as in exhibition times —in fact, more so, for at such times they have to take down, pack and unpack all their exhibits, and see to their shipment. As a matter of fact, I know that Mr.

Hutchison hurried from Seattle, spent only two or three days here to talk over matters, and had only a few days in Brussels to get ready for the opening of the exhibition there. I am glad to know that he was so successful that the Canadian pavilion was the only one ready on the day of the official opening. My hon. friend speaks of Mr. Hutchison's pay. I can only say that he is inadequately paid for the service he has done for the Dominion of Canada. Mr. Hutchison seems to have a perfect genius for exhibition work. He has been permanent exhibition commissioner for Canada for over eleven years, and has attended eleven international exhibitions, and he has been honoured for the work he has done by the authorities of most of these exhibitions. He has been praised, and his work has been copied by commissioners from other countries. I had an evidence of that last spring in Brussels, where I spent a few days just after the opening of the exhibition. I met a number of the foreign commissioners. I met, also, the members of the English commission, one and all of them praised without stint the work of the Canadian commissioner and the results of his work in exhibiting Canadian products, telling me that they had derived the greatest assistance possible in regard to showing their own products from the advice which Mr. Hutchison had been able to give them. With regard to Mr. Hutchison's pay, I would say that for a number of years we paid him at the rate of $3,000 a year, and during the exhibition time we made him an allowance of $20 a day. This sounds a little high, but any one who knows exhibition work knows that there is hardly a day during the exhibition when he does not have visitors whom he has to entertain more or less.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That is to cover his wine account?

Mr. FISHER. It is to cover all his expenses.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Surely my hon. friend does not approve of a wine account?

Mr. FISHER. It includes whatever Mr. Hutchison has to get to entertain his guests. Mr. Hutchison, however, felt a little hurt at some criticisms which were made in the House last year, or the year before, and he asked me to reduce his allowance. I increased his salary, but decreased his allowance, with the result that he got several hundred dollars a year less than he had been getting before. I did that at his own request, not to save the country any money, and not to make any change from my own point of view, as I did not think that Mr. Hutchison was getting too much for the services he was rendering, or the expenses to which he was put.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. LALOR. I desire to express my appreciation of Mr. Hutchison's services to Canada. I have had the pleasure of attending some of the exhibitions under his management, and I have found him most courteous, obliging and painstaking towards Canadian visitors. I have had more than one experience of that kind. I believe Mr. Hutchison is a most efficient officer, and I do not believe he is overpaid. I think Canada may well be proud of Mr. Hutchison as her head official at these exhibitions. Any Canadian who visits them, whoever he may be, will receive from him most gentlemanly and courteous treatment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not by any means finding fault with the amount paid to Mr. Hutchison. I am finding fault with the method of bookkeeping. I do not think it is right that the onus of spending $20 a day of the people's money should be laid upon a public servant. If he is not paid properly, I think it is up to the department to give him an adequate recompense for the work he is doing. To the average farmer $20 a day for spending money appears to be a very large amount. Twenty cents a day, in my country, is considered a fair amount.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, no.

Mr. SPROULE. What amuses me is the hon. minister's description of his employees. Whether a man is a horticulturist, a botanist, an exhibition commissioner, or anything else, he is the one man par excellence for that particular job. You would imagine they were all heaven-born and government appointed.

Mr. FISHER. No, Canadian-born.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister describes every selection he has made in the superlative degree. Every one of his officials seems to have combined within him all the excellencies that it is possible to combine within the same amount of human hide. Each one seems to have been born for his particular position, whether to manage a festival of empire, an exhibition, a piggery, or a chicken hatchery. I am glad to know that they are all such excellent men, but the results, I am afraid, do not always prove it. When you pay four men $5,000 a year for looking after a few poultry, and get a return of only a few hundred dollars, there is something wrong either with the man or with the hens. I notice that all these things are very much like the widow's cruse of oil, or the expenditure on the Transcontinental railway: they look small at first, but they seem to grow as time goes on. We are never given, at the beginning, any approximate idea of what the whole expenditure is going to be. I think it would be well, when these matters

are submitted to parliament, that we should be given some approximate idea of what they are going to cost, and what we are likely to receive in return, before we commit ourselves to an expenditure, the end of which we do not know. I am not saying anything about Mr. Hutchison; I have not attended any of the exhibitions at which he was Canadian commissioner. He may be the best man in the world for that position, or he may be a commonplace man. Eleven years ago Mr. Hutchison was employed for one exhibition, but the department have been able to keep him engaged at other exhibitions each succeeding year up to the present. We are always told that the expense of these exhibiting at these exhibitions will be slight, and the results will be something wonderful, but as time goes on they do not pan out exactly as they were represented to us.

Mr. FISHER. I have to take exception to my hon. friend's statement. I said a year and a half ago when the Brussels exhibition was started that it would cost between $125,000 and $150,000. It is costing between $125,000 and $130,000. I said this afternoon that the Festival of Empire would cost at least $250,000. I venture to say it will not cost more than $275,000.

Mr. SPROULE. When the minister got the first appropriation he represented that it was a comparatively small affair and would not be very expensive.

Mr. FISHER. I have explained repeatedly the reason for the change, which is not only justifiable but necessary. I think it will be money well expended and my hon. friends and gentlemen with him would be amongst the first to criticise the government if they did not take part in the Festival.

Mr. SPROULE. Oh, no, I will exonerate the minister.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the agricultural exhibits be similar to those at the Alaska-Yukon exhibition.

Mr. FISHER. To a great extent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is it intended to send many back-benchers supporting the government over to these exhibitions?

Mr. FISHER. We never send members of parliament to exhibitions.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I see in the accounts of last year eight cases of dummies at $8.64. I was wondering if these would be supporters of the government.

Mr. FISHER. We do not have any dummies on this side. Silence is sometimes golden.

Mr. BRADBURY. I had the pleasure of attending the Brussels exhibition and I was surprised when I heard the statement of the salary paid to Col. Hutchison, $300 a month. I do not believe he is sufficiently paid for the work he is doing. The $20 a day, I understand, is for entertaining.

Mr. FISHER. At Brussels he was getting only $12 a day.

Mr. BRADBURY. It was not enough. I want to be fair. I believe that Mr. Hutchison is doing good work and the Canadian exhibit was a credit to him. I think there should be a fair allowance made to any man occupying such a position, and the country would be well advised in paying him a reasonable salary. I do not consider $300 or $400 a month is a fair salary for the work he is accomplishing; I would be willing to see him get $500 a month. Something should be done so that we would know exactly what was being spent in connection with the work. The minister might fix a salary which would include all other expenditures. I spent two days at the exhibition and received from Col. Hutchison all the courtesy that any one could expect. He was very kind in showing me around the exhibition and he extended to me the courtesy which he would extend to any man who went to that exhibition.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not agree with the hon. member who has just spoken. Col. Hutchison, in addition to his salary, gets $20 a day, so he is drawing about $10,000 a year for salary and expenses. He is getting more than the minister presiding over his department. He must be worth more than the minister himself.

Mr. FISHER. Possibly he is.

Mr REID (Grenville). Then he should take your position and you should take his, because the best man should be Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. A man may be a first-class commissioner and not be able to do something else. Col. Hutchison is commissioner for exhibitions, and he is unexcelled.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When he went to the old country he had never been in charge of an exhibition.

Mr. FISHER. He had been in charge of the Central Canada Exhibition for years.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Running a small fair is nothing compared with running these exhibitions. There is no doubt the position was given to Mr. Hutchison because he was a defeated member of this House.

Mr. FISHER. There is every doubt and that is not the fact. I had the appointing of Mr. Hutchison, and he was appointed to go to Buffalo because he has had experience in exhibition work and had been

the manager of the Central Canada exhibition for years and had brought it up from being a very small and unimportant exhibition to be a very good one; it was that which attracted my attention to him. He was not a defeated candidate because he did not run and was not defeated; but his having been in the House before had nothing whatever to do with his appointment.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The running of a small exhibition in Ottawa does not seem to me to be any great qualification for the position of manager of these large exhibitions.

Mr. FISHER. His success shows that it was.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister could have got men who had had experience

Mr. FISHER. Not so good as Col. Hutchison.

Mr. REID (Grenville) He could have got them for $10,000 a year to pay their expenses and entertain more than Col. Hutchison does. As to Col. Hutchison being a defeated candidate, I may have been wrong in that statement, but at the same time he was willing and did try to get the convention in Ottawa and could not.

Mr. FISHER. Again my hon. friend was wrong because he refused to go before the convention.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Because he knew he could not win. The minister knows that his being in Ottawa and a former member of the House supporting the government was the reason for his appointment.

Mr. FISHER. That is not the reason he got the appointment.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister can have his opinion; I have mine.

Mr. FISHER. I know, but my hon. friend does not know.

Mr. REID. (Grenville). No doubt. these exhibitions have done good. But what has the minister done for the farmer ? Take, for instance, the farmers of eastern Ontario, in which district I live, the minister has an experimental farm here at Ottawa, but no person sees it, except a few who go out on excursions; no information is sent throughout the country, as to what is going on there. I have tried, and I cannot find any way in which the minister is helping the farmers of eastern Ontario. He tells us: See the way dairying in eastern Ontario has improved. Why, that is the work of the local government, which sends its instructors and inspectors to the cheese factories and creameries. The minister does not spend as much in a year in promoting the interests of the farmers as does the Department of Agriculture of the single province of Ontario. It is true, about a million is spent every year through the minister's department, but it goes for quarantine, for exhibitions and other things that do not help the farmer. It seems to me the minister has lost his influence in the cabinet. When this government took office, the expenditure of the Militia Department and the Agriculture Department were about equal; now, the Minister of Militia gets appropriations of about $15 for every $1 that the Minister of Agriculture gets for agriculture. Which of these, then, has influence in the government ? The Minister of Militia, of course.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, he has.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then, it is time that the farmers should demand that a man should be put at the head of this department, who will have influence and use it in the interest of agriculture. The first thing the minister (Mr. Fisher), knows, the Minister of Labour will be getting larger appropriations for the Labour Department than he gets for the Agriculture Department. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), smiles because since he came in, he has been able to grab more for his department, than the Minister of Agriculture, by ten to one. There is no department that has stood still so long as that of the Minister of Agriculture, and I want the farmers from the Atlantic to the Pacific to realize that. The minister gets a little more money for exhibitions and to pay men like Colonel Hutchison and other supporters of the government, money spent where the Public Accounts Committee cannot show up the graft that goes on because the people are on the other side of the Atlantic. So far as eastern Ontario is concerned, the minister has not done anything for the farmers for ten years. There are many ways in which he could help them, instead of lying idle.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid, Grenville), wants the farmers to know about these things. I am afraid he will have to bring further proof than his assertions about them.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). If the minister will refer to page D-12 of the Auditor General's Report, for 1909-10, under the heading Alaska-Yukon exhibition, he will find this item:

Fournier, Fournier Limited, St. Hyacinthe, P.Q.; Red Line Cocktails, 7 cases at $8, $56.

I desire an explanation of this item. Were these for the minister's own use, or were they for Mr. Hutchison to distribute among his friends ? Why these should be bought at St. Hyacinthe and exported to the Pacific coast, I do not understand, unless

it was, that the minister wanted to have really choice stuff for his own use.

Mr. FISHER. I am afraid I cannot answer that question, I did not use the cocktails, and did not know they were there. Why cocktails should have been bought at St. Hyacinthe, I do not know; I was not aware that it was a particularly favoured locality in that respect. I am afraid I am not a judge of cocktails myself.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). But the minister bought 7 cases at $8 a case.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that this was an exhibit, bought and sent to the Alaska-Yukon exhibition, to show what the province of Quebec could produce in these things.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT. I understand that these were goods bought in St. Hyacinthe for exhibition somewhere. They were bought for that purpose, because they were good goods; that is all. It is a compliment for the establishment for which I thank the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). These supplementary estimates, I believe, are what they are called. The item before us is for something that has been overlooked in the original estimates. There has been an oversight in connection with a certain other exhibition. I refer to the Selkirk Centennial. The minister (Mr. Fisher), will, no doubt, thank me for calling his attention to it. Over a year ago, a delegation of important business men from Winnipeg, came here during the sitting of the House, and I believe the Minister of Agriculture received that delegation, and there were with him the Prime Minister and some other members of the government. The delegates explained their resources and put their case before the government. And I believe that the Prime Minister told them that they had not resources enough, that they must dig up some more money, and when they had done so, he would see them again. They went back. They say that they complied with his requisition, and carried out his suggestion to the letter. Since that, they have had, I believe, two or three interviews with the government, and I think the minister (Mr. Fisher), himself knows the situation. We have had some statements from the press and from some of the delegations; whether they were authorized to make those statements or not, I do not know. But the people would hear with interest the position in which the matter now stands, and they would be very much pleased, I know, to see in subsequent estimates a substantial sum to carry out that exhibition.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg), understands that these supplementary estimates are for the current year, but the exhibition of which he speaks, is for the future. I think my hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), has stated to the House that the matter was one which was still under advisement and the government were not prepared yet to give a definite answer. I cannot say more at this time.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). As to these being estimates of the current year, I might remind the minister that, this being a world's exhibition, those concerned cannot wait until that year; they must have at least three years for preparation.

Mr. STAPLES. Do I understand from the minister (Mr. Fisher) that he is going to use his influence, whatever little help it may be, towards getting the necessary money to carry on that exhibition, or bring it about? I believe that if the Minister of Agriculture would get at his fellow members in the cabinet and work a little more diligently, he would be able to accomplish something. But since I came here I have observed that the Minister of Agriculture does not ring in and try to get the money that is due to the agriculturists of this country, in order that they may show to the world at large what Canada can do in that line. There is no doubt that our agriculturists have the greatest claim for government assistance of any class or profession in Canada, but judging from the figures in the estimates year after year, they are not getting their just portion of the expenditure. I am not criticising what other departments may spend, but I am criticising that minister for not expending on agriculture what we are entitled to. The farmers pay the greatest portion of the taxation, as is well known, and that is a consideration that should have more weight with the government than it appears to have. It is all right to put the blame on the Prime Minister. But this world's fair at Winnipeg is practically an agricultural undertaking. There is no doubt that it would do more for that western country in showing the world what it is capable of, and what all Canada is capable of, than anything else the minister could think of. But unless he rings in his fellow-members and tells them that he is going to give the agriculturists what they are entitled to, I do not see much hope of his succeeding. Now, I want the minister to make a promise that he will do his utmost towards getting such an appropriation for the Winnipeg centennial, as the delegates from that city have asked for, in order that they may proceed with the great undertaking. If the minister will promise to use his efforts with his colleagues, perhaps he will be able to accomplish something.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman does not encourage me to do that, because he

says I have no influence, and that I do not succeed with my colleagues.

Mr. STAPLES. I want you to rehabilitate yourself.

Mr. FISHER. I can only say that I have no doubt whatever that an expenditure of this kind on a world's exhibition in Winnipeg, or at some other central place in Canada, in the near future, would do this country a great deal of good.

Mr. STAPLES. Does not the minister think that Winnipeg is the best place?

Mr. FISHER. I am not sure, but I am inclined to think that Winnipeg would be the best place for such an exhibition, and I have no doubt that Canada could make such a display there as would attract a great deal of attention throughout the world.

Mr. BEST. It is not my intention to find any fault with this amount, but I want to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that the agriculturists of Canada are getting this year less than one million dollars from the government, and even one-tenth of that is going to this festival in England. I am not saying that is wrong, but I do say that it is a disgrace to Canada that less than one million dollars is expended for the benefit of this, the greatest industry in Canada. I do not think the farmers have a right to more than their share, nor do I think that they have been asking too much, but no man can honestly stand up in this House and say that the farmers are asking too much, when the fact is that less than one million dollars are expended on the agricultural industry, on the other hand. Now, I believe that if the minister tried to do his duty he could get more for this industry than he has been getting. It was a common saying among the farmers' delegation which came to Ottawa from the west, that this Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa was a disgrace to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. I heard many people say just the reverse.

Mr. BEST. I want to tell the minister, from a farmer's standpoint, that if the people in the county I represent could not produce better stock than he has on that farm, I would be ashamed of them. That is a fact, and I am not trying to make little of the farm, either. But I can honestly tell the minister that farmer after farmer that goes to that agricultural college says that it is a disgrace to this Dominion. I have seen for myself, as hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House have seen. and know well, that there are pigs kept there, I suppose for breeding purposes, who were born blind, and they are kept there as a disgrace to this Dominion. Now, the minister says that some people tell him that the dairy was well kept there. Now, the minister's own report of 1910 shows that the milk products of his dairy herd only amounted to 6,115 pounds. Now, there are herds in this Dominion that produce over 10,000 pounds. I say that this experimental farm, which should be the greatest and the best kept in the Dominion, makes a very poor showing, after it has been in existence for a quarter of a century, and still has a dairy herd the production of which is only a little more than half that of other herds in this Dominion. Now, I say that these are facts that cannot be got over. I find them in the minister's own report. I do not think it becomes a country such as Canada to occupy that position. I have been at that experimental farm myself twice during the last session, and once this session, and I say that the beef cattle there—I presume they are beef cattle, we know that there are only two purposes for which cattle are kept, one for dairy and the other for beef—and the beef cattle at the experimental farm, with the exception of a few that were imported, are a disgrace to any farm, let alone the experimental farm.

Mr. FISHER. Does my hon. friend refer to the shorthorn herds there?

Mr. BEST. All, except a few herds of shorthorns that were imported.

Mr. FISHER. There are no beef cattle kept there as beef cattle for breeding purposes at all; it is entirely a dairy herd.

Mr. BEST. Then the dairy herd is not paying very well.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think I shall have to interfere with this discussion, as the item before the committee is for an entirely different subject, that for an exhibition. If other branches of the Agricultural Department are to be opened up for discussion, it would take the committee too far away from the item before the chair.

Mr. BEST. I am quite willing to submit to your ruling. I simply wanted to say that when so large an amount of money is being taken out of the country, the farmers ought to receive more consideration, and I am of the opinion that part of that money should be spent at home for the benefit of the farmers. I really think that the farmers of this country are not getting their share.

Mr. FISHER. Probably before the end of the session, I shall bring down some more agricultural estimates, and I hope that hon. gentlemen will show their good faith in what they are saying now and support them.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I certainly shall.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). With reference to the Winnipeg exhibition, I would call the minister's attention to the fact that it is very important, not that they should get this money at once, but that they should know the decision of the government at the earliest date possible because there would be an excellent opportunity at this London pageant of advertising the date.

Mr. FISHER. I sympathize with what my hon. friend says, and I shall press upon the Prime Minister the decision of the question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In reply to what was said by my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) the minister made the statement that he would have to show that the farmers of Canada were not getting what they should get from his department. I would like to quote from the Auditor General's Report, to show what is being expended by my hon. friend's department for the farmers of Canada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I take it from the announcement the hon. gentleman makes that he proposes to enter generally upon a discussion of the expenditure of the Department. This item is particularly for exhibitions. I do not wish to draw the line too stringently, yet, from the announcement he makes himself, I think it my duty to point out that unless the argument can be applied to exhibitions somewhat rapidly I will have to rule against him.

Mr. SPROULE. May I most respectfully submit that when we are dealing with an item of expenditure for exhibitions which is under control of the Department of Agriculture we are within our rights in showing whether there is too much or too little spent in that department, and whether the department is well or properly conducted. I take it that the exhibits which the minister is going to make will be of grain and fruit which will be supplied largely from the farm. That brings us back to the farm, and we might very well discuss the question as to whether the produce that he is likely to supply from there will be likely to constitute a creditable exhibit or not. It seems that the connection is very close between them, and I think it is very hard to draw a line and say you shall not refer to the general question of agriculture in dealing with this item or any other item in connection with the expenditure of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that the line of relevancy is not easily drawn and that cognate subjects may be referred to. It depends very largely upon whether the argument touching cognate matters is applied in any way to this item of exhibitions. The hon. gentleman to whom I spoke a moment ago desired to discuss a particular question without any reference to exhibitions, and if the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) desires to speak in the same way I shall have to rule against him. But if his argument can be applied to exhibitions, then an argument arising out of the Department of Agriculture would be applicable. It was his announcement of what he proposed to do that suggested to me that I should warn him that the argument should be applied to exhibitions.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have always recognized the merits of the Chairman, but did not know until now that he was a mind reader. I was going to bring forward these facts to show that it would be more desirable if the Department of Agriculture should make expenditures, that were more pertinent to agriculture and to suggest that the money would bring better returns to the farmers than by expending it in the way suggested by this vote.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think that such an argument would be applicable.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, taking it up from the point at which I was interrupted, I was going to point out, in answer to the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture, that this department was not spending as much money on the agricultural industry as it should spend. Looking up the Auditor General's Report of this year I see that a total expenditure of something less than a million and a half is charged to the Department of Agriculture. A million and a half, were it spent for the farmers and in the interest of the farmers in propagating good seed and in educating them in proper and up to date methods of farming, would be a very respectable sum, but in looking over the accounts I find that a very small proportion of it is spent in that way. For instance, the first two items I find are salaries and contingencies which amount to $351,000 and odd. I see that other items are charged up that should be in no way chargeable to that department as they have very little to do with the farmers, such as exhibitions, archives and patents, amounting to $221,000. Then, there are fumigation $4,900, Seed Control Act, $48,200, health of animals, meat and canned foods, $110,000 making a total of $735,535 that cannot be justly charged to the farmers. Take Archives for instance; what interest have the farmers of Canada in the Archives? Then there is the Patent Record, $17,000. What interest is that to the farmers? Statistical Year Book, $6,000; Census and Statistics $11,000—I suppose we will have a much larger sum charged up to the farmers for that this year—Gold and Silver

Marking Act $2,000; how does that affect the farmers? Then we have Canadian exhibits and the Swine Industry Commission $8,242. While I approve of money being spent in that way for the farmers as an educative process, I think it would be better, judging by this very identical Auditor General's Report, to have an inquiry into that matter of the proper breeding of swine by certain men who are really competent because I see that after the Swine Commissioners were appointed a certain gentleman had to be appointed to further educate them in their duties, a man named C. C. Meyer of Ottawa, who is paid $100 for his services in instructing the commissioners.

Then, there is an expenditure of thousands of dollars for reindeer in the Canadian Labrador, which I cannot see are of much importance to the farmers of Canada. As a matter of fact out of the $1,492,000, considerably less than $500,000 has been expended for the benefit of the farmers. While I appreciate the value of the work in connection with exhibitions I think the money would be far better spent at home if applied to the improvement of agriculture in the northwest. The entire expenditure on agriculture in the west amounts to only a few thousand dollars on the experimental farms there. These experimental farms ought to be located in different parts of the four provinces of the west, because there we have a very big territory and an experiment that will prove useful in one locality is not applicable three or four hundred miles away under different climatic conditions, and different quality of soil. Anything the minister can do in the direction of improving agriculture in the west will have my ardent support, but when it comes to wasting money in this way I must object to it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As has been pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) not more than $383,000 of this large vote is actually expended in the interests of the farmers of Canada. That alone proves that the Minister of Agriculture is not devoting himself as he ought to the improvement and advancement of agriculture in this country. This government has now $130,000,000 a year to spend, and yet the Minister of Agriculture has not, since they came to power, been able to get the Minister of Finance to spend one dollar more in the interests of the farmers than was expended by the Conservative government when the annual revenue was only one-third of what it is to-day. It seems strange that the Minister of Militia can influence the Minister of Finance to give him ten dollars for every one dollar he gives to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) has referred to the establishment of experimental farms, and when the item for that purpose comes before the House I think he will see that I am meeting his views in that respect to a large extent. I ask for this vote because I think it is necessary, and justifiable in the interests of the farmers as well as the general interests of the country. I can assure the committee that if the $100,000 is granted it will not influence me to spend less in connection with agriculture in other directions.

Mr. BLAIN. I regard this as a very important expenditure, and I am sure that it will receive fair consideration from this side of the House. I recall a statement made in this House by the Minister of Agriculture not long ago, that he had never been refused any expenditure for the benefit of agriculture in Canada, which he had asked from parliament. My hon. friend acquiesces in that statement. Then, if there has not been enough expended in the interest of the farmers of Canada, it is because my hon. friend does not ask for more. That is the only conclusion we can come to, as he has never been refused.

Mr. FISHER. I am willing to acknowledge that.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the responsibility which my hon. friend from Dauphin has pointed out must rest with the minister.

Mr. FISHER. I accept all the responsibility for that.

Mr. BLAIN. Does he think that the expenditure for agriculture is sufficient or fair, compared with the expenditure on the militia of Canada?

Mr. FISHER. I am not going to criticise the expenditures of other departments. I have been able to obtain for agriculture all the money I have asked for. Just as soon as I can see that I can expend more in the interests of agriculture, I will not hesitate to ask for it, and I believe the House will vote it, as it has done in the past.

Mr. STAPLES. Can the minister tell the committee how much the committee that undertook the work of making arrangements for the exhibition at Winnipeg has expended so far?

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to say off-hand from memory.

Mr. STAPLES. I know that they have expended thousands of dollars and have gathered many valuable statistics. Has the minister looked them over or given any attention to the information these gentlemen have placed in his hands?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. Does he consider them of any material value ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. Does he purpose, in case that exhibition does not go on, to remunerate those men for the expenses they have made ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not even thought of any such suggestion.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the minister tell me whether or not he thinks they are entitled to it ?

Mr. FISHER. I shall have to consider it very carefully.

Technical Education Commission—further amount required, $10,000.

Mr. KING. This amount is required to enable the Commission on Technical Education to continue during the balance of the present fiscal year the work which it is now carrying on. At the last session of parliament $25,000 was voted towards the expenses of this commission. The commission has now been engaged for about seven months, and the appropriation made by parliament last year has been exhausted.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister explain how the money already voted has been expended ?

Mr. KING. The commission entered upon its duties about the 18th of July last, and it has held sittings in the different cities and towns of the Dominion, has visited industrial establishments and taken evidence under oath, from manufacturers, workingmen and educationalists as to the needs of the Dominion in the matter of industrial training and technical education. Up to the present time, the commission has visited 99 different localities, and has heard 1,466 witnesses. It commenced its work at the Atlantic coast and has followed a course which has taken it through the different provinces to the Pacific. The work of taking evidence in Canada will be completed with the session to be held in Ottawa next week, and then the commission will prepare an interim report summing up the findings so far as the needs of the Dominion are concerned. It will then go abroad and study the methods adopted in other countries to meet similiar needs. The members of the commission have travelled about 10,000 miles.

Mr. BLAIN. What is expected to be the total cost of this commission ?

Mr. KING. $25,000 has already been voted, $25,000 will be asked in the estimates for next year, and $10,000 is asked in this vote. I should think this would be enough to enable the commission to complete its inquiries. Something further may be necessary for the publication of the report.

Mr. BLAIN. When is it expected to be completed ?

Mr. KING. It is expected that the commission will return from abroad in the latter part of August, and I hope to have the report ready for presentation to parliament in the session to be held next fall.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do the commissioners travel together ?

Mr. KING. In the larger centres, like Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver, they have sat together, but in some cases they have divided, and two or three have visited one locality and two or three another.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was there any special reason for having such a large commission ?

Mr. KING. The reasons that governed the number of the commission were that the subject was a large one, and the Dominion a large dominion, and a great many interests had to be considered. The manufacturers had made strong representations as to the need of this commission, and it was thought well to have a representative of them. Similarly the labour men had made strong representations, and it was thought advisable to have them represented. The commission does not seem to be too large, considering the nature of its work.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will agriculture be taken up at all?

Mr KING. Yes; agriculture is one of the subjects, and my hon. friend will recognize in the name of Dr. Robertson, who is chairman of the commission, one of the leading agricultural authorities in the Dominion. With Dr. Robertson on the commission as chairman, I think the hon. member may feel quite sure that the agricultural interests will be very fully inquired into.

Mr. BLAIN. On whose recommendation was the manufacturers' representative selected?

Mr. KING. The manufacturers presented their veiws to the government on the subject through Mr. Murray, secretary of the Manufacturers' Association, who had made a very complete study, up to a certain point of the subject from the manufacturers' point of view. The government felt that they could not give greater satisfaction to the manufacturers than if they chose for the commission the man whom the manu-

facturers had themselves chosen to present to the government the needs of such a commission. That is why Mr. Murray was chosen.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that some of the provincial legislatures are also inquiring into this question. Is there any co-operation between this government, and, say, the government of Ontario?

Mr. KING. Yes; I am happy to say there has been the most cordial co-operation. In each instance the members of the commission, in visiting a province, have called first of all upon the Prime Minister and members of the government of the province being visited and explained that the federal government, before appointing the commission, had conferred with the premiers of the several provinces, and had secured from them their express wish that the federal government should take this step and co-operate with the provinces. In each case the provincial government, Dr. Robertson informs me, has done everything in its power to assist the federal commission in getting information. In Toronto, for instance, Sir James Whitney's government had appointed Mr. Seath a commissioner to inquire into certain phases of the work. Mr. Seath intimated to the chairman of the commission that he had been instructed by his government to give to the federal government's commission the benefit of his views in advance of submitting his report to his own government, should this be desired, he of course intimated that he would prefer giving his report to his own government. I mention that to show the hearty manner in which the provincial authorities have co-operated. Prof. Robertson assures me that in every province the provincial authorities have expedited the work of the commission and have used their good offices to see that the commission got the fullest information possible.

Mr. SPROULE. What salaries do the commissioners receive?

Mr. KING. Each commissioner receives $16 a day and his necessary travelling expenses. Out of the $16 the members of the commission pay their own hotel and incidental expenses, and they do not receive any remuneration for Sundays.

Mr. BLAIN. How was the labour representative elected

Mr. KING. In a manner similar to the selection of the representative of the manufacturing interests. The Trades and Labour Congress, for a number of years past, have been asking the government to appoint this commission and on each occasion they have designated Mr. Simpson, the vice-president of the Trades and Labour Council, to present their case to the government, and, in fact, the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress at one conference suggested that Mr. Simpson should be the person appointed to represent labour in the event of the request being granted, so the government simply took the nominee of the Trades and Labour Congress.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is Mr. Simpson's occupation?

Mr. KING. A reporter, I think, on the Toronto 'Star.' He seems to be especially well qualified for this position. He was a former vice-president of the Trades and Labour Congress, and was, as I have mentioned, nominated by that body as their representative. He was, at the time of his appointment, chairman of the Toronto Board of Education. He had been a member of a special committee on technical education of the Toronto board in 1906. He was a member of the Technical Education Commission which visited seven United States cities and recommended a curriculum for the new Toronto Technical School in 1909. He had presented the subject of technical education before the provincial government at different times.

Mr. BLAIN. Was he a candidate for parliamentary honours?

Mr. KING. No; I do not think so. I might say that so far as I know he is not a Liberal.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the members all the same?

Mr. KING. I cannot say what the politics of some of them are. The government sought to choose the best men.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume it would be one of the duties of the commission to outline a scheme by which technical schools may be established and maintained jointly with the provinces or independently of the provinces, and to suggest the curriculum of study.

Mr. KING. Yes; the commission is for the purpose of gathering information generally which will be compiled in the form of a report, and this report will then be available for distribution, and the provinces may take on this report such action as they think best. The scope of the commission would be best indicated by this communication, which the chairman of the commission has sent out in each locality visited. In each case it has been similar to the following.

Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education.

Ottawa, Ont., December 27, 1910.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to intimate to you that the Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education proposes to visit places according to the itinerary outlined in the sheet which is inclosed herewith.

The commission will give particular at-

tention to the manufacturing industries, to agriculture, to domestic occupations, to mining, to the fisheries, to the lumber interests, to the building trades, to the transportation services, as well as to the technical training required for commercial operations.

The commission will also make inquiry into, (a) the needs of existing industries in respect of labour, (b) the quality of labour which is available, and (c) the needs of such labour for industrial training and technical education.

The plan for the work of the commission at each place has ordinarily been as follows::— A local committee representing the mayor, the board of trade, the manufacturers' association, the educational institutions, the trades and labour interests, and any organization identified with training for women, makes provision for a place in which to hold the sessions of the commission. That is usually the council chamber or court house. The local committee also notifies persons who represent the various local interests and industries that they will be expected to appear before the commission to testify in regard to the present equipment and needs of the place and locality in respect to industrial training and technical education. The commission devotes part of each day to visiting the industrial establishments and educational institutions, and holds one or two sessions to receive testimony from those who desire to appear before it. The inquiry is ordinarily conducted by questions and answers, although those who appear before the commission may present information either by oral or written statement, bearing on the matters of the inquiry.

The commission will appreciate your co-operation in any manner which you may consider appropriate regarding any or all of these matters.

A reply to this might be addressed, care of Deputy Minister of Labour, Ottawa.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
JAS. W. ROBERTSON,
Chairman.

I think that communication covers largely what my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), asks.

Mr. SPROULE. Partly and partly not. What I had in mind was this: there are many people in the country who desire to acquire knowledge of the principles of certain arts or trades, not with a view to making them a permanent lifework, but with a view to equipping themselves better for that which they have chosen as their lifework. For instance, many a young man would like to gain knowledge with regard to mechanics, another with regard to agriculture. Will there be in these technical schools, branches where agriculture, mechanics, artisan's work, and other lines will be taught ?

Mr. KING. It is impossible for me to anticipate what the recommendations of the commission will be, but the scope of the commission, as I understand it, covers just the kind of thing my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), has suggested. I asked Dr. Robertson if he would give me a brief statement of what, up to the present, had come under the notice of the commission along the lines they were likely to report upon. Perhaps, if I read his statement, that will indicate to what extent the commission has in mind, making recommendation along the line my hon. friend has spoken of. This is Dr. Robertson's statement:

In general the testimony has been that provision for industrial training and technical education, in institutions and industrial establishments, exists in very few places and in them not to an extent adequate to the needs of the industrial population. The testimony indicates that some further opportunities are necessary to enable young men and women, from the ages of 14 to 18, to enter upon the various industrial and productive occupations with such educational qualifications that they may become industrially efficient.

I. In almost every place representative men have stated that urgent need exists for night classes for boys, after the age of 14, who have left the day schools.

II. The workmen have been practically unanimous in the expression of a desire for opportunities for such a measure of technical education as will enable them to acquire a knowledge of the principles which underlie the processes of their occupations, and also to give the more energetic and ambitious of them a fair working chance to prepare themselves for advancement and promotion.

III. There has been a unanimous expression of opinion that the several towns need some provision for industrial training and technical education which, in its general character, shall have an educational value equivalent to the high school or academy courses of study, but which shall be adapted specifically and directly to the needs of those who are to enter upon industrial occupations; and also to meet the case of those who would like to matriculate into, or enter upon the more advanced work of, technical colleges or agricultural colleges.

IV. Statements in respect of these four matters have come alike from the representatives of industries, from those who are responsible for educational work, and from the workingmen and women themselves. Not only are they all agreed as to the need for industrial training and technical education, but they have evinced enthusiastic keenness in offering co-operation, towards meeting the need in some adequate manner.

In other words, the commission has been endeavouring to ascertain from as many sources as possible, what are the needs in Canada, with respect to the different industries and industrial callings which employers and artisans are experiencing in the matter of a proper equipment for industrial efficiency. I think they have already got a good idea of the needs of Canada. The idea now, is that they should visit Europe and see how similar needs are being met in the different countries there. They will then return and prepare a report which will be of service in enabling the provinces of

this country to shape their educational work, so far as it relates to industrial training and technical education, along lines which will be of the greatest benefit to the classes in whose interest the work is undertaken.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this cover the field for female as well as male labour ?

Mr. KING. Yes. That is a phase to which the commission is devoting some special attention.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there any females on the commission ?

Mr. KING. No, but a number of female witnesses have testified before the commission.

Mr. SPROULE. It does seem to me, thinking it over, that it might have been the part of wisdom to have one member of the commission, at least, an intelligent lady, who had shown an aptitude for such educational work and had acquired a general knowledge of industrial life among the female population.

Mr. KING. I think there is much to be said in favour of that view.

Mr. SPROULE. If I followed the figures correctly, we have voted $25,000, and are voting $10,000 now, and I understand that $25,000 more is likely to be asked for in the——

Mr. KING. Main estimates of next year.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be $60,000 all told. Is that expected to be sufficient to do the work including the report?

Mr. KING. I answered a moment ago, that possibly the printing of the report will require some further appropriation. I am inclined to think it will take $25,000 to cover the expenses of the commission in Europe.

Fisheries Protection Service, $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been urged upon the department that better protection should be given to the fisheries on the British Columbia coast, and it has been considered advisable that we should charter a couple of vessels for that purpose. With this vote of $20,000 devoted to that special service it is expected that, with a couple of ships, we will be able to protect our fisheries adequately.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like some information with reference to the appointment of new fishery overseers throughout the province of Ontario, and perhaps on this item the minister would be able to give me some information. I notice some 37 new appointments have been made in the other provinces. I would like to know whether these men are intended to supplant the provincial overseers, or to implement their work.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am glad my hon. friend has mentioned the matter, and I will furnish him with the reason for that change. I may say that in British Columbia, the western provinces, and the maritime provinces the overseers are all appointed by the federal government; I do not think there are any other overseers in those provinces except those appointed by the federal government, though there may be a few appointed by the provincial authorities. It was found advisable that we should have in Ontario our own officers to carry out our own laws and regulations. Formerly, all the officers were appointed by the federal authorities. But by a judgment which was rendered in 1898, it was decided that the beds of the rivers above the tide were the property of the provinces, and that the provinces had some rights in the fisheries, one of which was to issue licenses for catching fish. As a result of that judgment, most of the officers were kept on by the provincial authorities; we had, however, to maintain a limited number of our own officers. It was found, however, that the provincial officers were looking chiefly after the execution of the provincial regulations concerning the issuing of licenses, they were not supposed to carry out the federal regulations. It seemed proper, therefore, that the regulations passed by the federal authorities should be carried out by federal officers. I am not making any reflection upon the way the fisheries had been protected by the provincial officers, but they were not of course appointed to carry out our regulations. There were numerous complaints that our regulations were not properly enforced, and facts were reported to the department which rendered it advisable for us to appoint our own officers to look after the protection of the fisheries in pursuance of our own regulations.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 74) respecting International Railway Company and International Traction Railways.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Fowke.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Conmee.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Railway Company. —Mr. German.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the minister regarding the appointment of some 37 fishery overseers in the province of Ontario—as to what their duties will be, why they are now appointed, seeing that no such officers were required before, and whether they are to take the place of the provincial overseers now discharging duties of a like character, or whether they are to implement their work by doing some other kind of work in connection with the protection of the fisheries.

Mr. BRODEUR. As I have already explained, since the judgment rendered by the Privy Council on the fisheries case, both the provincial and the Dominion authorities now exercise jurisdiction over the fisheries. It was decided by the Privy Council that the provinces, by virtue of their proprietary rights in the fisheries, are entitled to issue licenses and to make regulations as to the manner in which those licenses shall be issued. By the same judgment it was recognized that the regulation of the fisheries, generaly speaking, devolved upon the Dominion authorities. So that there is to-day a double jurisdiction in respect to the fisheries. The Dominion authorities are required to adopt the necessary laws and regulations for the protection and preservation of the fisheries, and we have been trying to exercise our powers according to our best judgment. We found that the regulations affecting the fisheries were not properly carried out. In Ontario there were only three officers to exercise supervision over the fisheries. The provincial officers are necessarily called upon to look after the observance of the laws and regulations passed by the provincial authorities concerning licenses. They have to see whether there are many people fishing without licenses, and, if so, to call upon them to cease fishing. But there are many regulations over which the provincial authorities have no jurisdiction, such as those relating to the size of the mesh, the gears with which fishing operations are carried on the close seasons, &c.

We had only three officers in Ontario who had general supervision. We could not expect the provincial authorities to enforce the observance of the Dominion laws and regulations. As there were complaints that our own regulations were not properly observed we thought of appointing a certain number of officers, whose duties would be to look after the carrying out of those laws and regulations. I have divided the province into districts and have appointed about 40 officers, who are going to supervise the fisheries in Ontario, as the officers are doing in the provinces I have mentioned. We have adopted a new principle of having a less number of officers who will be called upon to devote all their time to this work, and we expect that the salary they will receive from the government will enable them to discharge their duties in such a way that the complaints which existed before, as to the carrying out of our regulations, will not be heard in future. These officers will enforce the Dominion laws and regulations and will report violations of them to the Dominion authorities, and on the advice of the department, take the necessary action.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Dominion authorities do not propose to issue licenses to fishermen to fish, that will be left in the hands of the Ontario government ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The authority of the provincial government of Ontario in that respect, is absolute, we have no right to prevent them from issuing licenses. We have, however, the right ourselves, which was not denied to us by the judgment of the Privy Council, to issue licenses. We do not intend for a moment to exercise any such right.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I cannot understand why it is necessary to appoint a lot of these officers in Ontario. I assume that the minister wants to run his department as economically as possible and not to appoint unnecessary officers. Between Kingston and Brockville the Ontario government have three efficient fishery overseers. They have gasoline launches running up and down all the time to see that the laws are not violated, that nets are not used. The overseer in my county has a wagon load of nets that have been seized. Through the good work of these overseers there is now practically no illegal fishing there. It looks as if the minister is simply appointing these men to give them positions and that men will be paid as fishery overseers to do electioneering work. I defy the minister to show where these officials are going to be of any use. At Brockville there are now two officials appointed by the Ontario government, who are doing the work properly. There were complaints a few years ago that the Ontario government officials did not do good work and the reason was, that they paid men $50 a year and of course, the men could not be expected to do work of that kind for that salary.

Mr. PARDEE. What do they get now ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). They now get $300 for the season and a launch. The present Ontario government, when they

came in, saw fit to pay a reasonable salary. I suppose the minister will pay about $600, but the men he appoints, cannot do anything more than is done by the men now on the ground. How much territory will the man at Brockville cover ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He is to supervise the Thousand Island district from Lake Ontario down.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That would be from east of Kingston to perhaps Brockville and there are now three men in that district. In appointing these men did the minister consider that there is now an efficient staff of provincial government officials, and did he consult the Ontario government to see whether they had men doing the same work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We made our organization to cover Ontario with our own officers. My hon. friend says the service has been well performed by the Ontario officers. The department has no means of ascertaining such a point, for we never get any information from these men. If there have been violations, seizures and impositions of penalties, they have not been reported to us.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I take it that the minister receives the official records the Ontario government are supposed to reports, these official records, come to him?

Mr. BRODEUR. We get their annual report, that is all. The men appointed by the Ontario government are supposed to look after the enforcement of the laws of Ontario, and not to enforce the Dominion regulations. In fact, I do not think they have authority to do it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In the official record of the Ontario government there is a report of every fishery overseer, and I cannot believe but that the minister or his officials see that record showing the number of seizures and the fines imposed. If there are any laws of the Dominion which will assist in protecting the fisheries there is no doubt that the Ontario fishery overseer would use those laws in addition to the Ontario law. In making these appointments along the River St. Lawrence, the minister should have taken that into consideration. I think it does not show the best administration of the department that he has never even consulted the Ontario government on this subject. And now he has to admit to the House that he never even knew they issued an official report of the work done by the Ontario fisheries service. The appointment by the minister of a lot of officials under these conditions is simply squandering the people's money.

Mr. BARKER. As I spend, whenever I can, a month or more in Muskoka—where there used to be plenty of fishing, and still is some—I know a little on this subject. The Ontario government, for some years past, has been making very strenuous efforts to do something practical in the way of protecting the fisheries. They have, at the head of the department there, an old sportsman, Mr. Tinsley, a very strong and very good Liberal, appointed by the Conservative government of Ontario, to supervise this work. He is a most excellent man and was appointed simply because of his lifelong experience. On these lakes the Ontario government has officers who supervise everything connected with the fisheries from the point of view of the provincial law. What I fear from what I have seen of the minister's proposal is that we shall come to a realization of the old proverb, that too many cooks spoil the broth. With two governments, Dominion and provincial, acting independently and without communication, neither knowing what the other is doing, you will find the Dominion officers and Ontario officers getting into what is called a 'scrap' occasionally. Besides, you will find that when alleged violators of the law are summoned before the magistrate by the officers of one government, they will plead that they were acting in accordance with what was told them by the officer of the other government. So, between the two, we shall have no law, or worse than no law. In the interests of us all, not only those who live by fishing, but those who take pleasure in fishing, the fishery laws should be enforced. Both governments are striving for the same end. But the present method is very much as though you had two officers in the same custom house, each entitled to exercise his own judgment as to the duties to be charged upon goods. You cannot have effective work under such a method. I would beg the minister (Mr. Brodeur) to consider whether he should not send the chief officer of his department to meet the chief fishery officers of Ontario and Quebec, or ask the provincial officers to come here and discuss the possibility of agreeing upon a common system. If you act independently my judgment is you will ruin everything.

Mr. HENDERSON. In justice to the overseer in my county, because there is a very important fishing station adjacent to the county of Halton, I want to say that I have no recollection of hearing any complaints such as the minister speaks of in respect to the non-enforcement of the regulations. I am quite sure that the Ontario overseer there insists stringently upon the regulations being observed, the chief one of which has reference to the size of the

mesh, the other I suppose would be the close season. But I have not heard any complaints with regard to neglect of duty or of the non-observance of the regulations. The fishery overseer there considers it his duty to see that the regulations of this government are enforced as regards the size of the mesh, and the close season.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am glad the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has raised this important question of jurisdiction between the Dominion and the provincial authorities with regard to the fisheries. I may remark that before 1898 the fisheries were entirely administered by the federal authorities. Since then, as a result of a legal decision, the jurisdiction has been divided ; that is to say, everything pertaining to the issuing of licenses was taken over by the provincial authorities. Although the Dominion authorities had power to issue certain licenses, we have not exercised that power, but have left it entirely in the hands of the provincial authorities. However, I agree with my hon. friend that this dual jurisdiction is not at all satisfactory. I hope that some day the two authorities will be able to reach a settlement of this question of jurisdiction. I may say to my hon. friend that I have discussed the matter with a minister of the provincial government, and I think we are not very far apart. I think in view of the good relations which exist to-day between the two authorities as to the administration of the fisheries of Ontario, we may be able before long to reach a compromise, or a settlement, which will put an end to this dual jurisdiction. But it would be premature to discuss that question now in the House. It may be a question whether the fisheries should not be administered entirely by the Dominion authorities, and that we should pay a certain amount of money to the provincial authorities in lieu of the licenses. Now there are two important features of the case to keep in mind. In a short time we are going to have in force regulations on the Great Lakes, and the boundary waters between the United States and Canada, that is to say, upon the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence where that river forms the international boundary, the Niagara river, the Detroit river, the St. Clair river, and the St. Mary's river. The treaty between the two countries which has been laid before the House provides that regulations shall be made by two commissioners, one appointed by this government and one appointed by the United States government. Those regulations have been framed and have been laid before the House, and in a very short time, perhaps, the proclamation will be issued by the two governments declaring that these regulations shall govern the fisheries on the Great Lakes and the boundary rivers. In such a case, as my hon. friend from Hamilton knows, the treaty will have to be enforced by the Dominion authorities, because there is a special provision in the British North America Act to the effect that laws which have to be passed in execution of treaties must be enforced by the Dominion authorities. It will, therefore, become our duty when these regulations are passed to see that they are enforced on the lakes and rivers I have just mentioned. Perhaps we could reach a settlement on this basis : That we should assume the protection of the fisheries on the Great Lakes, while the provincial authorities took over the protection of the inland fisheries and their regulations ; that of course, would require an amendment to the British North America Act. But I think that every effort should be made to reach a settlement of some kind, because this divided jurisdiction, even with the best intentions in the world on both sides, leads to some conflict. Take the question of the fish hatcheries for example. The hatcheries which exist in the province of Ontario have all been built by this government, the Ontario government has no hatcheries.

Mr. HENDERSON. There are private hatcheries.

Mr. BRODEUR. I mean the provincial government has none.

Mr. BARKER. I am not so sure that the hon. gentleman is correct. They send up large quantities of fry.

Mr. BRODEUR. There may be a few hatcheries controlled by the provincial government, but the federal government has built practically the whole of them, and maintains them. When the eggs become ripe, and are hatched, the fry might be considered to a certain extent as the property of the provincial authorities. Therefore, we are spending money for the artificial propagation of fish which becomes the property of the province, and for which they issue licenses. Well, many people say : Why should you go on and build more hatcheries? Why do you not make an agreement with the provincial authorities by which at least you may get a share of the money which comes from the licenses? Remember that all the revenue which comes out of the fisheries goes into the provincial treasury and the Dominion treasury gets nothing. This is evidently an unjust situation, and the sooner we reach an agreement in that respect the better it will be for all parties concerned. My hon. friend spoke about the absence of relations between the officers and the department. I may say that so far as I am concerned, I have had several opportunities to meet one of the prin-

cipal officials of the provincial government, we have been often in communication discussing questions of general interest, both by correspondence and otherwise. Besides, the officers of the department are in constant communication with the officer whose name has been given by my hon. friend. Coming to the question of the observance of our regulations, it has been alleged that there has been a violation of them. If so it cannot be wondered at. Regulations are, in the ordinary nature of things very often violated. I do not know if that is the case, but no report was made to us by the provincial authorities or their officers that there had been violations or that penalties had been imposed. The hon. member for Grenville has referred to the fact that in the report issued by the provincial government it is stated that a numbe of penalties have been imposed. We have their report, and we have noted its contents but there is nothing in the report which says that these penalties have been recovered for violations of our own regulations. They must have been violations of the provincial regulations concerning the issuing of licenses. If they had been violations of our regulations concerning gears, size of mesh, or close season they would have been reported to us.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But they do not issue any licenses at all on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but generally speaking.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But you spoke of complaints in so far as the St. Lawrence is concerned. I say that they do not issue any licenses at all.

Mr. BRODEUR. I speak generally of Ontario, I do not speak particularly of the St. Lawrence, because I know that they do not issue any licenses there. If there have been some violations of the close season they should have been reported to us. If penalties have been imposed and money has been collected as a result of these violations not only should the violation have been reported to us but the money itself should have been returned to us.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It has reference to the close season established by the Ontario government in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the provincial authorities have no right to make any regulations as to close seasons. If they make regulations they are entirely ultra vires. They would be against the law because the right to regulate the fisheries belongs exclusively to this parliament. But, they have the right to issue licenses and they may make regulations in connection with the issuing of licenses. But, they would have no right to determine any close season different from the one which had been determined by this government. A similar case was brought up in one of the provinces and it was decided by the Superior Court that the province had no right to make any close season. I do not know but that the case is now before the Privy Council.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to understand the situation in the St. Lawrence. The minister states that the Ontario government have no right to make any close season unless it is in connection with the issuing of licenses. I suppose that their law is the same in so far as the close season is concerned as that of the Dominion. If they established a regulation in so far as close seasons are concerned, I suppose it would apply to licenses only. Is that how I am to understand it?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Dominion parliament and the Governor in Council have the right to make regulations as to close seasons. The provincial government cannot do it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I understand there are regulations now of the Ontario government under which there are close seasons.

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understand that on the St. Lawrence——

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend will permit me, let us take the season for bass for instance; the close season or the open season is determined by a regulation passed by the Dominion authorities here, whether by Act of parliament or by order in council. The right to issue permits for the catching of bass may be exercised by the provincial authorities and licenses may be issued for the open season which is provided by our own regulations.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I know that the fishery overseers appointed by the provincial government have printed instructions about the close seasons when bass and other fish cannot be caught. If the minister states that close seasons cannot be established by the Ontario government then they must be acting under the laws of the Dominion government and the Ontario government may have conveyed the instructions of the Dominion government to these overseers, by making their licenses conform with the regulations of the Dominion government. As these three overseers on the St. Lawrence are carrying out the regulations as to close seasons, as they are doing the work faithfully, constantly running up and down the river, and as no licenses are issued at all at the present time, I would like to know what there is for another man to do.

Mr. BRODEUR. The provincial authorities may have their own officers to carry out the regulations which they have the right to make with regard to the licenses themselves. They have a right to see whether a person is fishing with or without a license or, it may be, to make some further regulation in connection with the issuing of licenses, but as to general regulations with regard to gears, close seasons, open seasons, &c., there is only one authority and it is the Dominion authority. The law says that these regulations have to be enforced by the fishery officers appointed under this Act. If these officers appointed by the Ontario government have undertaken to carry out these laws they may find that they have not the right to do it; in fact, they do not undertake to do it because they do not report to us any violations of their own regulations. Will not my hon. friend admit that in that case it is very much better that we should have our men to report to us all the information with regard to the fisheries? Should we require to change the regulations concerning the fishing season these three officers do not travel the country enough to be able to inform us as to local conditions which it is absolutely necessary we should be aware of. For instance, the size of the mesh is a very important matter and we must have men on the spot to report to us as to that and other such matters of detail.

Mr. BARKER. I admit that the Minister of Marine like the provincial minister, is desirous of carrying out the law for the general good, but where we have the admitted difficulty of a dual authority surely it is the duty of the governments to see whether or not, in the public interest, they can agree upon a common ground. If the minister is going to appoint a lot of officers to see that Dominion rights are vindicated and the provinces are actuated by a similar spirit the result is that you have thrust upon the Dominion, as upon the provinces, a host of officials. In two years you find, perhaps that the people condemn the whole thing and force the Dominion and the provinces to agree upon a uniform system, and then you have to pension your officials and you are thus mortgaging the country to a considerable extent. Why should not the federal Department of Fisheries agree with the representative officers of the province upon a common mode of work. No province in this Dominion is more anxious for the preservation of the fish than the province of Ontario. They have spent large sums from year to year and they are prepared to expend still more towards that end. But if the province should know that there is a big sum of money per annum paid out by the Dominion to overlap their work, instead of good, mischief will be done. I cannot see why in a matter of common interest the federal officials cannot sit down with the provincial officials like business men and agree upon what is right for all. You are standing apart holding each other at arms length, each insisting on its right, and that means that somebody suffers between the two. There are millions of dollars brought into Ontario every year by families who come from the United States to the Muskoka lakes, the Thousand islands and Georgian bay, and who fancy they will have some fishing. The cultivation of that business is of enormous value. On the Muskoka lakes I suppose $1,000,000 have been expended by Americans in erecting dwellings; they sit on the wharfs and if they catch one fish a day they are content, but they want to do the fishing. There is no use telling these people that they have to inquire whether it is the Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Ottawa, or some gentleman at Toronto, who lays down the law; their only desire is to know what the law is. Surely the rights of the people are paramount to the dignity of any official whether provincial or federal. Before we sanction the payment of a host of officers and give them the powers of the czar, we should ask the minister whether any effort has been made with the provincial minister to agree upon a common system. However zealous the federal officers may be they cannot be more zealous than the Ontario officer, a good old Liberal, a man who gives his life to the business, a sportsman who has his heart in it; and who was appointed by the Ontario Conservative government because of his qualifications. He is just as anxious to do what you want as any man could be, and why not sit down with him and agree upon common regulations. What is the sense of having one set of regulations here and another in Toronto, and two officials going to the person and fighting over the body of the prisoner to see who will get him. I submit that is not business like.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am absolutely converted to the idea of putting an end to this dual jurisdiction, and for years past I have made many efforts to bring about the result the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) desires. As far as the maritime provinces are concerned, the matter is in very good shape. In fact, we have reached an agreement with the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. So far as Quebec is concerned, the gulf part of the province is under the exclusive control of the federal authorities, who not only make regulations concerning the way in which fishing shall be carried on, but issue licenses and maintain vessels for the protection of the fishermen and the fishing industry. In the inland part of the province, the provincial authorities issue licenses, and the regulations, so far as I have seen, are generally well enforced. In the province

of British Columbia there is the question of jurisdiction, which has been submitted for the judgment of the Supreme Court, and I expect that the matter will be reviewed during this month. Hon. gentlemen opposite have suggested that we should agree with the provincial authorities as to the question of making regulations. Less than four months ago the provincial authorities of British Columbia and ourselves agreed that we should have a regulation as to boat rating in the northern part of the province, and a commission was appointed composed of their chief officer and one of our inspectors for British Columbia. They went on the ground of the interested parties, and made a report, which I adopted, and my colleagues accepted my recommendation that this boat rating should be observed. I fully agree with my hon. friend that this overlapping of jurisdiction is not for the benefit of the fisheries themselves, but rather is very detrimental to them, and the sooner the question is settled the better. It is not a question that can be settled by the officers; it will have to be settled by the representatives of the respective governments. In regard to improving the regulations, I thought I should have the provincial minister of Ontario come and confer with me as to the regulations which should be adopted for the Great Lakes, and we passed a few days together and discussed the regulations. I mention this just to show my hon. friends that good relations exist between us. But the fact remains that there is overlapping. In some parts of Ontario we are face to face with the depletion of the fisheries, and some day, when the fisheries have disappeared, it may be charged against us that we did not protect them, if we do not now look after the regulations for that purpose. Some reference has been made to politics. There is no politics in the administration of my department in respect to the fisheries. We do not claim not to make any mistakes, but we try our best to meet the exigencies of the situation by adopting the best regulations possible to preserve the fisheries. In some provinces we are issuing licenses, and they are issued to bona fide fishermen, and I have never heard of any complaint that we are granting licenses or refusing licenses for the purpose of obtaining any party advantage.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I quite agree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that it is very unfortunate that the jurisdiction with respect to the fisheries has, by the decision of the Privy Council, been made concurrent as between the provinces and the Dominion. But I cannot agree with him, at least so far as my section of the country is concerned, that the fishery regulations are not being enforced. Indeed, in my county the complaint made is that when the Ontario government took charge of the regulations they were made too stringent, and I know of four cases where seizures have been made for infringements of the fishery laws. In one case at least the seizure was unjustly made, and the man was returned his nets and is going to be compensated for the injury done him. I think it is unfortunate, from what has been said to-night, that the minister did not delay the appointment of these 40 overseers in Ontario, because their duties will overlap those of the provincial officers. There will be two sets of officers to punish people for the offences committed. If a man fishes within the close season, the minister contends that the provincial officers have no right to prosecute him. On the other hand, if he fishes without a license, the Dominion officer would have no right to interfere with him. How is a Dominion official to know whether a man is fishing without a license or not? He would have to get that information from a provincial officer. On the other hand, when a man is fishing in the spring of the year, he cannot be prosecuted by the provincial authorities. It is the practice in Ontario not to give a man a new license if he has infringed the law in the previous year, so that the provincial authorities will have to inquire of the Dominion authorities whether or not he has been convicted under the Dominion regulations. I would like to know how many overseers are going to be appointed by the Dominion government on the Georgian bay.

Mr. BRODEUR. One at Parry Sound, one at Leith, one at Wiarton, one at Penetanguishene.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I said there would be three, apparently there are four. Then these seven fishery overseers are in the southeastern portion of the Georgian bay. That is altogether too many officials, three or four competent men would be quite sufficient. Thus it looks to me as if politics had something to do with these appointments. One of the main strengths of the fishery overseer is that the fishermen look to him to exert his influence to lengthen the open season or shorten the close season, or hope to have him act as leniently as he can with reference to the enforcement of the fishery regulations. When this government had no fishery overseers the petitions of these men had to be transmitted to the government through the provincial overseer and it was to him that the fishermen looked for a reply. It looks as if these officers were being appointed by the Dominion government so that the information may be sent back not to a provincial official, but to a Dominion official. From whom has the minister had complaints that the provincial regulations have not been properly enforced?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether the provincial regulations were enforced, but we know that ours have not been properly enforced in some cases.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Can the minister cite a single case?

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, yes, I can cite many.

Mr. GORDON (Kent). I can cite one. A short time ago I visited a fishing country and found leads of 550 feet being used, contrary to law, in Mitchell's bay.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Did the hon. gentleman advise the provincial authority?

Mr. GORDON (Kent). Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Did he take action?

Mr. GORDON (Kent). Shortly after, but it had been going on for a year without being noticed.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That is a case where something was brought to the attention of the officer and he rectified it. That is all that could have been done by a Dominion official. There can be no argument for the appointment of these men and it would be in the interests of the fisheries not to have them appointed. Did the minister consult the Ontario government as to the necessity of appointing them?

Mr. BRODEUR. The law says that the fishery officers appointed under the Act are the ones to have authority to enforce the Act. There must have been violation of the law, but there has never been any return to us of money collected as fines, while the law provides that all money so collected must be turned in to the Receiver General for Canada.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Have you applied to the province for it?

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, yes, we have.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The minister admits that he has not communicated with the provincial authorities to find out whether they have been enforcing the Dominion regulations, although he is willing to forego his right to fishery licenses. Has he intimated to the provincial authorities that he was going to appoint 40 Dominion officers, and asked them if they thought it was necessary or whether the provincial officers would perform the duties which the 40 Dominion officers are about to perform.

Mr. BRODEUR. I must admit that I have not asked the provincial authorities whether they would advise me if these officers should be appointed or not, because I thought it was our duty to do it ourselves. So long as we were satisfied that there were violations of the law and that these violations were detrimental to the fisheries, we thought it was our duty to prevent such violations. The provincial authorities have their own officers to look after their own regulations concerning licenses, but it is our duty to see to the observance of our own regulations. As to violations of the law I might mention the Killarney case, a very flagrant case, referred to in the report of the Georgian Bay Commission. In view of these facts we are not going to beg of the Ontario government to carry out our regulations. It is our duty to see that they are properly observed, for fear that we may afterwards be charged with not having performed our duty. I feel I would have been derelict in my duty if I had not adopted this course.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the minister not think that the provincial officials going over the same ground, could, without any additional labour, perform the duties which will be performed by these 40 officers to be appointed by this government.

Mr. BRODEUR. But once more, my hon friend—

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I quite understand that what the minister wants is the enforcement of the regulations of his department by his own officials. But he tells us that he is in perfect harmony with the provincial authorities, yet he has given the provincial government no chance to come to an agreement with him on this point, he has not consulted with them as to the appointment of these officials. And I do not see why something should not have been done along that line.

Mr. BRODEUR. One point, perhaps, I did not make very clear. The officers appointed by the Ontario government, of course, receive instructions from the provincial authority, and these instructions must refer to the provincial laws and regulations. For the enforcement of our regulations, we must give those who are to enforce them specific instructions, but how can we give instructions to these provincial officers? We have no authority over them, and they would probably tell us so. I expect that the men whom we appoint will see to it that our regulations are observed, while the provincial officers will especially look after the regulations in relation to issuing of licenses and matters under the authority of the provincial government.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. But could not the minister appoint these provincial officials to carry out the regulations of the Dominion? If that suggestion were made to the provincial authorities, I have no doubt they would agree to it. There would be no confusion and one corps of officers would carry out the two sets of regulations.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would rather have our system than one under which a large number of officers are appointed. We have suffered in some provinces by this system of appointing guardians and overseers at such small salaries that they could not be expected to devote their time to the work. But we appoint fewer men, pay them salaries that will cover all their time, and look to them for results.

Mr. BARKER. What will the 40 men with all their paraphernalia cost?

Mr. BRODEUR. Five hundred dollars for each man.

Mr. BARKER. Twenty thousand dollars per annum on a little question of dignity.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The point the minister raises is one of those that could have been amicably arranged between the two governments. If the number of officials is too large, and the salaries too small, an agreement could have been made to follow rather the plan that he thinks best.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How does the minister expect that these men are going to devote their whole time to the work for the money he speaks of—$500 per annum each? These men, if they are going to perform their duties, must be away from home a good deal, travelling up and down the river. I suppose each will have to pay his own living expenses.

Mr. BRODEUR. His living expenses, when he is out, will be paid by the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then the minister did not give us the facts correctly. He said these men would cost $500 each per annum which—

Mr. PARDEE. You asked what the salary was.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) asked what these men would cost, and the minister said $500 per annum each. But now the minister says their expenses must be paid while they are out, and it is clear they must be out every day, for the men along the river have small nets which they will use in an effort to evade the law. The Ontario government men are running up and down the river in their little gasoline launches all the time. I have seen them come along where men were trying to spear fish at night. How much will the minister allows these officers of his for living expenses?

Mr. BRODEUR. We pay the actual disbursements. That is the custom that has always been followed in the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I suppose you will furnish each man wish a gasoline boat?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.

Mr. BRODEUR. Where necessary, but not in all cases.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How is a man going to watch the fisheries unless he is out on the river? Such a man must have a gasoline launch, and it must be a fast one too, because the men who are fishing illegally generally have pretty fast little launches themselves. The running of the launch and the living expenses of the men will add at least $2 a day while they are travelling around—the expenses will probably be more than the salary. Instead of $500 each, these men will cost $1,000 each. That is, $40,000 is to be paid by this government quite unnecessarily. The only point that the minister makes, it seems to me, is that the Ontario officials have not authority to carry out his regulations. But, if the minister would have an order in council passed that the fishery officers appointed by the local government should have power to enforce the Dominion regulations, he could save this $40,000 per annum. Am I not right in understanding it that way?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then, will the minister explain.

Mr. BRODEUR. These men would not be under our control or subject to our instructions. It would be a system absolutely detrimental to the fisheries. The hon. gentlemen (Mr. Reid, Grenville) seems to be surprised at an expenditure of $40,000 in connection with these fisheries. These fisheries in Ontario are very important.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No doubt.

Mr. BRODEUR. And I say that spending a sum of even $40,000 for the preservation of those fisheries would not be an extravagant expenditure. I think it worth while to expend that amount of money to make sure that the fisheries shall be well preserved.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The issue I take with the minister is that it is not necessary.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a difference of opinion.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister states that these fishery overseers have no jurisdiction, and could not carry out his instructions. As I understand it, the only instructions he could give them, would be the official regulations.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not only the official regulations, but there are a great number of specific instructions, which we have to give, and how could we do that to officers over whom we have no control ?

Mr. BARKER. Has the hon. gentleman never heard of a station master at a union

station, who obeys the orders of several railway companies, and he only draws one salary ?

Mr. STAPLES. Is the minister going to make any appointments in the province of Manitoba ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have one inspector and several overseers in Manitoba. It is not intended to increase the number.

Mr. STAPLES. Where are they located ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The inspector is at Selkirk; there is one overseer on Lake Manitoba and some on Lake Winnipegosis.

Mr. STAPLES. Are any of those additional officers you are providing for, going to be located in Manitoba ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Those officers have been appointed for some time, and occasionally we may increase the number. I am informed that last year we appointed a new overseer.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Is it the intention of the minister to collect any license fees from the fishermen in Ontario ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The matter has been considered by the department, but no decision has been reached whether we should issue licenses in Ontario or not. We hope some day there will be an agreement, and we do not want to complicate the question.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Will the minister state why the fishermen in British Columbia have to pay licenses to both governments, while in Ontario, they get off with a license to one government ? Notwithstanding what the minister said about the importance of the Ontario fisheries, the revenue collected by his department in that province was only $1,520 last year, while in the smaller province of British Columbia, the amount collected from the fishermen was $41,000. It seems to me there is a discrimination which should not be continued, and that the money of the fishermen of British Columbia should not be taken to pay the salaries of those supernumerary overseers in Ontario, because that is what it will look like to them, when they find a difference of $40,000 between the revenues of the two provinces, and 40 new men are to be put on in Ontario to absorb this whole $40,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This sum of $1,520 which the hon. gentleman speaks, must represent penalties which we have collected. We do not collect anything in the way of licenses for the reasons I have just explained. But we are expending a large amount of money in British Columbia, much more than we are spending in Ontario. This amount under discussion is for the purpose of providing for the fishery protection service in British Columbia. Outside of that, we maintain several ships for the protection of the fisheries; we have also a large number of gasoline launches, and small boats for the same purpose. So the money expended for fishery protection in British Columbia does not compare with the amount spent in Ontario.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The point the minister has not touched is this: I have a large number of fishermen in my constituency, and when I go to them they demand an accounting from me as to why they are taxed $5 a year, and their brother fishermen in Ontario are not taxed at all.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is mistaken; the fishermen in both provinces are taxed. But in Ontario the money is collected by the provincial authorities, while in British Columbia it is collected by the Dominion authorities. Lately the provincial government saw fit also to put a tax upon the fishermen by imposing a new license. Formerly, there was only one license, that imposed by the Dominion.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The minister still has not met my point. In British Columbia there are two licenses exacted from the fishermen, one by the provincial government and one by the Dominion government. In Ontario there is a license by the provincial government, but none collected by the Dominion government. So we have two licenses to pay, while in Ontario, there is only one license to pay.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is in virtue of an especial agreement we made with the two provinces. After the judgment of the Privy Council we made an agreement with the British Columbia government by which we were to continue to protect the fisheries, to maintain the hatcheries, at the same time to administer the whole business, and also to collect the licenses, with the understanding however, that a certain portion of the amount which we collected was to be paid back to the provincial authorities. If I remember right, the amount voted last year by this parliament that we paid to the provincial authorities was $56,000 in virtue of that agreement. In Ontario an agreement was made that the province should collect the fees, pending a settlement of the fishery question. In the maritime provinces we continue to collect the licenses; in Quebec we collect the licenses in a portion of the province, and the provincial authorities collect them in another portion. But since we have made this agreement with the British Columbia government, the provincial authorities have seen fit to issue licenses themselves. They may

have had a right to do so, I do not say, it was a violation of the agreement which was made, but I think it would have been just as well to leave the situation untouched, and not to impose another license upon the fishermen. They could have left the matter in the hands of the Dominion authorities, until it had been definitely settled. But my hon. friend cannot find fault with the Dominion government for having continued to carry out the agreement which existed before. We claim that there is a part of British Columbia over which the provincial authorities have no jurisdiction. I mean the three-mile limit, and we claim that the right to issue licenses within the three-mile limit belongs exclusively to the Dominion authorities. That is a matter which is before the courts and of course, we will have the point settled by the decision which will be rendered.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I think the minister has not yet met my position, which is why his department collects licenses in British Columbia, while it collects no license in Ontario.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is in virtue of the agreement which was made with the provincial government after the judgment of the Privy Council was rendered. An agreement was made in Ontario that they should collect the licenses, and with British Columbia and the maritime provinces that we should collect the licenses. Now, to our great surprise, the provincial government of British Columbia goes to work and passes laws taking power to issue licenses itself. In British Columbia we are under very large expense for the preservation of the fisheries. I suppose my hon. friend would think it only fair and right that as we are spending so much money for the preservation of the fisheries in British Columbia we should have some revenue out of them. The provincial government maintains one hatchery, but the most important hatcheries are maintained by us. The fishery protection service is maintained by the Dominion authorities. We have several ships that we are maintaining there for the protection of the fisheries, and I think it is only fair and just that we should issue these licenses for the purpose of meeting at least a portion of the expenses of protecting the fisheries. The situation is not the same in Ontario. There we do not maintain a fleet as we do in British Columbia. If the provincial government has seen fit to impose another tax upon the fisherman, I have no fault to find with it, as it simply exercises the power that it has to issue licenses and collect a fee. That is a question that the provincial authorities will have to discuss with the fishermen.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Perhaps my English is defective, but the minister has altogether avoided the point I tried to make. I have no fault to find with the expenditure in British Columbia. I think it his duty to make that expenditure, and that he is trying very hard to make the expenditure effective, but I am speaking just for the moment from the standpoint of the licensed fishermen in my riding, who are taxed five dollars a year, while their contemporaries in Ontario are taxed nothing at all.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, they are taxed in Ontario, too.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Well, they are taxed by the provincial government, but I am speaking of the federal taxation.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is the provincial government spending for the purpose of the fisheries the money which it collects from these fishermen? Is it not true that almost all the money that is spent there is spent by the federal authorities?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The minister has discussed the fishery policy of the British Columbia government with the ministers of that government, and I think they are quite able to take care of themselves, so it is not necessary for me to appear here as their champion. I will leave their case to themselves. But I would like to put on the records the contributions from the several provinces, as the subject has been mentioned. I have it here in the Auditor General's Report, at page O-204, and it is as follows:

Ontario	$ 1,520 75
Quebec	4,948 46
Nova Scotia	3,865 81
New Brunswick	13,029 88
Prince Edward Island	2,359 93
Manitoba	3,952 88
Saskatchewan	1,211 44
Alberta	703 00
Hudson Bay District, &c	309 83
British Columbia	41,864 80
Yukon Territory	457 00
	$74,223 78

One province contributes just about sixty per cent. It seems to me that an injustice is being done to the fishermen of that province, inasmuch as they are so heavily taxed as to pay sixty per cent of the whole fisheries revenue of Canada, while all the other eight provinces and a couple of unorganized districts contribute only the other forty per cent. I do not think the minister has met that situation.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, take the case of Nova Scotia. The fisheries in which the Nova Scotia fishermen engage are mostly

those on the Grand Banks. The results of those fisheries are included in the reports which my hon. friend will see as to the yield of the fisheries in Nova Scotia. We could not very well issue licenses to go and fish on the Grand Banks. Sir Charles Tupper introduced a law some years ago under which fishermen going on the Grand Banks should receive a bounty. In British Columbia most of the fisheries are on the Fraser, and the other rivers in which they catch salmon. Fishing there is carried on in a different way from the method pursued in Nova Scotia, and that is the reason why there is a difference.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I see I cannot budge the minister on that point, but I would like to call his attention to another matter of some importance in connection with the fisheries protection service in British Columbia. About three years ago, when the government had its dispute with the British Columbia government, and when the two sets of officers were first put on, the minister issued licenses to a number of fishermen along the Fraser river, giving them certain rights, as they supposed. While they were exercising those rights they were interfered with by other fishery protection officers acting the same as the minister's own officers, in the name of the King. These men should not be subjected to any penalties from any quarter for doing anything which they were licensed to do in His Majesty's name, but they were brought before the courts by the provincial inspectors, subjected to heavy losses, fined and their occupation interfered with to a considerable extent in the height of the fishing season. These men naturally looked to the government, whom they had paid so handsomely for their licenses, to protect them from any of the consequences of the exercise of the power granted by those licenses. They have received no satisfaction whatever from this government, not even a sympathetic response, but merely a heartless declaration that this injury was not inflicted upon them by the federal authority, but that it was inflicted upon them by the provincial authority, and that, therefore, they must look to the province for compensation. I submit that is not the proper attitude for a federal department to take. It is not for me to say whether the federal government or the provincial government were in the right. To my mind that question should not be raised as regards the individual fisherman. The only correct course to take would be for the federal government to protect the holders of its licenses, to compensate them for any loss they met with through relying upon those licenses, and then in turn the federal government should look to the provincial government for compensation if compensation is due. Does the minister not think that as a matter of right this government should protect the holders of its licenses?

Mr. BRODEUR. We undoubtedly have the right to issue licenses in British Columbia as in other provinces, and to make laws and regulations concerning the fisheries. The provincial government was authorized by the legislature to issue licenses and they requested the fishermen to take provincial licenses. The provincial government undertook at the same time to pass regulations in connection with the fisheries and the fishermen of British Columbia thought the provincial government had no right to do that. The provincial government did not dispute the right of the federal government to issue licenses.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). That is the very point; the authority given by the federal license was put in question.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think so.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The point was this: The Dominion regulations permitted the fishermen to carry on their calling during certain hours, and the provincial regulations provided certain different hours, and it was because the fishermen were found fishing in the hours permitted by the Dominion but forbidden by the province that they were brought to court. These men were fined for fishing at a time when the Dominion license told them they could fish.

Mr. BRODEUR. They were prosecuted because they were violating the provincial regulations, in that some of them did not take licenses as the provincial law prescribed. The fishermen fought the question in the courts, and though the question before the court was whether the provincial government had the right to make these regulations or not, I thought we should be generous enough to extend some help to these poor fishermen contending against a wealthy province. It was not because the province questioned our right to issue licenses, about which there is no doubt, but because the men were violating a provincial regulation, that they were prosecuted. In the first instance we got a lawyer to follow the case which was won by the fishermen, and on appeal to the high court that judgment was sustained. I should think it was a case in which the provincial government should pay the costs of the fishermen, but as they refused I thought it was only justice that we should reimburse them their costs.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Was the payment of the costs made recently?

Mr. BRODEUR. We paid the court charges.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I think the minister is in error; they never were paid their costs.

Mr. BRODEUR. Claims were made by some of the fishermen for loss of time, but of course, we could not pay such. As a friend of the fishermen, my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) should commend us for having reimbursed them their costs. Not only that, but we are now before the Supreme Court to argue the stated case in which is involved the question of the three-mile limit.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am delighted to hear that from the minister, but I am afraid he does not mean all he says. If he is really going to pay the fishermen all their costs, that is all I have been asking him to do, but that has not been done yet.

Mr. BRODEUR. We paid all the court charges and the hon. gentleman should not press us to do more. If the fishermen have any claim for loss of time it should be paid by the provincial government which instituted the proceedings, and I am sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) with his influence and prestige can get the provincial government to do that.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Unfortunately for the fishermen my commission is not to the provincial but to the federal government.

Mr. BRODEUR. I know my hon. friend has great influence with the provincial government.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). My point is, that the federal government should look to the provincial government for reimbursement as it is the federal government that ought to protect the holders of its licenses. The minister was a little in error about what is done with the fisheries revenue collected from British Columbia, when he said that part of it is by arrangement paid over to the provincial government. True, there was an arrangement several years ago when the decision of the Privy Council was first given, and under a modus vivendi the federal government was to continue to collect the license fees and remit one-half to the provincial government. What went wrong with that arrangement I do not know. But I do know that this government for some reason did not carry it out, and did not pay to the provincial government the part they agreed to pay; and it was in consequence of their failure to pay that amount during five or six years that the provincial government eventually took control of the situation by issuing regulations and imposing a license fee which from that time on they have collected. If this government had stuck to the modus vivendi, there would never have been any difficulty between them and the province of British Columbia, but one authority or the other would have imposed the license fee and divided it with the other government. The minister seems to be under the impression that that is going on now, but such is not the case, as I understand. I understand that this government is under no obligation to pay any part of the revenue which it collects to the provincial government, and I would not like it to go on record that British Columbia was getting something which is not coming to us.

Mr. BRODEUR. After the judgment of the Privy Council there was an agreement that we should reimburse the government of British Columbia for some of the license fees collected if it transpired that we had not the right to issue such licenses. For many years no claim was made by the provincial authorities. But finally they made a claim, and we tried to determine what the amount of the claim was. There was a great divergence of opinion as to the basis of settlement, as to what should constitute the cost of administration. There was one contention on our part and another on the part of the provincial government. After a couple of years of discussion, we reached a settlement, and in the meantime the provincial government notified us that they wanted to put an end to the modus vivendi; and last year, after we had reached a settlement as to the amount that should be paid, the money was voted by parliament, and it has since been paid to the provincial authorities.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to ask if the minister's attention was called to a report in the daily press the other day, of wholesale poaching on the west bank of Vancouver island, and of complaints that the protection service given there is altogether inadequate. Is any part of this money which we are now asked to vote for the purpose of strengthening that service, and, if so, in what respects is it to be strengthened?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not only part, but all of this money is for the purpose of affording better protection to the fisheries on the western coast of the Island of Vancouver. The poaching my hon. friend refers to has been reported to the department in different ways, and it has been brought specially to my attention by my colleague, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) who urged very strongly upon me the advisability of providing more boats for the protection of our fisheries, and this vote is for that purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). What nature of boats is this to provide?

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall be glad to give my hon. friend privately all the informa-

tion as to what we are going to do; but I think it would perhaps be better that the poachers should not know.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). That is a very smooth answer of the minister, and I am very much obliged to him for the offer; but I am afraid that he cannot keep his boats so private that the poachers will not learn what he is doing almost as soon as his officials do; because I can tell him that the men engaged in poaching in our waters have the very fastest boats that money can supply them with, and he must be very alert, indeed, to keep up with them. Up to the present our so-called fishery protection boats have been a laughing stock to the poachers. They know in advance the proposed movements of these boats, and every time a vessel of our protective fleet is due to approach, they are able to move in the opposite direction. I do not think that an apprehension or conviction of a poacher occurs once in a year, although scores of boats are poaching there all the time. No doubt these facts are known to the minister, but I mention them so that they may be placed on record, and perhaps act as a stimulus to the department to do a little more than it has been doing to bring to an end a state of affairs which is almost ruining our fisheries. I would also like to ask whether any part of this vote is for the protection of the fisheries on Puget Sound in connection with the regulations under the International Fisheries Treaty.

Mr. BRODEUR. No. I may say that the treaty is not yet in force. It has not yet been passed by the United States authorities. When I was in Washington some days ago, I took up the question with the United States government, and the Secretary of State intended to advise the President to request the passage of the necessary legislation as soon as possible. I do not know whether that has been done yet or not. This vote is entirely for the protection of the fisheries on the west coast of the Island of Vancouver. If the necessity arises for the protection of the fisheries on Puget Sound, that will be attended to.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Of course, the protection of the fisheries on Puget Sound is a matter of joint arrangement between the two countries; and if the fishery regulations, which are now overdue, are proclaimed simultaneously in both countries, it will be necessary for us to have our arrangements for protection ready, otherwise the season will pass with our fisheries there at the mercy of fishermen from the American side.

Mr. BRODEUR. Provision is made for that in our main estimates. This vote is only to make provision from now to the first of April.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Does the minister rely altogether on the Americans for the inspection of their traps, or will there be Canadian boats also for police duty?

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course, we have to rely on the American authorities, because under the treaty the carrying out of the regulations on each side of the line must be carried out by the authorities of each country.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The minister has a regulation in regard to the export of fish. Will that be carried out under his inspection, or are the Americans under any arrangement to assist in keeping our fish out of their markets?

Mr. BRODEUR. The fishery regulations for preventing the exportation of fish in order to preserve the fisheries are certainly going to be attended to by this government.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The minister has no intention of making any other regulations this year with regard to the exportation of fish than the regulations in force last year, and for some years previous?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have not considered any change in the regulations in connection with that.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I ask that because I observe in the arrangement recently under discussion here that there is to be a free interchange of fish between the two countries, and that there is also an engagement on the part of Canada that no regulations of any kind will conflict with this offer of the free interchange of fish. Of course we have induced the American government to take off the duty on fish in the expectation that they will get our salmon to use in their canning factories, and they would regard it as a violation of our promise not to have any conflicting regulation, if the minister maintained his prohibition of export. This matter ought to be clearly understood, because it is important to our fishermen to know well in advance if they are to be permitted to export their catch during the present season. They are advised by the arrangement we have recently been discussing that they will be permitted to export while the minister's regulations provide that they will not be permitted. We have here the two ministers concerned in what seems to be a conflicting arrangement, and I think it would be well to have an authoritative statement, so that men on the Fraser who are so vitally interested should be advised as early as possible.

Mr. FIELDING. There is nothing in the arrangement which interferes with the right of the Canadian Fisheries Department to

make any regulation which may be deemed necessary for the protection of the Canadian fisheries, and in like manner the American government will be free to make any regulation that seems reasonably necessary for the protection of their fisheries. That is the general state of the situation. What would be the effect of any particular regulation that might arise would have to be considered. I can only state the general principle governing the arrangement.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am sorry to hear that, because that was one feature of the arrangement at Washington that pleased me, that we were to have free interchange of fish. It was a matter I had urged on the House during the three sessions I have been here. I have always thought that the exportation of fish should not be prohibited, as it is by order in council, and I read in the agreement from Washington that no regulation shall be made or maintained which unreasonably hampers the more liberal exchange of commodities now proposed. It seems to me quite clear that the prohibition of the export of fish does unreasonably hamper the interchange of this commodity, and that it would be so held. It seems to me the ministers would do well to take council together on that point.

Mr. FIELDING. I am content to state the general principle. As to how it shall apply in this particular case I must leave the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to study that out for himself.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows that this regulation has been put on the statute-book for the purpose of protecting our fisheries, and if I remember rightly such a provision was unanimously recommended by the British Columbia Commission which sat some years ago, and on which all interests were represented. It was unanimously recommended that this was a measure necessary to protect our fisheries. It is a regulation of local concern for the special purpose of protecting our fisheries, and we may exercise in respect to it the same right as we do with regard to licenses.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). If that interpretation is carried out it puts us in this position, that an arrangement has been made for the free exchange of fish, and that under that we are bound to admit all the American fish offered to us in competition with the catch of our own fishermen, while under the regulations made by the Fishery Department those same fishermen are prohibited from passing their fish across to the canners on the American side, which I think is a condition most unfair to the fishermen.

Mr. FIELDING. That would be a matter entirely under our control, of course.

Immigration, amount required for seed grain and relief advances, $50,000.

Mr. OLIVER. This amount is asked for to meet requirements which have arisen by reason of the unfavourable nature of last season in the southwestern part of the western provinces. The season was very dry, and the crops short, and so far as our information goes there are about 4,000 homesteaders who are short of seed grain. Seed grain has been supplied in the past under similar circumstances, and it is understood to be the policy of the country that where people are in occupation of land in the west, of which they have not acquired the ownership, so that they can raise money on it as security to buy grain, the government will make advances, taking a lien upon the land as security for those advances. The government does not make a gift of the grain; it makes an advance of the grain to the farmer, and, being the only authority that is able to take a lien upon his land, takes that lien as security for the advance. We are afraid we will have to ask for more than $50,000, but $50,000 is sufficient for the purchases that will have to be made now, so that the grain will be ready for distribution at the beginning of the season. We may have to ask for a further sum in the supplementary estimates for the coming year.

Mr. ROCHE. How does the minister estimate the quantity? Has he reports from his officers or does he judge by the applications from farmers?

Mr. OLIVER. It was known, of course, last summer, that the crop was short in that part of the country. The immigration branch has had officials, from time to time, go through the country and size up the situation. Also, of course, we have received a large number of applications. But we depend rather on the investigations of our officers. Of course, there are many people who are apt to leave off making an application until the time they need the grain, and so, between now and the spring, we may expect applications to come in of which we have not heard. But we have, as far as possible, covered the area affected by the drought and believe we have made a fair estimate of the requirements.

Mr. ROCHE. For the three provinces?

Mr. OLIVER. No, we are not taking any action with regard to Manitoba so far as I am aware. In Manitoba, as my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) knows, in the part where the shortage occurred, the land has practically all been patented, and so there does not exist the position of which I have spoken in which the Dominion government

is the only authority that can take security against the land. We are not touching cases in any of the provinces in which the land has passed out of the hands of the Dominion government. In such cases, we feel, the settler is in a position to make provision for himself, or the provincial government is the authority that should undertake the responsibility.

Mr. LAKE. Would the minister mind specifying the district to be covered. He speaks of four thousand homesteaders to be supplied. I do not think that $50,000 will cover, or anything like cover, what is necessary to supply so many. How much seed does he propose to allow?

Mr. OLIVER. At the moment, I can only outline the district in a general way. It is particularly, south of the Canadian Pacific railway main line and west of the Sault line, that is, it is in southwestern Saskatchewan and southern Alberta. It is quite true, and I have already said, that the amount we are asking for now is not all that will be required, but we think it is sufficient to carry us through the present fiscal year. As I have said, we shall have to ask for a further sum in the supplementary estimates for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. LAKE. I notice that this is for relief advances also. Is there necessity for relieving farmers in distress?

Mr. OLIVER. There has been, I am sorry to say, some necessity, and some advances have been made—not on a large scale, but there have been cases in which we felt it was needed in the general interest and that something might be done so that suffering might be avoided.

Mr. ROCHE. Does the department look to the individual farmer for repayment or to the provincial government?

Mr. OLIVER. We collect direct from the individual. On the occasion of the seed grain advances of two or three years ago, the advances were made to the provincial government, though we handled the actual distribution. The provincial government dealt with the farmers who held their patents, and collected from the farmers, and we collected from the provincial government. But in all cases where the farmer has not received his patent, he is not in a position to give security to any other authority than the Dominion government. In such cases, the Dominion government deals direct with the homesteader.

Mr. ROCHE. What has been the experience in the past as to repayment of these advances? Have repayments been made promptly?

Mr. OLIVER. I may give a few figures on that subject. Advances were made in the years 1886, 1887, 1888, 1890, 1894, 1895, 1896, total amount advanced was $4,660.08, and in 1908 the total amount advanced was $401,621.76. The aggregate of these advances for all the years named was $745,303.05. Of that total $549,858.56 has been repaid. The remainder, $195,444.49, is still outstanding. Six per cent interest was charged on advances before 1900, and since then 5 per cent has been charged. I think, under all the circumstances, the repayments have been made fairly promptly. We do not press the settler for payment. We hold a lien against his land, and when he applies for his patent the patent is issued to him, but the lien is inscribed on the face of the patent. Whenever he wishes to dispose of his land, or raise money on it, this lien must be paid off before he can complete the transaction. We find that effective in securing repayment, and, inasmuch as we are receiving 5 per cent on the advances, we have never pressed settlers for repayment. The result, I think, is a fairly satisfactory statement.

Mr. ROCHE. Does that cover patented as well as unpatented lands?

Mr. OLIVER. Only the unpatented. We have made no advances on patented lands except through and on the responsibility of the provincial government.

Mr. LAKE. I presume that, in the case of relief advances, a lien is made?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; it is the same.

Mr. LAKE. This whole question, I suppose, is being watched by the officials of the Immigration Department?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. And I presume they receive information from the mounted police and from other settlers, the people watching to see that there is no suffering?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, the severity of the winter and the conditions have been such that we cannot guarantee that there have been no cases of suffering. But, so far as it has been possible and reasonable, we have done what could be done to prevent any serious cases of suffering. We believe we have done very good work and have not unduly burdened the resources of the country.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 20, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PELAGIC SEALING.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the First Minister prepared to give to the House any information regarding the treaty that is being negotiated with respect to the seal fisheries?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not to-day; we have not yet received the text of the treaty.

DAMMING THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I wish to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the following letter from Governor Dix of the state of New York to the Hon. Senator Frye which appears in the New York Evening 'Post,' of February 17:

February 16, 1911.

Hon. William P. Frye, chairman Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir,—My attention has been called to Senate Bill No. 10588, introduced by Senator Oliver of Pennsylvania, which carries congressional approval of hydraulic development in the St. Lawrence river by the Long Sault Development Company, chartered on May 27, 1907, by the legislature of New York.

Congress will of course, appreciate the very careful consideration which this proposition demands, in view of its relation to both a state and international boundary stream, and a stream of primary importance to navigation as well as one whose use has been specially guarded and regulated by international treaty. The State of New York is, from its location, more directly interested than any other state in the preservation of St. Lawrence river navigation, and it is the only state with ports on that river.

In view of the superior jurisdiction of the federal government, and of its superior opportunities through its appropriate departments to pass upon problems affecting the navigation of this river, the legislative action of New York in regard to this proposed hydraulic development very properly and expressly and very clearly made concurrent action of the federal government essential to the creation of the rights in the river defined in the state Act of 1907. While the state of New York in that Act deferred wholly to the judgment which should be passed by the federal authorities on what would or would not injure or perhaps improve, the river at this point for navigation uses, it remains the duty of the authorities of this state to scrutinize any particular federal Bill which by its terms or by its necessary effect shall give vitality to the very great powers sought by the Long Sault Development Company. The state Act expressly recognizes the interest of the state in the proper settlement of all questions affecting the navigation of the stream.

Mr. OLIVER.

In my opinion, the pending Bill fails to cover properly the interests of navigation. While a survey of that part of the channel to be affected is provided for in the Bill, the survey should, in my opinion, be made prior to final action by Congress. Official approval by the secretary of war, and, if possible by the Dominion or other necessary authorities, of any specific plans for construction work should be secured before instead of after final action by Congress, and I would suggest that procedure in place of the course proposed by the Bill.

The possession by this company of the enormous powers defined in the Act of the state legislature would embrace both the state and federal authorities in negotiations with our Canadian neighbours concerning this matter, and embarrass efforts to conserve the interests of navigation and of other property owners whose holdings would lie within the reach of the impounded flood waters and ice of this great river.

This proposed development and the development of the Niagara river are the only two instances involving state boundary waters, and both had their origin in special state legislation, in each case as it seems to me, without full appreciation of the nature and extent of various phases of public interest to be immediately or ultimately affected. As in the Niagara river case, which is now involved in another Bill pending before Congress, so in this case, I do not feel justified in speaking alone for New York state at this time, but intend to call the Bill to the notice of the state legislature, which is now in session, for consideration. Pending an expression of views by our legislature, I request through you that action by Congress on the Oliver Bill may be suspended.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN A. DIX.

I would ask the Prime Minister to draw the attention of Ambassador Bryce to this letter and urge him to have Congress delay that Bill. As I understand it the Bill was reported by only one majority in the Senate Committee, and with a protest from New York state, a protest from our provincial governments and a protest from the Dominion government. I think the Senate will hesitate before passing the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think it would be proper for us to transmit this protest to Mr. Ambassador Bryce. I would suppose that possibly he has taken notice of it already. We have made our own representations.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—HON. MR. OLIVER.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I do not often complain of statements that appear in newspapers with regard to myself, but in the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' of February 18, there is a report of some remarks purporting to be made by me in the course of a debate which is supposed to have taken place on the previous day, and I think the House

should be placed in possession of the facts. It appears that my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) intended to bring forward the subject of the St. Peters' Indian reserve, and there appears in the 'Telegram' a report of a very comprehensive statement on his part, and a report of what I am supposed to have said in reply, as follows:

The Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, Hon. Frank Oliver, opened his reply with a tirade of abuse.

He did not demonstrate to the House the correctness of his bold and reckless assertions. There was not an argument in rebuttal. He denied the correctness in a general way of the charges, but in no case did he address one tittle of evidence to sustain his denial. He adopted, said Mr. Bradbury, unfair and insincere methods to counteract the damaging effect of the serious charges made by the Indians of St. Peter's against his department.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection whatever to offer to any report that may have been given of what my hon. friend from Selkirk did not say on that occasion; but I do very strongly object to the Winnipeg 'Telegram' giving me credit for a statement which certainly I am not to be credited with.

Mr. BRADBURY. Mr. Speaker, just one word in explanation. I am unfortunately the victim of circumstances. I do not think I am the first man in this House with regard to whom this has occurred. The facts are simply these. I expected to have had an opportunity of laying my views before the House eight or ten days ago, I was approached by a newspaper man, and I gave him an idea of what I intended to say. The criticism to which my hon. friend refers was a criticism of a speech that he made last year, and I did use the language exactly as he quotes, that is, that he opened his remarks last year with a tirade of abuse, which was quite true. If my hon. friend refers to the Minister of Railways, he will perhaps find that he has been in the same position; he has had matters published before it took place. I understand that the same thing happened with the Minister of Labour. I was simply following the footsteps of greater men than myself in giving to the newspapers an idea of what I was going to say.

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend went beyond what has occurred on previous occasions when he not only gave the newspaper a report of what he himself intended to say, but what another was to say in reply.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECURITY TRUSTS CORPORATION.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Security Trusts Corporation—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). On Friday evening last this Bill was allowed to stand over in order that the parties interested might if possible come to some arrangement in reference to the name. I have been asked to state the facts for the Security Trusts Company, Limited, which has been incorporated in the province of Manitoba, and which has been doing business there. The name proposed to be given to this company is the Security Trusts Corporation, and the promoters have asked further to be allowed to add the words 'of Saskatchewan,' that is, however, not the name that is in the Bill. Now, a company incorporated by an Act of parliament is an invisible, intangible thing, with power to perform the objects set forth in the Act; it has not a body to nourish or to starve, it has not a soul to damn or to save, but it must have a name. A salutary rule of all the committees of this House is that the name of a corporation must not be the name of any other known company, incorporated or unincorporated, or a name liable to be confounded therewith. The first two words of the name that this company wants are 'Security Trusts.' These are the first two words of the name of the company that we are now operating in the west. The third word in our charter is 'company.' The third word in theirs is 'corporation.' So that there is very little difference in the names of the two companies. The Companies Act, under which we get a charter upon an application to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, lays down the salutary rule that 'the proposed corporate name of the company shall not be that of any other known company, incorporated or unincorporated, or any name liable to be confounded therewith.' These are the express words of the statute, and the same rule is observed in this House. Most corporations are known by the first two or three words of their name, so that confusion between these two companies is very liable to occur, such as one party receiving the claim of another. It is just as inconvenient and as liable to confusion as if there were two James or two Johns in the same family. The promoters of this Bill contend that the word 'Saskatchewan' added to the name would be sufficient to distinguish it, but I submit that it would not. They also claim to have used the name. I admit that in Regina, in the province of Saskatchewan, there is a company, not a trusts company, but a loan company, called Security Loan Company, and they claim that because they have been using that name in connection with their loan company, they ought to be allowed to use it under the present charter. I submit that they ought to take some other name.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). This Bill has been waiting some weeks pending conclusion with respect to the name of the company. The Winnipeg company, I believe, was incorporated under the name of the Security Trust Company, Limited, for the purpose of transacting business in Manitoba, and there is no evidence to show that it used the word 'security' before we did. I do not know how long it has been in business. The company whose Bill I have in charge, has been carrying on business in Saskatchewan two years, under the name of the Security Loan Company, and it has a large number of loan agencies in that province. The new company which we are asking to incorporate under the name of the Securities Trust Corporation is taking over the business of the Security Loan Company, and has, therefore, the same interest in retaining the word 'security' in its title. And I submit it has just as much right to use that word as has the Winnipeg company. I am anxious, however, that there should be no conflict of names, and I am going to suggest that the name in the Bill, which is now security and trust corporation, be changed to the Security Trust Corporation of Canada. That, it seems to me, is a sufficiently distinctive name to enable this committee to pass the Bill.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not think that would be fair to this other company because it would lead to confusion between the two. The company, whose Bill is before us, intends doing business in Winnipeg and probably in eastern Ontario, in looking after trusts and estates, &c.; and the mails of each company are liable to get mixed since the only difference in their titles is that between the word 'corporation' and the word 'company.' The word 'Canada,' which the hon. member intends to add might be added in small letters and would not alter the position. There ought not to be any hesitation on the part of the hon. gentleman in giving his company some name which would prevent any possible danger of confusion.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina) Why should we give up the name 'security'?

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I understand it, this corporation, of which my hon. friend speaks, is a corporation that did nothing but lend money in Saskatchewan. It proposes now to do the business of trust company all over the Dominion, which is entirely different. It was not a trust company before, and it is now undertaking an entirely different business. No doubt it will do a loan business with the money on deposit, but I submit that the Finance Minister should see that it is given such a name that there could not be any possible conflict between the two companies, so that people would see exactly the company they are doing business with. So far as the Bill itself is concerned, I have no objection to its going through so long as the name of the company is such that there will not be any danger of confusion in the minds of the public.

Mr. SPROULE. Of the two companies, the one has been in operation about four years and the other about two years.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I do not know whether that is correct or not. To which one does he refer?

Mr. SPROULE. The one in Winnipeg.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I have no information of that kind, and I do not think that was said by the hon. member for Winnipeg.

Mr. SPROULE. It was from him that I got the information, and I take it that it must be correct. It was doing business a considerable time before this other company was doing business at all, and consequently has a prior right, and we should not create the danger of confusion by giving a younger company a similar name. The practice we have always followed is not to allow any corporation to take a name similar or nearly similar to that of one previously incorporated; and I am sure that if the attention of the committee had been drawn to this, they would not have passed this Bill without changing the name. The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) says that the company whose Bill he is promoting has been doing business in Saskatchewan for two years, and wants to keep its name; but it has not been doing a trust business at all, and it is now going into that business and thus coming into conflict with the other company in the same line. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) made a very fair suggestion when he suggested that the name 'Saskatchewan' should be added which would make a sufficient distinction between the two, and my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin) will be ill advised if he does not accept that.

Mr. BLAIN. If my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) would direct his remarks to the Finance Minister, I am sure he will get his support. I cannot believe that this matter has yet been drawn to the attention of the hon. minister, for I remember very distinctly that, on more than one occasion, he has taken exception to a similarity of names in companies doing the same kind of business. He will bear in mind that these two companies are both doing business in the same section of the

country. There might be some excuse if this was a charter for a company to do business in eastern Canada without touching the west, but in this instance, by the very nature of the case, they are competing with each other. When I recall, as I do very distinctly, the objections that have been taken by the Minister of Finance, I am quite sure my hon. friend will not consent to a Bill of this kind with a name so similar passing the House this afternoon.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is quite right, the Minister of Finance has sometimes raised that question; but I regret to say that in one or two instances his objections have been overruled. I suggested to gentlemen connected with this matter, on both sides, that this question could be better discussed if the Bill was referred back to the committee than it could be in the Committee of the Whole. I would renew that suggestion.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I accept it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad the Minister has taken that course as I have received three or four very strong remonstrances against it from gentlemen who have put their capital in the company and who feel it would cause great confusion and trouble to have this company given a name practically the same as theirs. I hope the committee will be able to find a way out of the difficulty.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I am quite agreeable to the suggestion.

Progress reported.

SENATE AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC BILLS.

On the order being called:

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 9) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—Mr. Carvell.

Mr. SPEAKER. On Monday last when these amendments were first before the House the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) raised a point of order to the effect that these amendments could not be considered because the Bill at its original introduction into this House had not been proceeded by resolution of the Committee of the Whole, as the Bill related to trade.

At that time I stated to the hon. member that his objection was taken too late; also that the Bill itself was not before the House, but only the Senate amendments.

At the suggestion of some hon. members I allowed the matter to stand until to-day.

After careful consideration of the subject, I see no reason to change my opinion. The time at which an objection is taken to any procedure of the House has always been considered as of importance, and some objections which might have very fairly prevailed had they been taken at the proper time, have failed on account of delay. There is no special precedent upon this particular case, but there are abundant precedents to the effect that an objection to procedure must be taken promptly and before the matter has passed to a stage at which the objections would be out of place. This, I consider, to have been the case in the present instance, the Bill having passed its three readings and Committee of the Whole in the House of Commons before this point was raised. Any other ruling would lead to very undesirable complications.

It was formerly decided by Mr. Speaker Blanchet, as far back as 1880, after discussion in which the Speaker was warmly supported by Sir John A. Macdonald, that when Senate amendments were before the House these amendments only could be discussed. See Bourinot, 3rd edition, page 676.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

HOPE TOWN LOTS.

* Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster):

1. With respect to receipts issued to Thomas D. Shorts, Hope, B.C., by the Dominion lands Agent at New Westminster, B.C., for payment of first instalment on purchase of lots in town of Hope, subject to approval at Ottawa, has said agent any authority to so deal with the matter?

2. Was the transaction approved by the department at Ottawa?

3. In cases requiring the approval of the department, is it the practice to signify such approval to intending purchaser, or is he notified only in the event of decision against approval?

4. Is there a time limit within which approval or disapproval is to be signified? If no recognized limit, within what period does the department usually take action?

5. On what date were the receipts issued to Mr. Shorts, and on what date did the department signify approval or disapproval?

6. Was any other application for these lands pending before the department?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. The Dominion land agent at New Westminster had authority to receive the application of Thos. D. Shorts for the purchase of lots 5, 6 and 7, block 10, town of Hope, subject to the approval of the department.

2. Approval or disapproval has not yet been expressed by the department in reference to the transaction.

3. There is no stated practice.

4. There is no given limit or period.

5. The applications of Thomas Dorlan Shorts are dated 9th December, 1909, the payment of $60 on account was included in the return of the agent, for the 15th December, 1909.

6. A previous application had been received from James Corrigan, who claims to have improved these lots. The claims of both parties in the case will be considered after an inspection has been made.

MR. N. D. ENNIS.

* Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Has a claim of N. D. Ennis, of Liverpool, for expenses for sending Scandinavian and Finn immigrants to Canada, amounting to £989 6s. 0d. or to any amount been received by the government?

2. If so, has it been entertained? If not, what are the reasons?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. No.

2. See answer to No. 1.

MR. JOHN JARDINE.

Mr. BARNARD:

'John Jardine, when he was elected in the Victoria 'Daily Times' of Wednesday, February 1, 1911, true?

'John Jardine, when he was elected in 1907, claimed that he lost work on account of his position as a Liberal representative. He appealed to the Public Works Department and was given work at the quarantine station. He was authorized to do work to a certain extent. He went on and did work and put in claims, I am speaking conservatively, to the extent of several thousands dollars in excess of the cost of the work he was authorized to do. He received that money without the knowledge of the Minister, and without the knowledge of the government.'

2. If the said statement is not correct, in what particulars is it untrue?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1.& 2. The extract in question appeared in the Victoria 'Times' of February 1, as part of a speech made by Mr. John Oliver on the evening previous. As to the statements that Jardine claimed that he lost work on account of his position as a Liberal representative and that consequently, he appealed for work to be given him at the quarantine station, these possibly may be facts of local knowledge, but the department has not been advised in respect thereto. Mr. Jardine was authorized by the agent at Victoria to do painting to a stated amount at Williams Head quarantine station and ignoring the instructions given him did work to an amount several thousand dollars in excess of what he was authorized to do.

RESIDENCE IN THE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

How many persons reside and sleep in the parliament buildings during the session, including the Senate, House of Commons and library of parliament, and what are the names of such persons?

Mr. OLIVER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

There are twenty-four persons who reside in the parliament buildings, not including the Senate, viz.: 22 in the House of Commons and 2 in the Library. The names are as follows:

The Speaker's Rooms: Mr. Speaker and Madame Marcil, Miss Clare Marcil, Mr. P. LaRoque (secretary), and Albina Gauthier (Ladies Maid).

The Deputy Speaker's Room: Mr. G. H. McIntyre.

The Sergeant-at-Arms' Rooms: Lt.-Col. H. R. Smith.

The Assistant Clerk's Rooms: Mr. J. B. R. La Plante.

The Housekeeper's Rooms: Mr. L. Dube, Mrs. Dube, Mr. A. Dube, Miss Dube and Miss R. Dube.

The Restaurant's Steward's Rooms: Mr. C. George, Mrs. George and three children.

The Speaker's Acting Steward's Rooms: Mr. E. Morin, Mrs. Morin and two children.

The Library: Mr. F. X. Desloges, caretaker, and wife.

As to the Senate, the authorities of the House have no information.

SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS.

Mr. McCRANEY:

Referring to the following question and the answer thereto reported in 'Hansard' of 8th February.

SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar):

What amount is still owing by the farmers of the west for seed wheat, oats, barley and flax supplied them by the government?'

Mr. OLIVER. On the 31st December, 1910, $195,444.49.

1. In what years were the advances referred to made, and what were the total amounts advanced in each year?

2. On what terms were such advances made, and what amount has been paid on each advance?

Mr. OLIVER:

1.

Year.	Total amount advanced.
1886-87-88	$ 98,499 39
1890	29,028 95
1894	45,817 31
1895	47,490 45
1896	25,999 32
1900	4,660 08
1901	28,042 14
1905	10,388 45
1908	401,621 76
1909	53,755 20
	$745,303 05

2. Interest at the rate of 6 per cent charged on all arrears due to 7th July, 1900, when the rate was reduced to 5 per cent by Act of parliament.

Year.	Amount repaid.
1886-87-88	$ 65,150 64
1890	30,781 16
1894	43,960 63
1895	47,664 60
1896	19,993 81
1900	4,571 10
1901	26,843 53
1905	8,361 38
1908	276,627 99
1909	25,903 72
	$549,858 56

REWARDS FOR SAVING LIFE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What are the names and addresses of all persons to whom rewards have been given by the government of Canada for saving life at sea during the five years ending December 31st, 1910?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Answer is as follows:

Names and addresses of persons to whom rewards have been given by the government of Canada for saving life at sea during the five years, ending December 31, 1910:

Felix Fraser, 30 North Bennet street, Boston, Mass.

W. W. Wilson, steamship 'Coastguard', Barrington, Nova Scotia.

Horatio H. Brammen, steamship 'Coastguard', Barrington, Nova Scotia.

Edgar Newell, steamship 'Coastguard', Barrington, Nova Scotia.

Edgar M. Brammen, steamship 'Coastguard', Barrington, Nova Scotia.

Reuben G. Penney, steamship 'Coastguard', Barrington, Nova Scotia.

L. F. Brammen, steamship 'Coastguard', Barrington, Nova Scotia.

Wm. Jouggren, steamship 'Coastguard', Barrington, Nova Scotia.

R. C. Maxwell, steamship 'Coastguard', Barrington, Nova Scotia.

Fred C. Smith, steamship 'Coastguard', Barrington, Nova Scotia.

A. West, British steamship 'Star of Australia', Belfast.

W. Brooks, British steamship 'Star of Australia', Belfast.

F. Mander, British steamship 'Star of Australia', Belfast.

Captain F. W. Ulyatt, British steamship 'Star of Australia', Belfast.

F. Simmons, British steamship 'Star of Australia', Belfast.

A. Larsen, British steamship 'Star of Australia', Belfast.

A. Halverson, British steamship 'Star of Australia', Belfast.

I. Mesner, British steamship 'Star of Australia', Belfast.

E. Johnson, British steamship 'Star of Australia', Belfast.

Captain Gibbons, steamship 'Ellen A. Swift,' Provincetown, Mass.

Joaquin J. Senna, steamship 'Ellen A. Swift', Provincetown, Mass.

Captain R. Prager, steamship 'Maine' New York, United States.

O. S. W. Freemen, steamship 'Maine', New York, United States.

J. Murray, steamship 'Maine', New York, United States.

E. Simpkin, steamship 'Maine' New York, United States.

S. Peterson, steamship 'Maine', New York, United States.

J. Holmes, steamship 'Maine', New York, United States.

William Calder, steamship 'Penelope,' Leith, Scotland.

Evan Owen, steamship 'Esmeraldas,' Liverpool, England.

Max Muttrick, 56 Ferdinands Strausse, Hamburg, Germany.

William Caddell, steamship 'Fifeshire,' Glasgow, Scotland.

Adam Winter, steamship 'Durango,' Sunderland, England.

Capt. S. W. Wilson, steamship 'Durango,' Sunderland, England.

Andreas Schau, steamship 'Mannheim,' Hamburg, Germany.

Max Scharf, steamship 'Mannheim,' Hamburg, Germany.

H. Oldenettal, steamship 'Mannheim,' Hamburg, Germany.

J. Treppa, steamship 'Mannheim,' Hamburg, Germany.

C. Reincke, steamship 'Mannheim,' Hamburg, Germany.

John Barber, Nichol street, Nanaimo, British Columbia.

James Norry, Nichol street, Nanaimo, British Columbia.

Thomas Wilson, Nanaimo, British Columbia.

Henry Allen, schooner 'Muriel,' Lunenburg, Nova Scotia.

Paul Nowe, schooner 'Muriel,' Lunenburg, Nova Scotia.

Capt. S. Ferjesen, Norwegian barque 'Pestalozzi,' Lillesand.

Austin Grady, East Baltic, Prince Edward Island.

Duncan Campbell, Duncan's Cove, Nova Scotia.

J. M. Greenshields, steamship 'Joan,' Nanaimo, British Columbia.

H. R. Brown, steamship 'Frederick,' Savannah, Georgia.

P. A. Hudgins, steamship 'Frederick,' Savannah, Georgia.

Capt. Tyler, steamship 'Frederick,' Savannah, Georgia.

A. J. Corimer, Magdalen Islands,

Jos. Reneaud, Magdalen Islands.

Joseph Corimer, Magdalen Islands.

Simon Corimer, Magdalen Islands.

Collis Arseneau, Magdalen Islands.

Cleophas Arseneau, Magdalen Islands.
Cyrice Reneaud, Magdalen Islands.
Obin Lapièrre, Magdalen Islands.
Mrs. Paterson, Cape Beal, British Columbia.
Mrs. McKay, Cape Beal, British Columbia.
Michael McDougall, Cape North, Nova Scotia.
Allan McDougall, Cape North, Nova Scotia.
Frederick Chester, Sarnia, Ontario.
Charles McLeod, Sarnia, Ontario.
Capt. C. Gjeruldsen, Norwegian ship 'Prudhoe,' Arendal, Norway.
N. McIntosh, Souris, Prince Edward Island.
M. Cheverie, Souris, Prince Edward Island.
Joseph Goulet, C. G. S. 'Arctic.'
John Livingston, Big Bras d'Or, Cape Breton.
Caut. J. McCranhan, Margaretsfield, Nova Scotia.
Capt. A. Munroe, steamship 'Ada Mildred,' Whitehead, Nova Scotia.
Bryon Scott, steamship 'Ada Mildred,' Whitehead, Nova Scotia.
John McKinley, steamship 'Ada Mildred,' Whitehead, Nova Scotia.
Harry Baker, steamship 'Ada Mildred,' Whitehead, Nova Scotia.
Capt. John Band, steamship 'Cairnsila,' Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Captain Smith, steamship 'Cairnsila,' Newcastle-on-Tyne.
J. Smith, steamship 'Cairnsila,' Newcastle-on-Tyne.
P. Johansen, steamship 'Cairnsila,' Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Charles Carlson, steamship 'Cairnsila,' Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Whilhelm Bushon, steamship 'Cairnsila,' Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Paul Swanson, steamship 'Cairnsila,' Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Capt. J. Cornulussen, Norwegian steamship 'Farmand.'
Capt. H. E. Lundbon, steamship 'Amphitrite.'
J. C. Wilson, steamship 'Amphitrite.'
L. Van Gelder, steamship 'Amphitrite.'
W. Smidt, steamship 'Amphitrite.'
W. Berg, steamship 'Amphitrite.'
H. R. Larsen, steamship 'Amphitrite.'
G. Hareside, steamship 'Amphitrite.'
John L. McPhee, Little Bras d'Or, Nova Scotia.
John Shubbert, Little Bras d'Or, Nova Scotia.
Captain E. Curry, Harbourville, Nova Scotia.
Capt. J. B. Morris, Harbourville, Nova Scotia.
Ingram Canners, Harbourville, Nova Scotia
Freeman Marshall, Harbourville, Nova Scotia.

William Laruses, Dingwall Harbour, Nova Scotia.
Arthur Gwinn, Dingwall Harbour, Nova Scotia.
Schiaffino, steamship 'America,' Italy.
Emanuele Fulle, steamship 'America,' Italy.
De Pasquale Nicola, steamship 'America,' Italy.
Collis Arseneau, Magdalen Islands.
Cleophas Arseneau, Magdalen Islands.
Cyrice Renaud, Magdalen Islands.
Obin Lapièrre, Magdalen Islands.
Capt. A. Munroe, Whitehead, Nova Scotia.
H. P. Munroe, Whitehead, Nova Scotia.
M. Munroe, Whitehead, Nova Scotia.
E. Munroe, Whitehead, Nova Scotia.
Wm. Munroe, Whitehead, Nova Scotia.
P. Levanson, Whitehead, Nova Scotia.
F. P. Leay, Whitehead, Nova Scotia.
A. Munroe, Whitehead, Nova Scotia.
Capt. F. Benson, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
Jos. Hatt, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
Jas. Dalgall, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
George Russell, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
Guy Benson, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
Capt. L. Wilson, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
Jack Wilson, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
Arthur Wilson, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
Leonard Benn, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
Geo. Stuart, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
Horace Schofield, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
Turner Ingalls, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
Ashton Guptill, Seal Cove, Grand Manan.
Theo. Rooney, St. Andrews, New Brunswick.
Capt. D. Rooney, Cobourg, Ontario.
J. Lavis, Cobourg, Ontario.
J. Markey, Cobourg, Ontario.
M. McMann, Cobourg, Ontario.
F. McMann, Cobourg, Ontario.
O. Markey, Cobourg, Ontario.
H. Rooney, Jr., Cobourg, Ontario.
Capt. A. Robinson, Cobourg, Ontario.
J. Rooney, Cobourg, Ontario.
J. McMann, Cobourg, Ontario.
C. McMann, Cobourg, Ontario.
Wm. Butler, Cobourg, Ontario.
John Holland, Duncan's Cove, Nova Scotia.
Thomas McNeil, Duncan's Cove, Nova Scotia.
Charles M. Holland, Duncan's Cove, Nova Scotia.
Charles Holland, Duncan's Cove, Nova Scotia.
Lawrence Johnson, Duncan's Cove, Nova Scotia.
Gasper Johnson, Duncan's Cove, Nova Scotia.
M. Welcher, Duncan's Cove, Nova Scotia.
Thomas Holland, Duncan's Cove, Nova Scotia.

B. Johnson, Duncan's Cove, Nova Scotia.
John C. Welcher, Duncan's Cove, Nova Scotia.

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Has the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company bought out the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company?
2. If so, what was the date and terms of the transfer?
3. Has the sum of $50,000, or any sum, been paid to the labourers between Caplin and New Carlisle?
4. Was not some provision made in a statute touching the above named companies, or one of them, that this sum should be paid to the labourers aforesaid?
5. What amount is owing to the labourers and why is their pay withheld?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The Department of Railways and Canals have no knowledge of the purchase of the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway by the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Answered by number 1.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ICE CONTRACT.

Mr. MONK:

1. Who obtained the contract for this year, 1911, for supplying ice to the Intercolonial at the stations at Rivière du Loup and Ste. Flavie?
2. At how much per ton did the contractor engage to furnish the ice for the two stations in question in the terms of his tender?
3. How much a ton was he paid during the season in question for the ice at the two stations above mentioned?
4. Who was the lowest tenderer in each case?
5. Did Mr. Polycarp Ouellet, of Rivière du Loup, tender for the ice at each of these stations, and what was his price per ton of ice in each case?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Phillippe Pouliot, Rivière du Loup, province of Quebec.
2. (a) For Rivière du Loup at 65 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds, packed in icehouse as required by the railway. (b) For Ste. Flavie, at 65 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds. packed in the icehouse as required by the railway. In this case (Ste. Flavie) the railway supplying cars for the transportation of the ice from Rivière du Loup to Ste. Flavie, and furnishing transportation for two men from Rivière du Loup to Ste. Flavie and return.
3. No payment has as yet been made.
4. In the case of Rivière du Loup the two lowest tenderers quoted the same price, namely Philippe Pouliot and J. B. Pelletier, Rivière du Loup; in the case of Ste. Flavie, Philippe Pouliot was the lowest.
5. Yes. For Rivière du Loup at 75 cents per ton, and for Ste. Flavie at 75½ cents per ton.

GASPE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MONK:

1. What amount has the county of Gaspé contributed to the postal revenue during the last financial year, or during the last five financial years?
2. Is the Postmaster General informed that, since the 30th January last up to the 5th February instant, Percé, the county town of the county of Gaspé, where the sittings of the Superior Court and the Circuit Court are held, and where the registry office is located, is said to have been without any communication with the postal system served by the Intercolonial?
3. Does the minister know that the storm which raged in the Quebec district, in the interval between these two dates, was but very little felt in the district of Gaspé, and especially that the traffic by horses and conveyances was not interrupted for a single day?
4. Is the railway company which carries the mails between Metapedia and Grande Rivière, eighteen miles from Percé, equipped so as to operate its trains in bad as well as in good weather?
5. Why did it not carry the mails during that period?
6. If this company could not operate its trains, why were the mails not carried by conveyances?
7. Is the minister informed that on the 5th February instant, the mails finally carried by this railway company, as alleged, reached Grande Rivière, eighteen miles from Percé, about five o'clock in the afternoon?
8. Is the minister informed that these mails afterwards only reached Percé on the next day near noon, that is to say, more than eighteen hours late?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Revenue of post offices in the electoral district of Gaspé, Quebec, during the following years: Year ended 30th June, 1906, $9,437.13; Nine months ended 31st March, 1907, $7,844.10; Year ended 31st March, 1908, $11,380.53 ; Year ended 31st March, 1909, $11,531.97; Year ended 31st March, 1910, $13,383.38.
2. Yes.
3. The department is informed, on the most reliable authority, that the storm which raged in the Quebec district raged with equal violence in the district of Gaspé, and was one of the most violent storms experienced in that part of the country for years, and that the traffic by horses and conveyances was seriously interrupted.
4. Yes.
5. Trains were stalled owing to snow blockades on the railway.
6. Weather conditions made same impossible. No one could be induced to furnish necessary vehicles.

7 and 8. Advice received that eastbound train on Quebec Oriental railway ran off track at Ruisseau Le Blanc, Friday evening, February 3. Mails were forwarded eastward in vehicle as far as New Carlisle and thence by train to Grande Rivière, reaching the latter point at 8.40 p.m. on the 4th of February, and Percé the following day at noon.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LALOR :

1. How many persons are in the railway mail service who have not passed the qualifying examination?
2. When were they appointed and what was the reason for their appointment?

Mr. LEMIEUX :

No. 1 and 2. The following is a list of the railway mail service employees who have not passed the qualifying examinations, together with the date of reporting for duty in each case :

Nova Scotia District (8)—
H. R. Daley, railway mail clerk, 9th February, 1907.
C. F. Lovett, railway mail clerk, 22nd April, 1907.
H. J. McGillivray, railway mail clerk, 3rd July, 1907.
F. W. Hope, railway mail clerk, 26th October, 1907.
W. L. Totten, railway mail clerk, 8th November, 1907.
H. McK. Ross, railway mail clerk, 5th June, 1908.
E. P. Jackson, railway mail clerk, 5th April, 1910.
H. B. McKinnon, railway mail clerk, 10th June, 1910.

St. John District (7)—
W. E. Brown, railway mail clerk, 3rd August, 1907.
H. R. Barnes, railway mail clerk, 30th August, 1907.
G. C. Somers, railway mail clerk, 19th February, 1908.
H. A. Higgins, railway mail clerk, 8th December, 1908.
B. Wishart, railway mail clerk, 16th February, 1909.
G. P. Coleman, railway mail clerk, 31st January, 1910.
A. F. Pearson, railway mail clerk, 15th March, 1910.

Quebec District (13)—
Mrs. M. C. L. Dussault, office clerk, 19th March, 1908.
J. F. A. Beauchamp, office clerk, 7th September, 1908.
C. E. de Lottinville, office clerk, 27th March, 1909.
Joseph Beaulieu, railway mail clerk, 25th June, 1907.
J. P. MacDermott, railway mail clerk, 21st December, 1907.
J. A. Daignault, railway mail clerk, 30th March, 1908.
P. Perrault, railway mail clerk, 13th August, 1908.
J. G. Dumont, railway mail clerk, 3rd February, 1909.
E. Reny, railway mail clerk, 19th March, 1909.
P. Veilleux, railway mail clerk, 27th June, 1910.
J. P. O'Farrell, railway mail clerk, 30th June, 1910.
J. A. U. Pare, railway mail clerk, 5th September, 1910.
J. A. E. Allard, railway mail clerk, 13th October, 1910.

Montreal District (18)—
W. P. Guilfoyle, office clerk, 13th October, 1908.
A. A. Marcile, office clerk, 4th May, 1910.
J. I. Lenoir, railway mail clerk, 29th October, 1906.
J. Labreche-Viger, railway mail clerk, 5th June, 1907.
M. J. Mullally, railway mail clerk, 20th June, 1907.
J. H. Letellier, railway mail clerk, 18th February, 1908.
J. E. R. Roux, railway mail clerk, 31st March, 1908.
J. H. Duval, railway mail clerk, 6th May, 1908.
M. Lafleur, railway mail clerk, 2nd June, 1908.
G. C. Elliott, railway mail clerk, 26th June, 1908.
A. Buies, railway mail clerk, 15th October, 1908.
N. Bezier, railway mail clerk, 10th December, 1908.
L. P. Bédard, railway mail clerk, 16th July, 1908.
S. Marion, railway mail clerk, 19th July, 1909.
R. Lamarche, railway mail clerk, 31st August, 1909.
A. Bouchard, railway mail clerk, 14th February, 1910.
J. E. Poitras, railway mail clerk, 18th April, 1910.
L. Proulx, railway mail clerk, 30th August, 1910.

Ottawa District (14)—
C. J. Ward, office clerk, 27th December, 1906.
J. I. Danis, railway mail clerk, 15th February, 1906.
G. C. Fredenburg, railway mail clerk, 2nd December, 1907.
R. G. Courtney, railway mail clerk, 26th March, 1909.
A. Goulet, railway mail clerk, 9th June, 1909.
L. E. Galipeau, railway mail clerk, 28th June, 1909.
R. E. Mallette, railway mail clerk, 23rd August, 1909.

C. Clancy, railway mail clerk, 2nd September, 1909.
M. Sullivan, railway mail clerk, 8th November, 1909.
A. A. A. McDonnell, railway mail clerk, 8th November, 1909.
D. J. Bourdeau, railway mail clerk, 16th March, 1910.
P. Gosselin, railway mail clerk, 15th August, 1910.
T. P. McNulty, railway mail clerk, 6th September, 1910.
F. A. Morin, railway mail clerk, 11th November, 1910.
Toronto District (14)—
C. M. Patmore, railway mail clerk, 17th September, 1907.
A. A. Allaire, railway mail clerk, 20th August, 1908.
J. H. Johnston, railway mail clerk, 2nd October, 1908.
W. R. Brooks, railway mail clerk, 23rd November, 1908.
M. Doody, railway mail clerk, 27th November, 1908.
J. A. Macdonald, railway mail clerk, 9th June, 1910.
R. C. Savage, railway mail clerk, 13th July, 1910.
J. E. Brown, railway mail clerk, 29th October, 1910.
A. S. Young, railway mail clerk, 5th November, 1910.
J. S. Coleman, railway mail clerk, 22nd November, 1910.
D. L. McKinnon, railway mail clerk, 28th November, 1910.
F. E. Ross, railway mail clerk, 12th December, 1910.
William Carr, railway mail clerk, 16th January, 1911.
D. A. Black, railway mail clerk, 23rd January, 1911.
London District (4)—
P. Dungey, railway mail clerk, 31st July, 1907.
E. B. Palmer, railway mail clerk, 16th November, 1908.
J. E. McDonald, railway mail clerk, 4th May, 1909.
D. S. Merrifield, railway mail clerk, 10th February, 1911.
Winnipeg District (22)—
Miss K. Adair, office clerk, 18th July, 1905.
J. Marshall, railway mail clerk, 11th July, 1905.
S. A. McCulloch, railway mail clerk, 11th August, 1906.
R. E. Hammill, railway mail clerk, 10th August, 1907.
J. R. Williamson, railway mail clerk, 4th June, 1908.
J. G. Davidson, railway mail clerk, 11th December, 1908.
B. Craddock, railway mail clerk, 8th February, 1908.
A. Paulson, railway mail clerk, 10th June, 1908.
S. Bruce, railway mail clerk, 14th June, 1908.
J. A. Bourbonnais, railway mail clerk, 9th October, 1908.
J. F. Brown, railway mail clerk, 20th October, 1908.
J. R. Leitch, railway mail clerk, 25th January, 1910.
H. H. Curtis, railway mail clerk, 10th March, 1910.
E. Hebert, railway mail clerk, 29th March, 1910.
A. Lecerte, railway mail clerk, 9th June, 1910.
W. E. Froome, railway mail clerk, 20th July, 1910.
P. J. Theobald, railway mail clerk, 11th August, 1910.
C. W. Baskerville, railway mail clerk, 23rd November, 1910.
W. Taylor, railway mail clerk, 28 November, 1910.
M. P. Dufault, railway mail clerk, 28th November, 1910.
T. G. Clarke, railway mail clerk, 29th November, 1910.
C. J. Dillon, railway mail clerk, 29th November, 1910.
Calgary District (15)—
Miss G. McTavish, office clerk, 5th August, 1909.
James McQueen, office clerk, 1st February, 1910.
H. H. Gray, railway mail clerk, 13th April, 1907.
H. A. Tait, railway mail clerk, 8th June, 1909.
A. Steurmer, railway mail clerk, 17th August, 1909.
F. G. Hannam, railway mail clerk, 17th January, 1910.
I. H. Gent, railway mail clerk, 5th April, 1910.
L. D. Atkins, railway mail clerk, 29th June, 1910.
C. E. Scantlebury, railway mail clerk, 2nd July, 1910.
E. V. Critchley, railway mail clerk, 8th July, 1910.
J. Letawsky, railway mail clerk, 15th July, 1910.
A. Koberstein, railway mail clerk, 20th November, 1910.
D. L. Moor, railway mail clerk, 7th December, 1910.
P. Durant, railway mail clerk, 21st December, 1910.
W. A. B. Phillips, railway mail clerk, 22nd December, 1910.
Moosejaw District (10)—
Miss B. Brigham, office clerk, 20th December, 1910.
Joseph Niowat, railway mail clerk, 19th May, 1909.
H. A. Macdonald, railway mail clerk, 26th August, 1909.

H. Revill, railway mail clerk, 30th June, 1910.
G. H. Larner, railway mail clerk, 29th July, 1910.
E. Cameron, railway mail clerk, 24th October, 1910.
E. C. Potts, railway mail clerk, 10th December, 1910.
G. C. Rose, railway mail clerk, 13th January, 1911.
F. M. Orchard, railway mail clerk, 13th January, 1911.
G. H. Manahan, railway mail clerk, 11th April, 1910.
Vancouver District (7)—
H. G. Ferguson, railway mail clerk, 15th October, 1906.
S. G. Ross, railway mail clerk, 26th February, 1910.
Tom Marshall, railway mail clerk, 21st March, 1910.
Ed. Hart, railway mail clerk, 29th June, 1910.
E. V. Willis, railway mail clerk, 19th July, 1910.
W. Sayer, railway mail clerk, 26th July, 1910.
J. A. McLeod, railway mail clerk, 14th December, 1910.

The above acting railway mail clerks were employed owing to the fact that it was impossible to get men who had passed the qualifying civil service examinations, and the service had to be maintained in the public interest. These people are only temporary employees, and have been notified that in order to retain their positions they must comply with the law and pass the qualifying examination.

BRONTE HARBOUR MASTER.

Mr. HENDERSON:

1. What is the name of the harbour master at Bronte?
2. What salary or allowance was paid to such harbour master for the year ending 31st March, 1910?
3. What was the total sum collected as harbour dues at Bronte for the said year?
4. What other moneys, if any, were collected by the said harbour master for the government in the same year at Bronte?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. James J. Wilson.
2. $2.00.
3. $2.00
4. $67.00.

ACCIDENTS TO RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. What are the names of the railway mail clerks who were injured or killed in railway accidents, to whom, or to whose families, a compassionate grant has been made since 1896?
2. Were such grants made in any case or cases in which there was recourse, or in which recourse was believed to exist, for damages against the railway company, on whose line the accident took place?
3. Has such a grant been made or recommended to be made in the case of R. E. Curran, a mail clerk, who was fatally injured in an accident at Owen Sound on 29th May, 1908?
4. Is it the intention of the government to carry out the policy with respect to compassionate allowances inaugurated or recommended by Sir William Mulock, formerly Postmaster General?
5. If it is the intention of the government to repudiate this policy, have the railway mail clerks, generally been so advised, so as to enable them to procure accident insurance, or make other provision against accident?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. The widow of John Campbell, killed in February, 1889, was granted $2,000 compassionate allowance in 1900, as she had no recourse against the railway.

The widow of Walter Starkey, killed in a railway accident, was granted $2,000 compassionate allowance in 1901 as she had no recourse against railway company.

F. W. Blizard was injured in a railway accident on the 29th January, 1897, and was granted $2,000 in 1901, for medical attendance and personal injuries sustained while on duty.

The exact extent of Mr. Blizard's injuries was not known until it was to late to take action against the railway.

M. W. Sloan was injured in a railway accident on the 15th November, 1898, and settled with the railway company for a very small amount before the actual extent of his injuries was known. He was paid $2,224.51, to cover what he would have earned in mileage had he been continuously on duty from the 16th January, 1898, to the 21st January, 1904.

The widow of J. O'Connor, who died as a result of injuries sustained in a railway accident, was granted $2,000 compassionate allowance in 1899, on account of having no recourse against the railway.

2. No, except in case of railway mail clerk M. W. Sloan, of the Toronto district, who settled with the railway company for a very small amount before the result of his injuries was definitely determined.

3. The widow was quite aware that she had recourse at law against the railway and the department had reason to know that she received compensation for her husband's death.

4. & 5. The department is not aware of any policy other than that of considering each case on its merits. The railway mail clerks are perfectly aware of their rights in these cases, and are quite capable of enforcing them. The question of accident insurance is one entirely for their own decision.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Was William D. Tye, a railway mail clerk, killed in an accident near Paris, on or about 4th February, 1911?
2. What is the amount of contributions paid by the said William D. Tye, in his lifetime, to the superannuation fund?
3. What claim has the estate of the said Tye got on account of such contribution?
4. Is it the intention of the government to place in the estimates or supplementary estimates, the sum of $2,000, as a compassionate allowance for the family of the said William D. Tye?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Yes.
2. $530.85.
3. None under the Superannuation Act.
4. The question will be dealt with in accordance with the policy of the department to treat all cases on their merits.

POST OFFICE COLLECTIONS IN CITIES.

Mr. MACDONELL:

What was the post office revenue and the customs revenue, respectively, for the years from 1906 to 1910, both inclusive, for the following cities:—Winnipeg, Vancouver, Ottawa, Calgary, Quebec, Victoria, Hamilton, Halifax, St. John, N.B., Edmonton, London, Regina, Brandon, Lethbridge, Saskatoon and Brantford?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

—	1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.
Winnipeg	$419,012 32	$374,020 23	$555,466 89	$580,385 74	$695,051 27
Vancouver	121,083 57	111,975 72	191,703 14	205,935 18	257,361 64
Ottawa	139,067 79	125,059 48	188,261 95	199,394 13	210,139 25
Calgary	53,408 73	53,346 88	90,941 05	99,070 84	125,749 04
Quebec	106,899 03	87,077 35	125,480 90	152,324 15	146,650 21
Victoria	61,466 75	53,465 83	84,769 67	88,895 07	96,807 55
Hamilton	150,966 03	125,711 60	183,585 28	184,746 09	202,921 50
Halifax	98,998 37	77,691 33	108,888 91	113,555 07	114,318 25
St. John, N. B	96,340 82	78,595 56	107,738 22	109,990 47	111,074 34
Edmonton	25,494 03	34,459 45	58,801 51	67,713 26	75,046 89
London	122,442 67	99,869 76	142,422 58	141,895 19	145,250 72
Regina	37,510 53	35,656 75	61,000 04	71,662 39	83,570 72
Brandon	35,974 88	32,703 36	45,960 97	48,307 98	53,299 36
Lethbridge	9,042 80	8,107 56	14,541 94	19,816 77	28,216 69
Saskatoon	9,985 76	11,619 82	17,711 21	25,344 80	37,204 04
Brantford	48,510 02	37,328 29	53,656 27	51,969 23	52,778 05

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS COMMISSION.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. What persons have the government appointed as members of the Canadian section of the International Waterways Commission, and what are the names and dates of appointment of each?
2. What sums of money have been paid to such persons, respectively, for salary or remuneration for their services, what sums of money have been paid for the expenses of such persons, and what are the amounts paid respectively to each?
3. What have been the total expenses to date of the Canadian section of this commission?
4. What services has the commission performed to date?
5. What services is it expected that the commission, as at present constituted, will perform in the future?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

I, William F. King appointed 3rd December, 1903, resigned March, 1907. James Mabee, K.C., appointed 7th January, 1905, resigned 21st November, 1905. Louis Coste, appointed 7th January, 1905. George C. Gibbons, K.C., appointed 21st November, 1905. W. J. Stewart, appointed March 1907.

2.

—	Services.	Travelling expenses and outlay.	Total.
J. P. Mabee	3,650 00	523 66	4,173 66
G. C. Gibbons	16,450 00	3,522 94	19,972 94
Louis Coste	9,276 03	4,330 15	13,606 18
W. F. King	3,800 00	1,374 43	5,174 43
Wm. J. Stewart	2,008 93	1,763 47	3,772 40
Total	$35,184 96	$11,514 65	$46,699 61

3. $118,329.64.
4. Full report published in volume 2 of Public Works Annual Report, 1906. Later, the delimitation of the boundary on Lakes Erie and Ontario; investigation of proposed dam at Long Sault Rapids and other words as reported to parliament at different times.
5. The present commission will be superseded by a permanent commission when the Bill now before parliament has been passed.

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND MAINLAND.

Mr. A. B. WARBURTON (Queens, P.E.I.) moved:

For a copy of all reports, correspondence and documents, not always brought down, including report of survey made in 1909 of the harbour of Cape John and Tatamagouche bay, in the counties of Pictou and Colchester in the province of Nova Scotia, relating to the route of the winter steamers between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada, and suggesting or recommending a change or changes on such route, and an increase in the number of trips daily of such winter steamers; also a copy of all similar papers, not already brought down, relating to the route of the summer mail steamers between Charlottetown and the mainland of Canada, and suggesting a change in that route, and an increase in the number of trips daily; and also with regard to connecting such suggested route with a point on the Intercolonial railway. Also for a copy of all such similar papers, if any, relating to or suggesting the route between Cape Traverse in Prince Edward Island and Cape Tormentine in the mainland, as a route for the winter and summer steamers. Also for a copy of all reports, papers and correspondence relating to additional or improved aids to navigation of the harbour of Charlottetown and entrance thereto and in Tatamagouche bay and harbour.

He said: In bringing this resolution before the House I desire to make a few remarks. On previous occasions I have brought this question before parliament. It may be wearisome to hon. members of this House to hear this matter brought up periodically, but there is no other way open to me to obtain the object I have in view. I must press upon the attention of the House the difficulties with which we have to contend in Prince Edward Island, and try to enlist the sympathy of the government and of the House in an effort to remove those difficulties. Last year I went into this subject with considerable detail, pointing out the various routes which were possibly available for carrying on a winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I also went at considerable detail into the nature of the topography of the harbour on the Prince Edward Island side, that is the Charlottetown harbour, which I think is the best harbour on that side of the straits for the purpose of winter communication. I do not propose to go into that branch of the subject again this afternoon with the same detail that I did last year, but for the purpose of my argument it will be necessary for me to touch upon it. I wish to point out that the channel leading into Charlottetown, about five miles from where it leaves deep water in the Straits of Northumberland is a couple of miles wide, but it gradually narrows until it gets to the mouth of the harbour where it is a third of a mile wide. The depth of water varies from 37 feet to 75 feet, a depth ample for any ship that floats. There is plenty of water there to prevent the ice from grounding and the ice never does ground. In addition to that, there are three rivers flowing into the Charlottetown harbour, which has an entrance of a quarter or third of a mile, and as the tide ebbs and flows twice a day, it creates very powerful currents. There is a current sweeping in and out of that harbour at that channel, which keeps it pretty free from ice. As I pointed out last year, for winter purposes, and also for summer purposes, owing to the larger ships that now come there in the summer time than formerly came, some improvements are required to aid navigation. In the winter, of course, the bell buoys have to be taken up, they cannot be left out: consequently vessels plying there in winter have no buoys to guide them in coming in or going out of the harbour. Most all of the time they can manage very well without these buoys, but if by any chance vessels require to come in at night, there might be some difficulty, although even at night it would not be so bad. But occasionally, as I pointed out last year, as the weather changes, as the weather gets colder than the water, or warmer than the water, the change in temperature causes a haze to rise sufficiently high above the water, on a fine day, to interfere with navigators seeing the lights on the land itself. It is a matter of rare occurrence, this year and last year it did not happen at all, and it only occurs once in a while. But for all purposes, in the summer as well as in the winter, some improved aids to navigation are required. One that I suggested last year has been made, that is, the placing of a gun on St. Peter's island on the right hand side of the harbour, where one has now been established. In addition, the Board of Trade have been urging the erection of a light-house at the extreme outer or eastern end of St. Peter's island bar. I think there is a better place still. There is a bank or mound of sandstone at a considerable further distance out, almost at the edge of the channel coming into Charlottetown, upon which there are only nine feet of water and upon which a light-house if built, would answer all purposes. Probably the department would be able to abolish some of the lights there which are now to be found lighting the entrance of that harbour.

We had a water survey made I believe a year, or a year and a half ago, in the summer of 1909, of Tatamagouche bay on the Nova Scotia side, directly opposite Charlottetown. I may say that the distance from wharf to wharf, from the Charlottetown wharf and the wharf that could be built in deep water in Tatamagouche bay either on the Colchester side, or the Pictou side, would only be some 25 miles. I am in-

formed, and I think I can say with certainty, that the survey made there found a depth of 30 feet of water on the Cape John or Pictou side of that bay, and a depth of 27 feet on the Colchester side. Whichever side is chosen for a pier to connect with that line of railway, I am informed that a wharf not exceeding 1,200 feet in length would be ample in order to reach this deep water. I brought this matter of Tatamagouche bay up last year, and objection was taken by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that it would require an immense amount of dredging. I think my hon. friend had not taken the precaution to acquaint himself with the conditions of Tatamagouche bay, or he would scarcely have made that remark. But his statement uncontradicted is liable to create prejudice against this route. Now, the very fact that the water on one side of that bay is 27 feet in depth, and on the other side 30 feet, and that the channel from the mainland through the Straits is of not less a depth than that, is in itself a sufficient answer to anv objection that dredging would be required there. The winter steamers never require more than 20 feet of water, as they draw only 17½ to 18 feet, so there would be a depth of some two feet more than would be required under any circumstances. I wish to emphasize the fact that dredging could not be required on account of the depth of water. I do so for the reason that persistent efforts have been made to prejudice and belittle this route by making out that such dredging would be required. A year ago the department very properly undertook to investigate the ice conditions in Tatamagouche bay, and in the winter of 1909-10, I believe that investigations were carried on there to see what those ice conditions were. It so happened that the winter of 1909-10 was an exceptionally mild one, there was very little ice, and I have no doubt that an investigation held under those conditions would not be as satisfactory as if it were held when there was more ice. Almost every winter there was more ice than there was that year, there must be much more ice now, and I would like to have an investigation made under the worst conditions as well as under the best. The tides in the Straits of Northumberland at either end are very swift. They meet in the centre and when they ebb or flow they do so at a rate varying from three to four knots. It so happens that they practically meet in the neighbourhood of Tatamagouche bay, and at that particular part the tide runs at a rate of half a knot which is almost still water.

When I took this matter up the year before last and last year I had to encounter the opposition—I do not blame him for it—of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). This question of winter navigation has been brought up time and again, although I do not think that until I took it up in the first session of this parliament the route which I am now advocating and have advocated continuously had been seriously taken in hand. Other routes have been tested, but this has not been, and I wish to point out that, owing to the short distance across Tatamagouche bay, laying directly opposite Charlottetown, very much less time would be required in making the trip across there, and the difficulties which have arisen this winter, as they have arisen regularly, would not arise. Steamers running to and fro between Prince Edward Island and the mainland occasionally encounter a snow storm, or mist, just after leaving the harbour, and you cannot expect any vessel to pursue her way in the ice when there is a snowstorm. But the distance between Tatamagouche and Charlottetown harbour is so short—it is only 25 miles from Charlottetown wharf to the proposed wharf in Tatamagouche bay, and not more than 18 or 20 miles from land to land—that a ship, such as the 'Earl Grey,' leaving Charlottetown would be able to cross from shore to shore, from harbour to harbour, in an hour and a half or less; in fact, she would get inside the entrance to the harbour in an hour. Any captain with his eyes open could tell, before starting, if he had time to make the short run from harbour to harbour, and under these circumstances it would be possible to obviate any condition which would cause harm or danger. The objection raised last year, as in fact, every year, was that the members from Prince Edward Island are not agreed upon the course that should be taken in this matter. While the members from Prince Edward Island sometimes do not see eye to eye upon all questions, there are some matters upon which they do see eye to eye. The hon. member for Pictou last year took this matter up and pointed out that he would like to see the members from Prince Edward Island agree on this question. At page 3192 of 'Hansard,' my hon. friend was good enough to say:

> I have not heard the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who come from east of the island, but I venture the prediction that they will not agree with my hon. friend from Queens in the proposition that the present winter port should be changed and that a new and experimental route should be established between Charlottetown and Tatamagouche.

The hon. gentleman did not remain in his seat to hear the reply, but the hon. member from Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Fraser), who represents the eastern end of Prince Edward Island, spoke upon that occasion, and he spoke very strongly, He said, as reported at page 3197 of 'Hansard' of last year:

I will not say much as to the relative advantages of the different ports on the mainland, because I do not pretend to have as much knowledge of the Brulé route as those gentlemen possess who have made a special study of this question. But I want to tell the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), who I see is not in his seat, that if there is one thing upon which the people of Prince Edward Island are united, it is in the opinion that the Pictou harbour is the poorest harbour on the mainland for winter navigation. Let the government make no mistake on that point. The hon. member for Pictou almost taunted us to-night because we were not unanimous upon any route; but we are unanimous in the belief that the Pictou harbour offers the poorest harbour for winter navigation of any that can be mentioned. Let the government take that much for granted. Then I trust they will go on and make a good survey, and obtain sufficient knowledge to enable them to give us a better harbour. This is not my opinion only. I have studied the records and the reports of the surveyors that have been sent down by this government and by other governments, and I find there is a unanimous expression of opinion from these surveyors in their reports that Pictou harbour, on account of its shape and its situation, is certainly the least feasible on the mainland for winter navigation. It is a V-shaped harbour, opening towards the northeast, and without any protection whatever. When the northeast and easterly winds blow the ice into that harbour, the whole harbour is blocked with ice, and navigation is completely stopped.

Other members from Prince Edward Island agree upon that point. So that the objections raised to this change based upon the disagreement of Prince Edward Island members, or people, are not well taken, and there is a unanimity of opinion as to the undesirability of Pictou as a winter harbour. We all agree upon that point. I must say that although the hon. member for Kings does not hold the same political views that I do, when he took that ground he took a very manly ground, because he knew that he was, to some extent, antagonizing some of his warm political friends. I must say that I compliment him for the courage and manliness displayed by him in expressing a view which I know he honestly and conscientiously held. But I have spoken upon this question on two previous occasions at some length, and the reply that I had from the hon. member for Pictou last year, in defence of Pictou harbour, was given us in a rather superior sort of way. He informed us that men living on the mainland had a practical knowledge of the conditions subsisting there, that we poor unsophisticated Prince Edward Islanders could not have a practical knowledge of the conditions, although we had crossed year after year, and that we could not know or speak about the actual conditions of the ice in the Straits of Northumberland. We have crossed and have been stuck in the straits time and time again, but he said that we could not know and speak about those conditions as could those living on the mainland, who never had crossed there at all. That seemed to be the inference to be drawn from his remarks. As a matter of fact, we, the people of Prince Edward Island, are compelled to have a practical knowledge of those conditions, because this matter of winter communication is one of the most vital questions which concern us. Any man living on Prince Edward Island who moves about at all, who does not know more about the conditions of ice to be encountered in crossing these straits than any man on the mainland must be a person of very weak intelligence. But while my hon. friend was talking about these conditions and about the superior knowledge of gentlemen living on the mainland, he, in that very same speech, showed conclusively that he himself did not understand or know the conditions which frequently exist in the very harbour upon which he lives. I will show that. My hon. friend, replying to me and seeking to minimize the force of my argument, stated ('Hansard,' 1909-10, page 3192):

> I am surprised that my hon. friend should once more undertake to entertain the House about this imaginary ice bar that forms in front of the mouth of the Pictou harbour. I was born in the little town of Pictou and have lived there some 40 years. Only once in all the years during which communication has been maintained from that place with Prince Edward Island has an ice barrier existed there at the time of winter navigation. Since that accidental circumstance which occurred some years ago hon. gentlemen in discussing this question have talked about it as if it were a permanent and continuous obstruction that came as sure as the winter came. Any hon. gentleman who wants to make an argument for better facilities for Prince Edward Island, whether by increased facilities or a change of route, and who rests his argument upon the basis which has no existence in fact and which is an accidental circumstance which should not be used as the basis of any argument for a change in the conditions of affairs.

The statement made here is that only once in forty years has a vessel crossing from Prince Edward Island been held up by ice at Pictou harbour. I do not know what the experience of gentlemen on the mainland may be, but I have a very practical and prolonged experience from which I can cite many instances of navigation being held up at Pictou harbour. In 1873, when I was returning from college, I was stuck for four days in the ice off Pictou harbour, in a sailing ship, but of course a sailing ship could not be expected to get through when a reasonably strong steamer could, and I merely mention the incident merely as an illustration of my experience. I can fairly claim to have as much knowledge of existing conditions there as any

man inside or outside of this House. Again, when I was returning from England in January, 1890, to run my first election, we were stuck in the ice off Pictou until the election was over, and any hon. member of this House who knows the anxiety there is about an election contest, will admit that I must have a very vivid recollection of that incident. But that is not all. In 1898 I was stuck in Pictou harbour for ten days, when the 'Stanley,' a very good ship, was tied up at Pictou wharf and could not get through the ice barrier outside of the harbour. In 1905 I was detained at Pictou 14 solid days, and then I had to go round by the capes. I was home for a month, and in returning got as far as the ice barrier near Pictou island, when we had to disembark and traverse about two miles of intervening ice to connect with the 'Minto' which came from Pictou harbour to meet us. That is the year my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) admits there was an accidental delay, but it is the kind of accident we don't want to occur more than once if we can help it. Again, two years ago, a member of my own family in crossing to Pictou was stuck in the ice for three or four days and finally had to return to Georgetown. The year before that a friend of mine from Prince Edward Island left Georgetown on Monday and after trying in vain for the balance of the week to get into Pictou, he got back to Georgetown on Saturday afternoon. This present season my brother was returning from here a fortnight ago and he left Montreal on Sunday expecting to be home on Wednesday, but he did not get there until Friday or Saturday morning, because the vessel was stuck on the Pictou side. Since then, the 'Earl Grey,' which is a magnificent vessel, has been stuck on the Pictou side for two or three days at a time. The 'Earl Grey' left Pictou on the 16th of this month in the morning, but she could not get further than six miles from Pictou, and she had to give it up and returned to Pictou at half-past two in the afternoon. I have this in correspondence received to-day.

Cannot make crossing until wind changes: we want a good northwest wind to move the ice clear of the light at Pictou.

I am informed by letters received in this mail that the ice off Charlottetown harbour is not anything like so heavy or troublesome as it is off Cape Bear, which is on the eastern end of the straits, on Prince Edward side, nearly opposite Pictou, and where the ice gathers. The ice coming down from the north fills up the eastern end of the straits and it blocks at Cape Bear, and some other points further up. At the present time, owing to the difficulty of crossing, our mails have to go round by the old Cape Tormentine—Cape Traverse route. I do not know that many members of this House have had to face an ice boat journey between the capes, but if so it is an experience they will not soon forget. I have been obliged to cross that way about a dozen times, the last time being five or six years ago, when we were eight and a half hours getting across. The crossing there is about eight miles wide, with about a mile of bord ice on either side and when you are trying to get over these hummocks of moving ice in a current running three or four miles an hour, with open holes all through the ice, into which the unsophisticated traveller is apt to fall, necessitating your travelling a distance of probably 20 miles to cover the eight miles actual distance, it will be realized what desperate work it is. I hope never to be compelled to cross that way again and nothing except sheer necessity will ever induce me to. I have here a picture post card bearing a photograph of these crossings, and if any hon. gentleman is curious he may have a look at it. I see here among the papers the following telegram from Halifax:

Halifax, Feb. 17.—Heavy ice has tied up all navigation in Northumberland Straits and on the north coast of Cape Breton. The government steamer 'Minto' which left Georgetown on Monday, is still in the ice off Cape Bear.

This is a week ago, and I think she is still in the ice, unless she got out on Saturday.

The government steamer 'Earl Grey' which has made uninterrupted trips between Pictou and Prince Edward Island, was yesterday for the first time unable to get through the ice. She left Pictou as usual yesterday morning, but was compelled to put back on account of the heavy ice. She will make another attempt as soon as possible.

There are, Mr. Speaker, some half dozen instances to my own knowledge of these steamers being tied up by the ice off Pictou harbour along the bar near Pictou, where the ice stretches from shore to shore, and where there is not sufficient depth of water for the steamers to get clear of it. If you meet with ice in the open sea with plenty of water on both sides and plenty of water underneath, a ship can smash through it because she has some place to dispose of it, but at the narrow entrance to the harbour where the ice is packed from shore to shore, nothing that you can build will go through it. I shall give a few more illustrations of the number of times ships have been stopped crossing over. I quoted these last year, and I am rather surprised that my hon. friend did not take any notice of them:

In the winter of 1898 I was stuck at Pictou ten days and was kept there by a northeast wind which blocked the place with ice. Many other stoppages have taken place. I looked up the other day in the reports of the department to see the record of a few more of these stoppages and I found that in 1898:

The steamer entered upon the winter mail service on the 25th December. It was not considered prudent to continue the 'Stanley' on the Charlottetown and Pictou route; the steamer, therefore, kept up communication between Georgetown and Pictou until the 22nd of January, 1898, when the ship was hemmed in by heavy packed ice off Pictou island; in trying to get through between Pictou island and the ice jam the ship ran aground on the reef. After emptying the after-ballast tank the steamer was backed off without damage on the 23rd of January. The ice loosening up, the steamer returned to Georgetown, finding it impossible to get into Pictou. On the 24th January the steamer left for Pictou again, but could not get in. The passengers and mails were landed by ice boats. The mails were transferred to the Capes route on the 26th January. The steamer was jammed in the ice at Pictou from the 27th of January to the 2nd of February.

Again in 1901:

The winter service between Charlottetown and Pictou began on January 7, the 'Stanley' running in conjunction with the steamer 'Minto,' each boat making bi-weekly trips. On February 5, the 'Stanley' got caught in the ice off Pictou harbour and remained in the ice until February 20, and did not arrive at Georgetown until February 21.

Again, the same year:

Owing to the heavy ice in the harbour of Pictou between February 5 and 21, and also on account of the shoal water on the bar the steamer was unable to move out of Pictou harbour until February 19. This matter was made more serious by the fact that the steamer 'Stanley' was at the same time icebound six miles out of Pictou harbour.

Again, in 1902:

The service between the two latter places was begun on January 10. The service was fairly regular until February 12, when the 'Minto' was caught in heavy ice off the end of Pictou island and remained fast until February 15. She was then able to get into Georgetown.

In 1905:

In leaving Georgetown on January 25, 1905, the ice was found to be very heavy and the 'Stanley' returned to Georgetown, and although repeated attempts were made to force the steamer through the ice, it was found impossible to cross to Pictou until March 3, when the 'Stanley' forced her way to the Pictou ice barrier, and the passengers and mails were transferred over the barrier to the steamer 'Minto' two miles away. The 'Stanley' reached Pictou harbour.

was found impossible to make another crossing until March 16, when the ice barrier, off Pictou, was reached and the cargo transferred to the 'Minto.' On March 21, the 'Stanley' then returned to Georgetown. It

I know about that because I was there.

On February 25, 1907, on a trip from Georgetown the 'Minto' was caught by a heavy ice-jam, in a strong gale and thick snow storm, and did not reach Pictou until March 2, and from that date until March 19 it was found impossible to reach Georgetown again, although several attempts were made. The return trip to Pictou was accomplished only on March 26.

I think this pretty effectually disposes of the idea that only once have these boats been prevented crossing by ice in Pictou harbour.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will my hon. friend be kind enough to tell us whether, from the reports he has received, the winter of the present year is considered as severe as those of the years he has just mentioned?

Mr. WARBURTON. The private reports I have received are that the winter this year is quite as severe as those of other years. But the severity of the winter is not the trouble so much as the northeast wind, which drives the ice into Pictou harbour. It is not the local ice that is the trouble; but there is a clean sweep of 250 miles from the Strait of Belle Isle to the mouth of Pictou harbour, and when a northeast wind prevails for a fortnight, it fills Pictou harbour with ice not only from side to side, but right to the bottom, and there is not a vessel built that could then go in or out of that harbour. The Strait of Northumberland separating Prince Edward Island from the mainland is a narrow strait 140 miles long. At the eastern end the strait opens up into a very broad gulf something of the shape of a letter V. At the inner end of this gulf there is Pictou harbour and Pictou island. On the Prince Edward Island side there is Cape Bear. From that point westward the strait gets narrow. Further up on the Prince Edward Island side there is Point Prim, running three or four miles out into the strait like a wedge. The trend of the current in the strait is from west to east, and if there were no northeast wind driving the northern ice into the gulf at the eastern end of the strait, the current would tend to loosen up the local ice; but if the northeast wind continues for any length of time, the ice is driven further up between Bear Point and Point Prim, and there the steamers often have trouble in attempting to carry on winter navigation between Charlottetown and Pictou, or between Georgetown and Pictou. The ice does not pass Point Prim, which is eight or ten miles to the eastward of the entrance of Charlottetown harbour. The route I advocate is entirely to the west of Point Prim and is actually protected by it. In this connection I wish to read a short extract from a letter written by the late Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Desbarats, in reply to a letter of August 7, 1909, from Mr. Patton, president of the Charlottetown Board of Trade:

I may say that it is not the fault of the captains of either the 'Stanley' or the 'Minto' that the steamers do not come to Charlottetown; it is because it is impossible for the ships to make their way through the heavy, closely-packed ice in the strait, up to Point Prim, even with such power as can be obtained from their engines. Could either of them get to the northward (westward) of Point Prim there would probably not be so much difficulty in Hillsborough bay or Charlottetown harbour.

That accords with all our experience. The difficulties in the route between Charlottetown and the mainland do not arise to the west of Point Prim, but always eastward of it. So when I am accused of basing my argument upon an isolated case or an accidental circumstance, my answer is that the dozen cases or more which I am able to give, in which the steamers have been hung up, bear me out in my contention. I can quite understand how an hon. member who lives on the mainland and has probably never crossed in these steamers in his life, can contemplate our difficulties with great serenity. If I lived on the mainland, and did not make use of these boats, I am not quite sure that I would feel so impressed with the necessity of a change as I do now.

My hon. friend, who no doubt, will dispute my statement, lives in a very nice place, on the mainland, where he has no difficulties to contend with, so far as the ice in the straits is concerned. But the people I represent, have to face any amount of difficulty coming from and going to the island. It is easy to say there is no danger, when you are not suffering yourself. We are told by the great poet of the epicurean philosophy that it is pleasant to recline on the summit of some lofty headland overlooking the storm tossed ocean, and from that place of security look out on the ships struggling in the grasp of the raging ocean. Not because we rejoice in the perils and trials that beset our fellow mortals as they battle for life and safety with the angry waves, but because we rejoice that we, ourselves, are free from such trials and difficulties; and I think the old poet pretty accurately summed up the position taken by gentlemen on the mainland, who object to any change. I wish to make another statement, because I propose, when dealing with this matter, to deal with it as completely and as earnestly as I can. Another drawback of the route to Pictou is this, that the department is practically forced to take an inferior quality of steam coal. For this I cannot blame the present or any other government, because the department cannot very well avoid doing so, so long as the steamers have to come to this port. In this connection, I would quote a clipping from the 'Guardian' of the 27th of January last, and I may add that this is not a paper which supports this government:

A considerable source of trouble on the 'Earl Grey' recently has been a poor supply of coal. The grade used is of such quality as to make it difficult to get up steam and to keep it regular.

Four weeks ago from last Friday, I am informed that the 'Earl Grey' was stuck in less than a foot of ice. But if that steamer were able to get up sufficient steam, she is capable of making her way through 18 inches of green harbour ice. She stuck however, in a foot of ice, and the reason was that, with the class of coal she had on board, she could not get up sufficient steam. I speak, of course, of the quality of that coal, only in connection with the purpose for which it is supplied in this navigation. The summer steam boat people, who run their summer steamers between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, will not use it, but get coal from some other mine in Sydney which is better suited for steam producing purposes. So long, however, as this winter port in question is the one used, so long will the department be compelled to use this inferior coal. But any one can see that the winter service is not thereby given a fair chance, nor is the magnificent steamer the 'Earl Grey', which cost this country some $500,000 or $600,000, given a fair show, when she has to face the difficulties of this winter passage with an inferior coal which only enables her to get up about two-thirds of her power.

We are told that the coast at Tatamagouche bay will be very great, that it will probably cost a million or more to put up the requisite piers, warehouses, &c. Well, I cannot see any ground for that assertion. It would, of course, cost something to build a line of railway to that port, but that line will be built some of these days in any case. But to say that it will cost a million dollars, or even a quarter of a million dollars, to build a pier or such warehouse accommodation as will be required, is absurd. We have on the the Georgetown side, a good pier and warehouse and ample provision for this trade when the crossings are regular. We have at Pictou, an enormous warehouse which must have cost an immense amount of money, and which could only have been built of its present dimensions, because it was known that when the ice conditions in Pictou harbour would prevent the regular transportation of commodities, these goods would have to be stored at Pictou. When I was ice bound in the winter of 1905, there were five or six hundred car-loads of freight bound for Prince Edward Island tied up, and the only reason for the building of this large warehouse was, because occasions had arisen, and which, no doubt

would again arise, when, owing to the stoppage of traffic through ice conditions, it was necessary to have ample accommodation for the storage of goods which would otherwise perish. But there would be no such need in a harbour whose navigation could be kept up reasonably well. I would not at all be disposed to criticise if a steamer were held up by a storm or a fog as that might happen anywhere. We have not many fogs down there, but we have snow storms just as you have up here. But to say that this work at Tatamagouche, to make it a suitable harbour, would cost $1,000,000, is very much exaggerated. I do not believe it would cost one quarter of that, because you would only have a 1,200 foot pier to build, and a small warehouse. But even supposing it did cost the amount estimated, we must not forget that Prince Edward Island was allowed damages to the extent of $1,000,000 up to 1901, through the failure to keep up winter navigation, and that failure occurred during many years, when this navigation was purely experimental and it could not be expectel that the authorities would know the drawbacks inseparable to this route. But these difficulties and drawbacks are now known. The traffic both passenger and freight, has largely increased and would increase still more, if we were sure of continuous navigation without any unreasonable interruption. And if these delays caused the loss of a million dollars in 1901, when the business had not very largely developed, what would the damages amount to since ? In fact it would seem to me that to-day we would be entitled to ask for aggravated damages, because experience has shown that this port of Pictou is an impossible one.

I said a moment ago that our difficulties were due to the northeast wind, driving in the northern ice, and that the trend of the current carries the ice out of the straits from west to east and and not from east to west. My reason for this statement is this, that the steamer ' Stanley ' some years ago lost her propeller blades up in the Straits of Northumberland. She was in the ice a considerable time, and slowly drifted eastward some 140 to 150 miles. She must have drifted 130 miles to the east. In the old days of wooden ships occasionally a ship leaving harbour late in the autumn got caught in the ice in the Straits of Northumberland and invariably drifted to the eastward, showing that the trend of the current is in that direction. Thus if there were no wind the natural trend of the current would have the effect of loosening up the ice even in the eastern end of the straits but, in view of the fact that this northern ice does not come down the straits beyond Point Prim, we have not even that to contend with. We have, it is true, heavy ice going up and down the straits between the two shores, but it is not that terrible ice which is packed in, and the distance is only a short one. From investigations made over a number of years, I do not know that any investigation was made this year although I have had a report, it would appear that there is no ice jam that would prevent the vessel from crossing. The western ice does not come down, it never finds its way up the straits except in small quantities; it is the ice that forms and piles up along the straits to the south and which does not present insuperable difficulties in crossing. In the early part of this season, up to the middle of January, the ' Earl Grey ' made trips to Charlottetown and Pictou. Up to that date we had a mild season. I crossed on the 14th and a sail boat could have crossed that day, but the weather changed the following day, and the next week they had it bad, a heavy snow storm set in, and the ' Earl Grey ' had to go to Georgetown. I have taken an extract from the ' Guardian ' of January 19, in which it says:

> The severe weather of the last three or four days has evidently made heavy ice in the straits. Yesterday at nine-thirty a.m. the 'Earl Grey,' en route to this port from Pictou, encountered very heavy ice off White Sands——

White Sands is between Point Prim and Cape Bear.

> ——and was compelled to back up three times to make headway through it. She came around the east end of Pictou island, making her trip one half an hour longer. A Marconi received here from the 'Grey' at 11.15 stated: 'The strait is full of ice from Pictou, west, which is very heavy in places. 'Grey' in good trim, is doing splendid work.' At eleven ten she was abeam Point Prim and at 12.30 docked here.

It took her an hour and twenty minutes to come from Point Prim. The distance must be fourteen miles, which shows that she could not have had very heavy ice there, whatever she may have had east of Point Prim.

> When she docked at this port, Captain Brown was tendered three hearty cheers and a tiger in appreciation of his successful determination to reach this port.

She went over to Georgetown. She decided for another reason not to discharge her cargo, and the following day she went to Pictou and brought her cargo up to Charlottetown on January 17. After that the heavy ice drifted into the eastern end of the straits and prevented her getting further down the straits. It was not the difficulties to the west of Point Prim, but the ice packed east of Point Prim that caused the trouble. In all of these cases, if my information is correct, notwithstand-

ing the severe frost we have had this winter there would have been very little difficulty, no difficulty for the 'Earl Grey,' in passing backwards and forwards in a direct line between Charlottetown and Tatamagouche. If that is the case, considering the experience we have had in so many years, the proof we have had that Pictou is not adapted to be a winter port, the Tatamagouche route ought at least to be tried, and I would suggest that even this winter, now that the mails are being carried round by the capes, and if you have a northeast wind the vessel might approach Charlottetown, it would be a very good idea to let her try for herself and see what she can do with the ice between Charlottetown and Pictou in this very severe winter.

There are also some matters connected with the summer route, but they are not of such moment as those connected with the winter route because we can always get across in the summer, although we have to take a slightly round about way. I have pointed out on other occasions that if we have to do business for instance in Halifax, the capital of Nova Scotia, it takes us three days to go a distance of 120 miles as the crow flies, about 170 or 180 by the route we have to take and return. There is 54 miles by water instead of 25, and we have to go over 100 miles further before we get to Halifax. We have to leave the island at 7 or 8 in the morning, and we get into Halifax about 8 in the evening, too late to do business. Then the train leaves Halifax at eight o'clock the next morning too early to do business, so if you have any business to do you have to spend a third day in Halifax, and get back to the island somewhere about eight in the evening. I would like members of this House from other provinces to have similar experiences for one week, when it would take them three days to go say from here to Toronto and back. That would serve as an object lesson. There is no reason why we should not get to Halifax and back in 12 hours. I have been told that we have not the right system, but we should start from the island in the evening and come back in the morning. That might be very nice for those who did not need to go, but not for those who have to. Going in that way you would have to spend two nights, one going and one coming, in Pictou instead of in Halifax, because the way the time tables are arranged now, if you got to Pictou in the evening you would be too late to connect and to get to Halifax and vice versa on the return trip. It would be out of the frying pan into the fire.

There is another matter in which the Minister of Railways may be interested. The Canadian Pacific railway have acquired the Dominion Atlantic railway and the Midland railway down to Truro. They have now practically a straight line from Yarmouth and Pictou down to Truro, and will have steamers running from Pictou and Yarmouth to St. John and Boston, in almost a straight line. They are now within almost 31 miles from Tatamagouche at Truro. It is inconceivable that a company conducted on the business principles of the Canadian Pacific railway will stay at Truro when by running a few miles further. by building a wharf and putting on vessels of 18 knots, like the 'Prince Rupert' now running on the Bay of Fundy, they can make one or two trips a day across that narrow strait, one vessel between Tatamagouche bay and Charlottetown tapping the centre and east of the island and the other between Tatamagouche bay and Summerside taking in the western trade. It is inconceivable that the Canadian Pacific railway having got that far will stop there for the sake of 35 miles of railway. That will mean that practically the whole business of Prince Edward Island will be diverted from the Intercolonial railway, the government railway, to the Canadian Pacific railway. That will mean a serious loss to the Intercolonial railway, as Prince Edward Island, instead of being a valuable feeder to the Intercolonial railway, will become largely a feeder to the Canadian Pacific railway. We discussed some time ago the question of taking over branch lines, and we should consider whether it would be wise to let the Canadian Pacific railway get ahead of us, and put this branch line down there and take over all this traffic, which they undoubtedly will. I do not think myself it is in the interest of the government railway to allow this to take place, but it is going to take place. As I have said, the Canadian Pacific railway have these fast vessels, which will be on their hands, and they might just as well send them there as anywhere else, and they will send them there. When that happens, the traffic through Pictou will die of itself, and largely the traffic between Summerside and Point Du Chêne will also die out, although a larger percentage of it will remain there than on other parts of the island owing to the fact of its affording a shorter distance to the west.

There is another route which has been suggested often, and that is the Traverse-Tormentine route. I do not propose to say anything about that just now. Of course, it is a short route, but whether you could lay our piers on the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island sides and establish a regular service there, I am not in a position to say. Before I conclude I wish to mention another grievance which we suffer by our not being able to have a direct service in the winter time. Our merchants and business men have been complaining year in and year out that they

have to submit to three short hauls; instead of having two hauls, or two carriages, they have three. We cannot avoid two hauls, in as much as one has to be by water. But I think there is no need of having three. As it is, the winter traffic is carried down through Pictou, which makes one haul. It is then transferred to the winter steamers and carried over to Georgetown, another haul. Then it has to be carried some 40 odd miles to Charlottetown, a third haul. This third haul is very expensive; it takes the profit away from the business, and our merchants look upon it as a serious grievance and loss to their business; any business man must agree with me that it is so. If the system I have been urging on this House the last two or three years were adopted, and a route made directly across from Charlottetown to Tatamagouche these three short hauls would be obviated. While the route from Cape Traverse to Cape Tormentine appears to be the most direct, according to the map, and might be less unsatisfactory if it were made continuous, still, as we are at present, unless you build the tunnel, it would not do away with the three short hauls.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak at so great a length, but I wished to bring before you the salient points of this subject, and to point out what our experience has taught us, and has taught others, who are not compelled to undergo the difficulties we have had to contend with. I wish to commend this matter to the favourable consideration of the House, and to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who, I must say, has always displayed the most lively interest in this winter navigation, and has done much to improve it. I specially commend it to him, and to the government, and I hope that one of these days an effort will be made to remove this unnecessary disability.

Mr. J. W. RICHARDS (Prince, Prince Edward Island). At the last session of this House I took occasion to make a few observations on this important question of transportation in the winter season between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada, and this afternoon I propose to say something more on the same subject. It is very important to us on the island to have the best route that can possibly be selected for our winter service, though there is a considerable variety of opinion as to which route is really the best. As I said on a former occasion, if it can be shown that the route between Charlottetown and Tatamagouche is the best route and that it can be kept open during the whole winter, then I should say that the people of the province would be in favour of it. On the other hand, if it is not considered to be the most practicable route, and that the Georgetown-Pictou route is a better one, then I would say that we should adopt the latter. But a question as to which is the best route can only be settled by investigations, and I do not see that there can be any objection to making further investigation, in fact, I think it would be a proper step to take. We have had this winter unusually severe weather, in fact, at the present time there is heavy ice around the coast of Prince Edward Island, and around the coast of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and steamers have been considerably delayed, though, on the whole, they have done remarkably good work. Trade over this winter transportation has grown very largely of recent years. A large quantity of produce of all kinds is taken over by these boats, and it is highly in the interest of the people of the province that we should have the most regular and convenient route that can be chosen. Now, I am not going to dwell at length upon this phase of the subject, because it has been so well discussed by my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton), who has just resumed his seat. But I rise this afternoon more especially to draw the attention of the House and of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the desirability of making proper arrangements at Summerside in the fall of the year by which one of the steamers could be sent to that place and take away the freight that accumulates there at the close of navigation. It is true that the 'Minto' was sent there last fall. She made one trip, and it appears she loaded with a large cargo at Summerside. But instead of landing it at Cape Tormentine, she went on to Pictou and discharged it there. This arrangement was not at all satisfactory to the people of that town, and of the county I represent. There was considerable annoyance and vexation caused in consequence of the boat not remaining on what is called the western route for a longer period than she did. Where the blame lies I am not prepared to say, but I have been told that proper arrangements had not been made at Cape Tormentine by which the boat could land her freight there as should have been done, and for that reason the officers of the boat decided to proceed to Pictou. Now, if that statement is correct, I presume it was an oversight on the part of some one. I hope that when another winter comes round such arrangements will be made as will avoid any inconvenience to the handling of freight at the Cape Tormentine pier.

Summerside is one of the best harbours of the island. Some of the shoal places in that harbour have recently been dredged. Further dredging of the north shoal or middle ground is much needed and will, I hope, soon be attended to. During the summer months of each year large steamers, such as those of the Black Diamond Line and other boats, make that place a port

of call. There is a railway wharf with which the trains make connection. There is a fairly good warehouse on it, although in that regard some improvement is needed. The export trade, I may say is very large from that place. During the summer months something like nine-tenths of the freight shipped from Prince Edward Island goes through Summerside and nearly all the passenger travel. The distance from Summerside to Cape Tormentine is not more than 17 miles, so that the trip is made over there in a little more than an hour. Summerside is situated in the midst of a most thriving and prosperous farming community. It has several large business establishments, three at least of the stores being among the largest of the maritime provinces, the volume of business is very large and as our agricultural development goes on, and it is going on very rapidly, we will make great progress in that regard and the amount of stuff shipped from that port will increase to ten times what it was last year—perhaps a greater extent. Considering all these things I wish to draw the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) to the importance, when next fall comes around, of having such arrangements made as will give proper facilities for shipping freight after the summer steamers stop running. This is an important matter to my constituents, and it is an important matter to the people who live in a part of Queens county represented by hon. friends who sit beside me. A great deal of the produce from their county goes that way, so that it is not a local matter alone, but it is one of provincial interest. I found the Minister of Marine and Fisheries very ready last year and on other occasions to do the best he could to meet the views of the people of my county and my own views in regard to transportation late in the fall of the year, but, unfortunately, last season things did not work at all in a satisfactory way and I would like to impress upon my hon. friend the great importance of having proper arrangements made in good time so that there will be no delay and no difficulty. I would also point out to him the desirability of giving instructions to the officers of the boats that they will not leave that port upon the first appearance of frost or because the weather may happen to be unfavourable for a day or two. They should have positive instructions to give that western route in the fall of the year a fair trial. The people have been asking for it for a great many years and until it has received a fair trial there will be grumbling and dissatisfaction. In my way of thinking, on every principle of right and reason, the people of that part of Prince Edward Island are entitled to have these transportation facilities which they have been for so many years demanding.

I had a letter only to-day from a friend in Prince Edward Island, a prominent citizen, and one of the leading merchants of Summerside. He has recently made a trip in the 'Earl Grey'. He tells me that he has read some of the criticism that has been passed upon that boat in an unfavourable way, but being a man who is well qualified to express an opinion upon such a matter, he says that the 'Earl Grey' has simply done marvellous things this winter, that she is a fine boat in every respect and very much superior to the boats they have there—the 'Minto' and 'Stanley.' There is, however, a feeling that the 'Minto', having been there for a number of years, has now pretty well outlived her usefulness and people down there are looking forward to the time at no distant day, when perhaps the Department of Marine and Fisheries may see their way clear to give us another boat similar to the 'Earl Grey.' When we get a boat of that kind we will expect that the people of Prince county will have the 'Minto' for service on the western route. But, as I stated here last session, we will never have regular and continuous communication in winter by the best of boats that can be built, because the ice conditions are such that when it packs in and around the coast of Prince Edward Island and the mainland there are periods, such as at the present time, when I believe no boat that could be built would be able to go through it. But until we get the tunnel we want to have the best possible arrangements we can have with regard to ice breakers so as to keep up communication from our little island to the mainland.

The day, no doubt will come when we shall have the tunnel, and I hope that day is not far distant. But, in the meantime, I do not think I would be asking too much of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if I were to suggest to him that he might keep the matter in view of giving us a boat similar to the 'Earl Grey' at no distant day. In view of the great development in our agricultural resources and of the rapid strides we are making in every way we expect that trade will go on increasing not only in summer, but in winter as well. From the favourable way that the minister has acted towards us in many respects we have every reason to hope and to believe that he will take up my suggestion with regard to a new boat and that he will give us the 'Minto' for the western route. Then we would have communication from both ends of the province, this would give satisfaction to us and would remove many grounds of complaint that we have had in the past. I would again earnestly impress upon my hon. friend the desirability of giving instructions so that proper arrangements will be made next fall for putting a boat on the western route at the

close of navigation, or when the summer boats stop running, and that such arrangements be made and carried out in such a manner as will leave no cause for complaint.

Mr. AUSTIN L. FRASER (Kings, Prince Edward Island). Mr. Speaker, the question is sometimes asked by members of this House, why the members from Prince Edward Island take up so much time—perhaps they may use the word 'valuable' time—pressing their claims before this House, and discussing this matter of winter communication. The reason why we do this, is not far to seek. When our province entered confederation, one of the things that were promised at that time was that this government would give us continuous and efficient steam communication with the mainland for the carriage of mails and passengers. I am sorry that neither this government nor the former government has been able to carry out this provision. I am safe in saying that until the last effort is made to fulfil this provision of the terms of confederation, the members of Prince Edward Island will be compelled to occupy more or less of the time of parliament in advocating their case, and that is my excuse, if excuse be needed, for speaking now. The present winter has been a very severe one all over the North American continent, and in respect to the carriage of mails between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, we are to-day bringing them across in small iceboats between the capes, just as we did fifty years ago. No improvement therefore, has been made in this respect in half a century, when everything else around us has made a wonderful advance. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have no knowledge of the feasibility of the new Tatamagouche route proposed by the mover of this motion (Mr. Warburton), and if parliament or the country is in possession of any exact information concerning it, I have been unable to discover it. I do not wish to say anything against that route for I would be glad to see a new harbour on the mainland but, while not taking back anything I said last year about the difficulty of winter communication being at Pictou, I would say to the government: Before you abandon that route and take up a new route, you should feel perfectly convinced that the new route will be the solution of the difficulty. Unless the government has positive knowledge that the new Tatamagouche harbour will be a better harbour than Pictou harbour, it would be a waste of money to experiment on Tatamagouche. There is, in my own county, Georgetown harbour, which is without doubt, the best harbour on the island, and even if Tatamagouche should turn out favourably, the steamers would still have to come to Georgetown from Tatamagouche, because I believe it is impossible to navigate the Straits of Northumberland into Charlottetown harbour in heavy winter ice. I am informed, and I believe it to be true, because I have often entered Charlottetown harbour, that it is a shallow harbour and one great danger is that, if the iceboat touches bottom, a catastrophe would happen, because the running ice would pile over the boat. Above all, what is required by ice navigators, is plenty of water and plenty of sea room. On one thing I can congratulate the department, and that is, that a few years ago, they decided to leave, to a large extent, the navigation of the straits to the captains of the boats. I cannot agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton), that the captains ought to be restrained from leaving Charlottetown or Summerside or any other port, when it is thought there may be danger. Nobody knows better than the captains whether there is danger or not, and the department was right when it decided to permit the captains to use their own judgment and to give them a free hand in this matter. I feel that the men in charge of these boats, will continue to give the very best satisfaction that men can give who are engaged in the most difficult navigation on the North American continent. I wish to add a few words of praise for the captains of these steamers. Captain Finlayson, of the winter steamer 'Minto' has been for 37 years engaged in the navigation of this difficult passage, and during all that time, he has never lost one life or one pound of freight.

Mr. BRODEUR. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. If there is any man in Canada to-day, who deserves reward for long and faithful service, it is Captain Finlayson, who after 37 years in active service, still pursues with vigour, his arduous calling. I may add that Captain Brown, who is in charge of the ship 'Earl Grey', is, I am informed and believe, also a very experienced and careful navigator. I do not think the department need have any fear of men of this class, whose judgment has been tried and found not wanting on many an occasion. I trust the department will continue to allow the captains to go in and out of such harbours as they deem fit. I am aware also, Mr. Speaker, that the merchants of Charlottetown and Summerside wish to keep these boats on the run late in the fall, to carry away their freight. I have no fault to find with that, but I do believe the government would not be justified in taking any risks with the ships. The government is not bound to find boats to carry freight; their duty is to provide transportation for the mails and passengers and the merchants of Summerside should not forget that there are merchants in George-

town and other parts of the island which have a right to be considered when it comes to carrying freight in the fall and spring. The merchants of Charlottetown require these boats to be kept there at considerable risk, and if they had their own way, they would probably keep them there all winter, even at the risk of being frozen in. The department is not supposed to run boats for the accommodation of Charlottetown merchants. The Charlottetown merchants sometimes scold these poor captains, who are trying to do their duty, and they keep the wires hot up to the department at Ottawa, with complaints, and even some of the newspaper editors of Charlottetown so far forget, what we should all join in asking for, namely, continuous accommodation for mails and passengers, that they sometimes find a great deal of fault with the captains, when in their wisdom, and as the result of their experience, they deem it necessary to go to Georgetown. As I have said, the merchants in Charlottetown and Summerside should not forget that there are merchants in other parts of the island; they should not forget that during nine months of the year the merchants in Georgetown, Montague, Murray Harbour, and other points, have not a word to say about the landing of freight at Summerside and Charlottetown, where the great bulk of the freight goes. But, these same gentlemen find fault, because for three or four months in the year, the ships go into Georgetown, which is the only natural winter harbour on the island. Now, I must draw the attention of the minister to what is really only a small matter in connection with the port of Georgetown, and I am sure he will have the complaint rectified. I want to read an extract from the Island 'Patriot,' the leading Liberal newspaper on the Island, of the 15th instant, to show the minister that even at the port of Georgetown, where all the shipping is going, the facilities are not as good as they should be:

> There was a rumour that a telephone had been installed in the railway station in Georgetown. A shipper however tried to call the station up, and he found to his consternation that the rumour was unfounded. Yet this is the twentieth century when the old stage coach is no longer with us, and many other old things have passed away. Nevertheless certain antiquated services such as a deaf and dumb telephone at what is now the principal shipping station of the island are still with us. How long, oh how long, must the public endure such back woods methods.

This is a small matter, and I trust, now that the minister's attention is called to it, that he will see that a telephone is put into the station at Georgetown, which would cost only $20 or $25 a year. It is very annoying to shippers and travellers who want to learn whether the boat is in or when it is going out, to find that there is no telephone at this, the principal shipping port of the province, and that the nearest public telephone is at least a quarter of a mile distant. While on this subject I wish to call the attention of the minister to another matter, for which he may be able to provide a remedy. The Charlottetown 'Guardian,' of the 16th of February refers as follows to the crossing at the capes:—

> To-day we are for a time back again to primitive conditions, the conditions of fifty years ago, with regard to our communications for mails, passengers and freight, to and from the mainland. Let us hope that it may not be for long, and let due credit be given to Captain Taylor and Post Office Inspector Whear for the promptness with which the change was made when the winter steamers proved unequal to their work.
>
> The change is the fourth of the season so far. The winter service began with one steamer on the Summerside-Tormentine route, progressed with one steamer and then with both on the Charlottetown-Pictou route and later, first one and then both steamers on the Georgetown-Pictou route, until that route has become impassable. Now, as already stated, we are back to the Traverse-Tormentine route and the little ice-boats of fifty years ago.
>
> This means that until the steamer service can be regularly resumed travel to and from this province will be mainly limited to a very few robust persons in the most active period of their life, whose business is urgent and who are willing to undergo the risks and hardships of the trip at the capes. Women, children, the aged, and infirm are practically debarred from coming to or leaving the province in that way.
>
> This is, of course, beyond immediate remedy. But better things were promised us by the terms of our union with Canada, and by Sir John Macdonald and by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, many, many years ago. And in the meantime what has been done or is now doing to prepare the way for better things? Little has been done and nothing is doing.
>
> An obvious need is a better steamer to replace the 'Minto,' which never was a good ice boat and is now practically useless in any emergent ice conditions in the straits.

This was referred to by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Richards), and I thoroughly endorse what he has said with regard to it. The most successful steamer on that route was the 'Stanley.' After some years the 'Minto' was built, but it did not quite come up to expectations. As a matter of fact, it is well known to everybody that the 'Minto' was not better, if she was as good as the 'Stanley.' But the new steamer, the 'Earl Grey,' which was put on a year ago, is proving to be superior to any of the steamers that preceded her, and it is thought now that until we get the tunnel, which I thoroughly believe is the only permanent solution of this question, we should get another new steamer of the type of the 'Earl Grey.' I would urge the department

to consider the advisability of so doing. It may perhaps be said that in asking for this we are asking too much, but I think not. When the 'Stanley' was built a few years ago, the government said to us, we are giving you the 'Stanley,' but the 'Stanley' has been taken off the route last winter and this winter and has been put on service at other parts of the Dominion. Therefore I do not think we should be charged with the cost of the 'Stanley;' we should rather be credited with it, since the steamer has been taken away from us, and this is a reason why the government should now give us another steamer of the type of the 'Earl Grey. This extract from the Charlottetown 'Guardian' continues:—

Nothing short of another steamer as powerful as the 'Grey' as a sister ship—a pair of 'Greys'—can meet the reasonable demand till we are altogether relieved of dependence upon steamers. There never can be an adequate winter service by steamers.

But for the present distress it seems reasonable to ask that the 'strap passengers' who help to haul the government boats and mails should be given free passage in return for their labours, and that the few other passengers who are compelled by age or weakness to remain in the boats should be taken over at regular summer passenger rates. This is a reasonable proposition. On sea-going vessels the man who 'works his passage' is not expected also to pay in money for his passage. Any 'strap passenger' who crosses at the capes earns his passage twice over.

The ice-boat service at the capes is a government service. Passengers who cross there and utilize it are compelled to do so solely because the government has failed to maintain the stipulated continuous service by steam between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. For this reason it seems to the 'Guardian' that passengers who assist in the arduous work of launching, working and hauling the boats should be allowed free passage.

And the rates heretofore charged, and which passengers to and from the island have been paying for thirty-eight years since confederation, are exorbitant. The charge of four dollars per passenger for a distance of seven miles is exorbitant. It is 57 cents per mile. And the charge of 28 cents per mile for a 'strap passenger' who works his way is even more so.

From what we know and have heard of Hon. L. P. Brodeur, he is disposed to be just and fair, and is not unsympathetic towards our people in their winter disabilities and hardships. We, therefore, appeal to Mr. Brodeur, and to the government through him, to reduce or sweep away altogether the unreasonable charges upon passengers at the capes. This request has been made before by the 'Guardian' and has not been heeded. It will be made again and again whenever the people are compelled to use this route in winter. We sincerely hope that this matter may be put right at an early day.

I shall not make any further comment on this, as the hon. minister is present, and I merely wished to place it before him for his consideration. It is not fair that these passengers, who have to cross the straits, and who have to get out and assist in hauling the boats, should be charged the exorbitant rate of 28 cents a mile for that service, especially as it is a government service.

One of the great difficulties in travelling to and from Prince Edward Island in the fall and spring is the uncertainty of the route you have to take, and I would ask the minister to remove that difficulty by placing one of the winter boats on the Pictou and Georgetown route on the first day of December and let it remain there until the first of May, and not rove around from one route to the other, as is sometimes done. The people on the island would then know that there was a decided route on which they could always depend, and they could buy their tickets and know which route to take to go to the mainland. Then, if instead of taking the Pictou and Georgetown route, they preferred to take a chance and go by Summerside or Charlottetown, that would be their own choice. This uncertainty about routes is one of the great drawbacks of our winter traffic. When I was going home during the Christmas holidays and got down to St. John, I could not find out whether I had to go to the island by Georgetown or Summerside, or Charlottetown, and there was nobody there to give me the information. I would, therefore, ask the hon. minister to carefully consider the suggestion of placing at least one winter boat just before the close of navigation, say the first of December, and keeping her on that certain settled route up to the first of May, when navigation opens again. Of course, the general impression among the people is that the steam navigation company want to keep the winter boats off all routes until the ice forms and navigation is closed, so that the company may get all the passenger and freight traffic up to the last minute. But the winter never comes on any settled day, and there will always be an uncertain time, a hiatus, between the summer and the winter travel, when the people do not know whether they should go by Georgetown, Summerside, or Charlottetown. But if you would put one of the steamers on the Georgetown and Pictou route and keep her there between the first of December and the first of May all that uncertainty and inconvenience would be removed.

Mr. BRODEUR. Even if the summer vessels continued to run?

Mr. FRASER. Yes; because the summer vessels may run to-day and to-morrow be unable to cross, and the passengers would be unable to tell whether they should go to Summerside or Georgetown, or Charlottetown.

Mr. BRODEUR. Would it not be better to put a boat on the route from Charlottetown to Pictou?

Mr. FRASER. The only difficulty is, as has been the case this winter, that you have to make a change. This winter there have been four changes. There comes a time when you have to change to Georgetown, and this year the 'Minto' had to make a change of route quite a long time before the 'Earl Grey' changed. What I would urge on the hon. minister is that there should be one certain route from early in December until May, and that is the route between Georgetown and Pictou. If the government will do this they will certainly give great satisfaction to the people.

Mr. JOHN STANFIELD (Colchester). As I represent a county which is interested in this resolution, I feel it my duty to say a few words in its behalf. Ever since I have had the honour of a seat in this House I have heard this question brought up from session to session, and previous to that period this question was also brought up, as I see by 'Hansard,' every session. If my information be correct, that the time of the House is worth $21 per minute, we have already expended on this subject more than $3,000 this afternoon, and if the hon. the Minister of Finance would calculate the time given to this subject every year, he would find that the amount of money thus expended would go a long way towards meeting the interest, if not on a tunnel, at least on a new steamer. Reference has been made to Tatamagouche, which is in the county I have the honour to represent. Well, last summer I had the pleasure of visiting that part of the county, and an old resident informed me that very little trouble had been experienced with the ice there during any winter. From that district to Truro, a little over 30 miles, the railway, which is in prospect, would give the people of Prince Edward Island much better communication and would also furnish a shorter route from that locality to Truro and Halifax. I would, therefore, urge the Minister of Railways to take up the question of building this railway at once. If it were built, and the government put on a line of steamers from the mainland, we would have one rate from Prince Edward Island to points on the mainland, instead of three, as at present. So important was the building of this railway considered at one time that two local members pledged their seats that if it were not constructed at once they would walk across the floor of the House, but so far neither of them has done so, although one has gone to the Supreme Court. I must congratulate my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Warburton) on the able manner in which he has presented his case. As he has said, if the Canadian Pacific railway should build that line, that would take away from the Intercolonial railway a considerable amount of business. I do not propose to say any more on this subject, further than to urge on the government the imperative and immediate necessity for better communication with Prince Edward Island.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). We have had, particularly during the last few sessions, since my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Warburton) has had a seat in this House, this question of winter navigation discussed from a new standpoint. During the last parliament, and for some parliaments before that the hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island insisted that the government of Canada should enter upon the enterprise of the construction of a tunnel between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse. I well remember in the last parliament an hon. member who represented that province, every year entertained us with the most vigorous protestations that unless a tunnel was immediately constructed for the people of Prince Edward Island, so that they would have railway communication under the Straits of Northumberland, connecting their railway with the railways of western Canada, all kinds of dire consequences would follow to Prince Edward Island, and to the rest of the Dominion. The Department of Marine and Fisheries pursued the same policy, that had been adopted in the past, of seeking to obtain the best communication that could be obtained by steam vessels, and as a result of the wise policy of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the ice-breaker 'Earl Grey' was procured. She has now been on the service for two years and I believe every gentleman who spoke here today and every gentleman from the maritime provinces who understands the situation will say, she has been a great success. But the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Warburton) does not appear to have been satisfied by the best possible means of communication that can be obtained by steamship; he has to find something else to growl about, and raise an agitation among his constituents and please a coterie of patronage hunters in his constituency. Therefore this House has had inflicted on it for two sessions this long imaginative story about having communication between a port in Prince Edward Island, which is never open in the winter even according to hon. gentlemen who live in that province. The hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fraser) has told us that Charlottetown is an impossible port in winter, but my hon. friend comes here and seeks to obtain a winter

service continuously between this impossible port in his province, and a port in which there are no wharfs to which a steamer can go, and to which men who belong to the island, and have owned steamers all their lives, never thought of going until this little coterie in Charlottetown evolved the scheme which the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Warburton) exploited. This is a very frank and practical statement of the case in regard to the story we have heard this afternoon. My hon. friend has dilated upon every possible shortcoming that he thought could be found to exist in the port and the constituency from which I have the honour to come. He is not content with attacking our facilities as a port, although it has been and is the only port on the mainland from Point du Chêne to the straits during the whole history of the Straits of Northumberland, from which communication has been maintained by sea not only with Prince Edward Island, but with the Magdalen Islands and the west coast of the island of Cape Breton, and no one, until my hon. friend evolved this story, has heard of such attacks as he has made on the port which every one has recognized as the one and only port on the northern coast of Nova Scotia. He has shown his prejudice in this matter by going so far as to attack the quality of the coal mined in my county. He may know something about crossing the straits in winter, but what he does not know about coal is a very large quantity. If he goes to Mr. Hyndman, the centre of the coterie exploiting this scheme, and asks him if he will endorse the proposition that Pictou coal is not good, that gentleman will not follow him. If he goes to Mr. Sharp, the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island railway, who has especially asked the Railway Department during the last five years, that the coal from the county of Pictou should be supplied for the operation of the railway, he will find that that gentleman will not stand by him in the charges he has made here, and when he told us that the people who run the Prince Edward Island Navigation Company's boats go somewhere else for coal, he forgot to say that the people who control the obtaining of supplies for the Prince Edward Island Company's boats are agents for a coal company and are interested in selling other coal. Further the Navigation Company's steamers have not time to coal at Pictou. They get there at eleven o'clock, and leave on the arrival of the train. For these reasons they get their coal from the gentlemen who are interested in the navigation company and in the company that sells the coal. My hon. friend, in dealing with a large question of this kind cannot hope to raise a case by descending to such miserable, unnecessary attacks upon industries that stand in the front ranks of the industries of Canada.

He seeks to raise a bugaboo about the danger it would be to this country if the Canadian Pacific railway undertook to build from Truro to Brulé. At this moment, I am advised that the Canadian Pacific railway recognizing the advantages as a railway centre and as a port of the town of Pictou, are considering the advisability of applying to the Minister of Railways for running powers in order to get into the industries in the county of Pictou and to get the advantage of the port there. My hon. friend need not fancy that the Canadian Pacific railway, with all its judgment and capacity, will be led into any such ridiculous proposition as he has advanced in this House, or that they would think of building a railway in the place he suggests. He speaks as if Charlottetown was the whole province of Prince Edward Island. He utterly ignores the conditions in the western part of the island, which my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Richards) represents. The hon. gentleman there represents a constituency from which communication is maintained in the summer months between Summerside and Pointe du Chêne. My hon. friend from Prince has the greatest difficulty in keeping the winter steamer as long as she might run there on account of the importunities of gentlemen in Queens county who do not want their brothers in Summerside to have the advantage of that steamer as long as she could go there, but continuously insist that she shall be brought to Charlottetown.

Mr. WARBURTON. That statement is not correct. I appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if I did not back up to the member for Prince county to the best of my ability, to get him to send the steamer to Summerside.

Mr. RICHARDS. My hon. friend from Pictou misunderstood me. I do not think I stated that the hon. member for Queens had done anything to prevent us from getting our steamer in the western part.

Mr. MACDONALD. I did not attribute to the member for Prince any such statement and I did not say that the member for Queens had prevented the steamers or tried to prevent them from going to Summerside, but the coterie he represents have been continuously asserting through the newspapers, and otherwise, that the proper place to run from was Charlottetown and not Summerside. That was the point I was making, and had a right to make. The member for Kings (Mr. Fraser) comes along and tells us that the hon. member for Queens did not know what they were

talking about when they spoke of Charlottetown being a possible winter port. There is only one winter port in Prince Edward Island, and that is Georgetown, and I agree in that statement. Every man who has lived along the Straits of Northumberland and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, every layman, and every man accustomed to the sea, and acquainted with seafaring conditions there in winter, will tell you that such a thing as navigation to Charlottetown continuously in winter is ridiculous, that no one would ever consider it as a matter of possibility. My hon. friend knows that the reason the 'Earl Grey' is not running to Charlottetown from Pictou to-day is not because she cannot get into Pictou but because she cannot get into Charlottetown, and he knows that the coterie he represents abused privately and publicly that honoured public servant Captain Finlayson, whose long service in connection with this winter route entitles him to admiration from every fair-minded man, because he took the 'Minto' away from Charlottetown sooner than they thought she should have been taken.

Captain Finlayson, who entirely deserves the compliment paid him by the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fraser), took away the 'Minto' from Charlottetown merely because he could not get in there; as a prudent officer, he had to take her to the only port in Prince Edward Island, where navigation could be properly maintained in winter. I regret that I have to speak with some heat in regard to this matter. But my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) both last winter and this winter, has gone out of his way to attack the constituency I have the honour to represent, and to make statements which are without foundation. I regret that he finds his case so weak that he must take the course of attacking everybody who happens to be associated with another route, and everything which is connected with the permanent conditions which have obtained for the last fifty years, until my hon. friend had this new idea. Now, let us examine the facts. First let us ask which is the best port in Prince Edward Island from which communication could be made. My hon. friend from Kings says it is Georgetown, and I say it is Georgetown. Nobody ever proposed seriously to take the chances of making the long windings which have to be followed from the time you leave Cape Bear unless you pass the lighthouse, and go up to Charlottetown, until my hon. friend himself put forward this view. I say my hon. friend will find it impossible to get from the captains of the winter boats a statement that Charlottetown is a port which can be navigated in winter, or if so why did Captain Brown and Captain Finlayson go elsewhere? Captain Brown cannot be charged with not being anxious to do everything possible to utilize Charlottetown. Why did these gentlemen in the exercise of their judgment and having regard to the safety of their boats, remove them from Charlottetown? Simply because they know they could not go there safely, and they did not wish to risk the government's property and the lives of the passengers in attempting to enter that harbour. Georgetown is situated on the eastern portion of the island and faces the Gulf of St. Lawrence ; and while difficulties which are to be found in winter navigation exist in that vicinity, yet I am in the judgment of every one in this House who is acquainted with the matter when I say that Georgetown is the only possible port in Prince Edward Island with which winter communication can be maintained at all seasons of the year. My hon. friend tells us that Georgetown is not the best port but that Charlottetown is the best ; because if Georgetown is the best port in Prince Edward Island from which certain and continuous communications can be carried on from that island, then he must at once assent to the proposition that Georgetown must be the base of operations there. He has to satisfy the government that Charlottetown is a better place than Georgetown to start from, before he can ask the Department of Marine and Fisheries to take the steamer away from Georgetown. My hon. friend cannot do that, and he knows it ; it is not a matter for argument, because the results have shown it, and conditions exist there which contradict any proposition of that kind. In considering this question I think we can start from the fact as absolutely proven, that Georgetown is the one and only place in Prince Edward Island from which winter communication has been maintained in all seasons of the year. Now, winter communication has been maintained from Georgetown on the island with Pictou on the mainland, ever since there was any attempt by any government to solve this question. I say the onus is on my hon. friend, and upon the gentlemen who are behind him in this matter, to satisfy the minister, and the government with evidence on that point which shall be so clear that there can be no doubt about it. The onus being against him, they should show that they have something better to offer than Georgetown and Pictou, before conditions are to be changed in any way. My hon. friend has not found a better port than Georgetown to start from, and he cannot start from Charlottetown and go to the mainland at all.

He says it is unfortunate that we have these three interruptions in the transportation of our freight, as if no person else in any other part of

Prince Edward Island was interested in this question; and, therefore, because certain goods are assigned to Charlottetown, you must try and carry the goods to Charlottetown, even though the boats cannot get in there. That is, in brief, my hon. friend's argument. In order to sustain that weak premise, he attacks the conditions which he says exist in the ports of the constituency I have the honour to represent. Last year my hon. friend went over this question at great length. I endeavoured to find out the truth of some of his statements, and I applied for information to a man who knew. I wrote to the pilot of the 'Earl Grey,' a man who has been piloting on that service for the last ten years. I thought he would be able to tell us whether my hon. friend's information was accurate or not, and this is what that gentleman wrote to me on February 15, last year :

Pictou, N.S., Feb. 15, 1910.

Dear Sir,—In a report of the speech of A. B. Warburton, Esq., M.P., made in the House of Commons on the winter service between Pictou and Prince Edward Island and which appears in the 'Patriot' of Charlottetown, there are many incongruities, contradictions and untruths, regarding the entrance of ice into Pictou harbour and also concerning the grounding, &c., of the 'Stanley.' I would therefore call your attention to the following facts:—

1. Regarding the ice from Belle Isle entering the harbour, I may say there is not any of that ice enters the strait, and hence cannot find entrance into Pictou harbour. All the ice we have to fight against here is made in Northumberland strait. Ice comes out of Egmont bay, Bay Verte, and other places on and about Northumberland strait in sheets, and moves east all the time till it 'brings up' against Cape Breton Island, where it begins to back and fill up the strait. The ice continues in this way until a southwest wind drives it out to sea, after having cleared the eastern route, Georgetown to Pictou and gives a good crossing.

Of course you know the prevailing wind during the winter is from west to northwest, then the wind comes southwest and clears Pictou it blocks Charlottetown.

Now the northeast wind which he claims blocks Pictou is worse for blocking Brulé. There is nothing to prevent the ice from entering and blocking that place so that nothing could come out or enter that port. Whereas the ice brought by the northeast wind as regards Pictou is broken by Pictou island by means of the tides about there.

Regarding the time three years ago to which he refers when we were blocked in Pictou 59 days. The ice came in with a very high spring tide and grounded, when the wind shifted as by that time the tide had fallen and we grounded. That was the only time in all my experience I have seen it do anything like that.

That is the occasion of which I spoke last year when I said that it was the only time in forty years when it had occurred. The pilot agrees that in his experience that statement is correct.

As regards the 'Stanley' getting ashore he claims it was owing to the heavy northeast winds and ice. This was not the case. The facts were as follows: We made a mistake as to the tide. It should have been ebb according to the tables, and also to the regular tides, but the tide was ebbing and we were carried ashore. Captains Brown and Finlayson could substantiate that statement regarding that occasion if it were required.

To prove the statement that the ice is made the way that I stated, i.e., makes in Northumberland strait and drifts down. Take the case of the 'Stanley' which drifted away from Sea Cow Head on January 12, and drifted down back of Pictou island, further towards Arisiag and thence down to Cape George and Palmere island, and then back to Pictou island where she was freed from the pan of ice. The foregoing shows very clearly there is very poor chances for Belle Isle ice to get into our strait and as a consequence into Pictou. We went to relieve the 'Stanley' in the 'Minto' from Pictou with coal, &c., and she was then stuck five miles southeast of Pictou island.

Let me say to my hon. friend that when he was speaking about occasions upon which he was stuck in the ice none of these ice barriers to which he referred were found in the vicinity of Pictou. Here is an illustration of what I said last year:

We got within two miles of her, and got into heavy ice and had to stop there, whereas if we had continued to Georgetown that day with passengers and mails we would have made the run from there in two hours. What makes the passage from Pictou to Georgetown so clear is that the tides open it. As a usual rule it is open water from Cape Bear to Panmere Island with the wind off shore.

Another good example as to where the tides run is that one winter a buoy went adrift from West Cape and it took all winter to drift down to Port Hood.

Regarding the boats being stuck outside for a number of days the ice jams them so that a ship cannot get free until a change of wind.

All those incidents of which my hon. friend talked last session as if they had occurred in or about the harbour of Pictou occurred out in the Northumberland Straits.

The foregoing statements are facts and can be proven by myself from experience, and also by the captains and other pilots, while on the other hand the statements made by Mr. Warburton are simply from hearsay.

This has been a very mild winter, or the 'Grey' would not be running to Charlottetown as long as she has been running. I know this from experience, not from hearsay. I hope the foregoing facts will be of use to you in presenting the Pictou side of the question for the consideration of the hon. Minister of Marine and the members of the House of Commons.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACDONALD. When the House rose at six o'clock, I had demonstrated, I think, that Georgetown was the one available port in Prince Edward Island from which winter communication could be maintained. That being so, the question is as to the best place for the steamer to run to on the mainland in winter. It is manifestly absurd to suggest running from Georgetown to Brulé because Pictou island intervenes, but it is still more absurd to suggest, as my hon. friend from Queens has done, that the steamers should ply between Charlottetown and Brulé. The hon. gentleman from Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) has argued that Cape George was the proper place for the steamers to run to from Georgetown, and while it has the merit of being the nearest point on the mainland to Georgetown, it labours under the unfortunate difficulty that it is many miles distant from a railway. Surely my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Warburton) and the special coterie whom he represents would hardly be satisfied with a proposition that the steamer, starting from the best seaport on the island for winter service, should land its passengers at Cape George some 25 miles away from a railway. I understand that my hon. friend from Inverness is disposed to urge seriously that Port Hood in his county is a place with which winter communication might be maintained, but there my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Warburton) would run across the difficulty of meeting the ice from Belle Isle which has always been the terror of their dreams by night and their aspirations by day so far as winter service is concerned. The result is that these hon. gentlemen are forced to come to Pictou which their forefathers (who probably had as much judgment in this matter as they have) selected as the best place on the mainland and with which the subsidized boats which are owned and controlled by Prince Edward Island people have maintained connection uninterruptedly through all these years. It does seem to me that my hon. friends from the island in discussing this question could have freed the discussion from the peculiar elements which they have introduced into it this afternoon. I say that the attack made by the hon. gentleman from Queens (Mr. Warburton) in regard to the coal which is produced in my county was entirely gratuitous and unnecessary. It was not prompted by proper motives; it was entirely unjustifiable, and the hon. gentleman was going far afield in looking for some argument in which to discuss the availability of a winter port on the mainland when he dragged that question in, without any knowledge on his part, and without any justification from even the people whose mouthpiece he is here. He chose to tell us that the railway accommodation provided at Pictou was entirely provided on account of the winter communication, and were it not for that it never would have been provided. The hon. gentleman does not know anything about the subject when he spoke in that way. Let me tell him that the four towns in my county contribute to the Intercolonial in gross revenue three-quarters of a million dollars a year, and that is contributed entirely by business inherent in the county and is not dependent upon any of the imaginary conditions mentioned by the hon. gentleman. I resent the attack of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Warburton) on my constituency in the strongest possible way, and I reiterate, that the argument he presented to the House is not based upon a desire to find a true solution of the best way to maintain winter communication with the island. On the contrary, the hon. gentleman is prompted by a coterie of patronage hunters in the county of Queens who do not represent the people in any degree whatever. The hon. gentleman says now that although Georgetown is the best place to start from, Georgetown should be eliminated and Charlottetown made the starting point, although the captains who are sympathetic to maintaining winter communication with Charlottetown if they could, have been obliged to abandon it solely on account of the difficulties of entering that port. Leaving the best port on the island, these gentlemen ask this House seriously to adopt the poorest port on the island for the maintenance of the winter service. Where do they want to go; for what do they ask the minister to disarrange the conditions of 50 years in regard to summer and winter transportation? They ask the minister to take a route which begins nowhere and fix the other end of it nowhere. That is their proposition. I have here a blue print showing the results of the examination and surveys made in Tatamagouche bay; this glorious harbour which my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) has found in his imagination after so many years of mental worry. I find here a place called Brulé wharf situated in Tatamagouche bay, and I find the depth of water at Brulé point and Brulé wharf as shown on this plan to be 3 feet and 4 feet within a radius of a quarter of a mile of the existing wharf. I go out half a mile further and I find the deepest water you can get is 13 feet, and the hon. gentleman would have to go nearly a mile out before he finds enough water to float either of these winter steamers. True, the nominal draught of the 'Earl Grey' is only 18 or 20 feet, but, when these vessels are engaged in the winter service and their bulkheads filled with water which is necessary in order to enable them to operate in the ice, their draught is increased to about 30

feet. It is quite evident that hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars would have to be spent in dredging before the steamer could ever reach this haven of theirs at Brulé.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It would be just as cheap to built a tunnel.

Mr. MACDONALD. Pretty nearly. My hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) wants this railway to come to Brulé and the steamers to go there, but he and his friends have apparently not studied this chart because we find here a bay called Tatamagouche bay and another called John bay and at the mouth of both of them there is Amet island and the distance between the mainland from either side of Amet island is a mile or thereabouts; and Brulé, the point to which they want to get is a point away inland where a large amount of dredging would be required. There is on either side of the mainland at this point, at Malagash—which is not in Colchester county by the way,—and I am sorry my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) was deluded by the hon. member from Queens who talked about this place Brulé being an available point, because the only available points in Tatamagouche bay to which steamers can go safely are Malagash which is in Cumberland county and Cape John in Pictou county.

Mr. STANFIELD. What is the depth of water at Warsaw point?

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman takes me into geography I am not acquainted with but I remember that my hon. friend (Mr. Stanfield) attacked the Minister of Public Works because he built a wharf at Tatamagouche which at low tide had no water near it, and that is the bay to which the hon. member for Queens (Mr Warburton) wants these winter steamers to go.

Mr. STANFIELD. What is the depth of water at that point?

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman can look it up from this map.

Mr. STANFIELD. I never mentioned Brulé.

Mr. MACDONALD. My attention was called to Brulé, by the argument of the hon. gentleman from Queens, and it is that point I am dealing with. The hon. gentlemen who are interested in this question will find that Malagash, in Cumberland county there is available water and at Cape John or John river in my county there is available water to which these steamers could come. Although my hon. friends have been discussing this question a long time, and have been occupying a great deal of the time of this House upon it, they do not know yet to what place these boats would run. There is not enough water at Brulé, and there are only two places where there is enough—Malagash in Cumberland county and Cape John in my own county. Before this House is asked seriously to consider a proposition to risk all the money which has been put into these expensive steamers, and the lives of the men and property carried by them, I would like to see some accommodation provided at a point on the mainland which the steamers could reach; and if my hon. friends have any practical appreciation of what they are asking for, I am willing if they are willing to join with me, to go with them and press upon the Minister of Public Works the importance of building a wharf at Cape John, and this I have already done. My hon. friend from Queens must know that all the conditions that he argues against as existing farther down the gulf exist in an equal degree between Charlottetown and Tatamagouche bay. The whole problem of winter navigation turns on the question of the steamers having sufficient sea room when they are in the ice shove to prevent them toppling over, and the merit of the present route lies in the fact that there is ample room for them to run out to sea in a northeasterly direction. My hon. friend knows that the proposition of a winter steamer running between Charlottetown and Brulé, starting from one impossible point and going to another impossible point, means that at all times the steamer will be wedged in by the narrowest kind of waters, and in the event of a storm from any point of the compass, will be liable to be driven ashore because unable to make any deep water for safety. In former years I have regarded my hon. friend's proposition with some degree of amusement; I did not think he could present for the serious consideration of the minister such an impossible proposition as the one he put forward last year, and has put forward again to-day; but the manifest feeling with which my hon. friend has approached the subject, and the animus which has dominated his utterances, particularly with regard to my constituency, warrant me in saying that he has come to the point where he regards himself seriously in making the proposition. I have no doubt that the minister duly appreciates the feeling that animates my hon. friend in this matter. The intelligence which has always been displayed by the department in dealing with this subject of winter navigation is such that I am certain the minister will regard it as absolutely impossible to take these winter steamers away from the only point on the mainland where they can cope with the ice conditions, where they are in proximity to the deep water east of Pictou island, and to start them from an impossible point in Prince Edward Island to another impossible point in Nova Scotia. I

need not point out to the House the inconvenience that would result from bringing the steamers to a point where there are no means of communication and no accommodation in the shape of a wharf or otherwise. Until such facilities are provided, my hon. friend is merely wasting the time of this House in making the proposal he has made. I do not know that I need detain the House any greater length. My object was simply to resent the aspersions which my hon. friend from Queens cast on the facilities provided in my constituency. My hon. friend has told us about having been in Pictou waiting for the winter boats. Of course, he has. Usually, when my hon. friend is not talking about this winter communication from a narrow standpoint, he is the most genial of men, and the people whom I represent are glad to see him there; but when he was loafing around the hotel at Pictou waiting for the steamer, she was not at Pictou wharf, but was floating about in the ice.

Mr. PROWSE. The boat was at the wharf.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend, whose cheery ways are known to us all down there, is, I think, the man behind the scenes in this matter. He has his ear close to the ground in regard to some things in his constituency, and I think the activity displayed by his colleague in this matter is to be attributed somewhat to his efforts. I submit that my hon. friends have submitted an impossible proposition for the consideration of the minister and the House, and they realize that they have not all their colleagues from Prince Edward Island with them. The hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fraser) tells us that beyond all question Georgetown is the only place on the island from which the boat can start. It does seem to me, therefore, that until we have wharfs and other facilities at the only available point in the bay to which my hon. friends would have boats run—and I am willing to join with them in an effort to secure those facilities—their suggestion that boats should run to and from Charlottetown is absolutely impossible, as has been proved by the events of past years.

Mr. L. E. PROWSE (Queens, P.E.I.). After listening to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), I feel it my duty to stand up for Prince Edward Island as he does for Pictou. I have heard so much about Prince Edward Island this afternoon that I have almost forgotten that there was any other place in the Dominion; and if we could only get the Prime Minister, the Finance Minister, and the other members of the cabinet to think so, in twelve months we would not be asking for anything, because they would give us everything we needed. I do not think there is any need of the hon. member for Pictou getting so hot under the collar at what my hon. colleague (Mr. Warburton) said this afternoon. I do not blame the hon. member for Pictou, because of the deficiencies of Pictou harbour. We know that he is not to blame for that; it is due to nature, and I have no doubt that if my hon. friend could change Pictou harbour for the better, he would do it. In Prince Edward Island we have two good harbours, one at Charlottetown, and the other at Georgetown, but we have none on the mainland. The hon. member for Pictou said we do not know exactly where to run the boats to. That is correct, but we want to find out where to run them to, and that is why this question is brought up so often. We know that Pictou is an impossible harbour. I was once caught outside that harbour seven days and had to walk ashore seven miles and during that trip got into the water two or three times. I, however, got ashore safely because I had an oar that kept me afloat. You can see, therefore, that Pictou is not all the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) claims it is.

My hon. friend and colleague spoke about the coal. In that connection I might say that a few weeks ago I received a letter from an officer on board the 'Earl Grey,' complaining about the coal. They said they could not make the steamer go through more than 12 inches of ice, because of the inferior quality of the coal, whereas with good coal they could work through 18 inches. I am not prepared to say whether the coal is good or bad, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) should have the different kinds tried and see which would give the best results. The 'Earl Grey,' cost a lot of money, and the government should get the best they can out of her in return. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said that if we would ask Mr. Hyndman he would be able to tell us about the coal, but Mr. Hyndman is agent for that coal and would be very unlikely to say anything but good about it.

My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) said also, that we should stick to Pictou harbour, because that is the harbour we used 50 years ago. But the people of the island are not disposed to think that what was good enough 50 years ago is good enough at present. This is an age of progress, and we should try our best to bring the producer as close as possible to the consumer. In the winter they are a long way apart. At times in that season we cannot get anything off the island during two, three and four weeks at a time. I am willing to admit that the government have made an honest effort to do the best they could for the island. My hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Fraser) says it is the same to-day

as it was 50 years ago. In that opinion I do not agree with him. We know that there has been very great improvement. First, we had the old steamer 'Albert,' which did very poor work. Then we had the 'Northern Lights,' which was an improvement, then the 'Stanley,' then the 'Minto,' which was an improvement, and finally the 'Earl Grey,' which is a very great improvement. And I have no doubt that the captain of the 'Earl Grey,' with the experience he has had, could suggest some further improvement, and if the government would purchase another vessel like the 'Earl Grey,' only improved, the people of Prince Edward Island would be fairly well satisfied. Of course, I do not believe that any steamer can give perfect satisfaction, but improvements can be made with the present one, and the people would be well satisfied if we had another such steamer, with such improvements as the captain could suggest. No doubt the government could then find a place to utilize the 'Minto' without any loss. I would suggest, therefore, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) that he should, as soon as possible, procure another steamer, so that we might then have two as good as the 'Earl Grey.' The people of the island feel deeply their present condition, but, of course, this winter has been an exceptionally severe one, and the steamers have had very hard work. We have had again to take to the iceboats at the capes to carry mails and passengers. Speaking of these iceboats, I may say that the men who handle them receive a very small pittance. They have to work like galley slaves; at each crossing they take their lives in their hands, and all they get is $2 a day. They should get, instead, $4 to $5 a day. Each passenger pays $2 for the privilege of working his way across the strait. That is not fair, and I would suggest that passengers who work their way across should not be charged anything. I know that if any member of the cabinet were to cross once and have to work his way he would be strongly of the same opinion.

A few years ago, on one occasion when I crossed, the thermometer was several degrees below zero. I had to go into the water up to my waist, and my pants were frozen so hard it was impossible for me at the time to sit down. I then made up my mind I would not cross again in the ice boats, but, nevertheless, I have since crossed some 20 or 25 times. The second last time I made the passage I was completely played out, and I vowed that would be the last crossing I would make, but when I came back from England I found that the steamers were still tied up and I had again to use the boats.

I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to take up any more of your time, but I want to stand up for the people of Prince Edward Island. I am only sorry that we cannot get the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to help us, which I think he ought in gratitude to do, because, if it were not for the island, there would be no Pictou at all. We are the people who supply Pictou with everything it gets, and yet the people of that county do not seem thankful. Of course, I understand that my hon. friend does not like to be rubbed up against the grain, and if all hon. members were able to do for their counties what he does for his our counties would be much better off. I was reminded quite lately that if I fought as hard for Queens county as my hon. friend for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has fought for his, we would have in my county better results, but while I have fought hard for my county, I do not manage to get as much as I could wish.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). I have no desire to take up the time of the House, but the circumstances justify me, I think, in making some observations on the resolution before us. During the past five years which I have spent in this parliament, the sympathy of the House has been extended session after session to the people of Prince Edward Island, because of the conditions of their existence. There can be no doubt that the people of the island are subjected to great inconvenience and expense, and that at times the experience they have had to endure have been almost intolerable. The question is what is the best route to select. Sometimes when lawyers have a bad case they take to abusing the other side, and we have had an illustration of this on this occasion. We have had a good deal of abuse of Charlottetown harbour from the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and a strong condemnation of Pictou harbour from the senior member for Charlottetown (Mr. Warburton). Well, I think that the condemnation of Charlottetown was due to the fact that my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) felt he had no defence for the port of Pictou, and the condemnation of Pictou was provoked by the fact that my hon. friend from Charlottetown (Mr. Warburton) recognized that his port could not be defended as a winter port. I agree with what my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has said as to Charlottetown being an impossible harbour in the winter, and I agree, also, as to what my hon. friend from Charlottetown has said as to Pictou harbour being at certain times in the winter inaccessible for weeks and months. Some years ago there was no communication for two months, because of a blockade in the harbour of Pictou. On another occasion Prince Edward Island was isolated during 48 days, and there is scarcely a winter season when there is not

detention during a considerable length of time, all due to the fact that Pictou was not intended by nature to be a winter harbour. The ice blocks in there so that you have virtually an impenetrable wall which no steamer can cut. This is due to the situation of that harbour, and its funnel shape.

The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said that the capes routes as it is called is out of the question. I agree with him. That Georgetown on the island is an excellent harbour is admitted by all. Two or three years ago some papers relating to that harbour were brought down to this House which I took occasion to examine carefully. They contained reports that showed beyond doubt that Georgetown, in the winter, is always open and the reason is given. As my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has pointed out, Georgetown is on the eastern side of the island, and that harbour is exposed to the gulf, where there is a wide expanse of sea, and the ice kept loose and mobile, there is never any trouble getting through if you have steamers which are strong enough. In Pictou the conditions are different when you go down opposite Charlottetown, because the ice is jammed in such a way that it is impossible to make either point. I could quote from the evidence of Mr. Chas. Duguid, naval architect of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and also from the reports of the late deputy minister of the department to show that what I say in this connection is correct.

I could also call attention to the report of Mr. Windham, an expert sent by the Board of Trade of Charlottetown and others who must be recognized as having expert knowledge more satisfactory than that of simple pilots whose opinions were quoted by the hon. member for Pictou to show that Pictou harbour is not a satisfactory one, and also that the capes route has been tried and proven to be a failure. As is mentioned in one of the reports, that route —the capes route—was simply a political route and had to be abandoned. It being established that the only harbour you have on one side on which you could depend all winter is Georgetown, the next question is where is the best harbour on the mainland side? Pictou harbour is bad in winter, proved to be bad, and I venture to say that Tatamagouche bay is just as bad as Pictou. Of course we have not the evidence of this before us, but I have no doubt it will be shown by the evidence when it is obtained that the same conditions obtain at Tatamagouche as at Pictou. Then the question arises where is there a harbour? The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) referred to a harbour at Cape George, Ballentine Cove. That is an excellent harbour, open the whole year round, deep, with plenty of sea room and always accessible. The reason why it is open during the winter season when Pictou is jammed with ice is the same as in the case of Georgetown, because it is exposed to the open gulf, you have the wide expanse, the ice does not jam and is movable.

Mr. McCOLL. What constituency is that in?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). In Antigonish. In this particular case, I am not speaking with a view to making political capital in my constituency. Other hon. gentlemen who have spoken might be charged with making appeals for their own constituencies, in order to strengthen themselves with their friends, but I am speaking from a purely altruistic standpoint. My constituents are not seeking for this as their right. It is not for them to ask for it as a matter of right, it is for the people of the island to ask it. I am only pointing out how they can have this difficulty solved, with very little trouble. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) admitted the conditions in Ballentine Cove at Cape George. No one can dispute the facts. The department asked the lightkeeper at Cape George to observe the conditions during the past few seasons between Cape George and Georgetown, and a report is that at all times there was open water between Cape George and Georgetown. A few years ago a coal laden vessel left Hastings on the Straits of Canso, and went to Georgetown when the island boats could not get to Pictou because of the ice. The hon. member for Pictou mentioned the fact that these steamers were down quite a way from Pictou, and it was not because Pictou harbour was blocked that they were drifting. No, they were drifting while those on board waited in the hope that the wind would shift and the ice would then be driven out and ultimately they would get into Pictou harbour. But during that time they could land anywhere along the eastern Pictou shore or in Antigonish, which are opposite the eastern shore of Prince Edward Island, where there is a wide expanse of water. I know that on several occasions when the boats could not get into Pictou and allowed themselves to drift down along the Antigonish shore the passengers were landed on the Antigonish shore and were driven across to Antigonish where they took the train. This has been quite a common occurrence, and if there was railway accommodation, then every time Pictou harbour was blocked they would go into Ballentine Cove or Arisaig or Georgeville, but these are not as good harbours as Ballentine Cove and, therefore, Ballentine Cove is the one I would recommend. It is about 18 miles from a railway now. Two years ago the late member for Kings county,

Prince Edward Island was coming across some time in April and when he came to pictou it was blocked. For three days they drifted down towards the Antigonish shore, and he said they could easily have landed anywhere along the Antigonish shore to Cape George.

The next question is a railway from Cape George to Antigonish, a distance of 18 miles. When we remember that proper steam communication between the island and the mainland was guaranteed by the terms of the agreement made between Prince Edward Island and the rest of Canada, that this country is pledged in this matter, the building of 18 miles of railway is but a small and unimportant matter for the people of the island to expect, and a railway there would be an immense benefit. Ballentine Cove is one of the busiest of places in summer. My hon. friend said that the only harbour from some place west of Pictou down to the Strait of Canso was Pictou. I differ from him. The best harbour and the only good harbour is Ballentine's Cove. In substantiation of that I could refer to the reports of engineers who have had occasion to report on Ballentine Cove, and I could produce other reports that Ballentine Cove is the best harbour along Northumberland straits. Five or six miles from Ballentine Cove which is a thriving fishing centre there are magnificent coal properties and shale from which coal oil and other products could be produced. The reports on the coal properties are most glowing, they have been examined by large capitalists in recent years, and there is every hope and prospect that they will be developed. There are also valuable iron properties near at Arisaig and Doctors' Brook. This will undoubtedly become one of the best mineral producing districts in the country. When that time comes, of course, the railway will be required so that the building of a railway from Ballentine Cove to Antigonish would be only a trifling matter, so far as expenses goes. The railway would pay from the start, and it would be the means of developing a rich country.

It may be said that this is a new route. It is not. It was brought to the attention of the House a quarter of a century ago. In 1874 the then member for Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Sinclair) called attention to the unsatisfactory conditions that obtained at that time owing to the condition of Pictou harbour, and he directed attention to the fact that there was another route which he had no doubt would serve the purpose, that it would be open all winter, that is the route from Georgetown or Souris to Ballentine Cove. Two or three years afterwards the attention of the House was called to this route by the member for Antigonish and others. At a later date it was advocated by my predecessor

in this House. Since I have had the honour of a seat in parliament I have called attention to it on several occasions. I have also called the attention of the department to it, and they have been making tests and investigations. Last year the winter was very mild, so it was not favourable for the tests, but an officer of the department was sent down there, he reported from day to day, and his report was that there was open water all the time from Ballentine Cove to Georgetown. I have no doubt there would be open water between Pictou and Charlottetown that year; but that year did not afford a proper test. I hope the test will continue for a number of years, and then we shall know which is the best winter route by which to maintain communication with the island.

I trust the members for the island will look into the route carefully, and I have no doubt they will then be unanimous in advocating the route. Until then, I can do no more than direct the attention of the House to its superiority over other routes and point to it as a solution of the difficulties that now exist so far as winter communication goes.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I may say to my hon. friend the member for Queens (Mr. Warburton), that there is no objection to bringing down the papers he asks for by his motion.

Mr. WARBURTON. Would the Minister of Marine and Fisheries follow me ? There are one or two remarks I would like to make in reply before the debate is closed.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the hon. gentleman will have the right to reply after I have spoken; I could not speak after him.

Mr. WARBURTON. My hon. friend is quite right, I will follow him.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend's motion asks for the production of papers concerning the route between Tatamagouche bay and Charlottetown; at the same time he asks for an improvement in the service in the direction of increasing the number of trips, applying his remarks not only to the winter service, but also to the summer service. In regard to the summer service, I do not know that there is much correspondence on this subject, because the summer service does not pertain to my department. The boats during the summer service are subsidized by the Department of Trade and Commerce, consequently whatever correspondence may exist in regard to that service, will be found in that department. As to the summer service, I do not think the question presents much difficulty. Some suggestions might be made, but generally speaking, I think the service is fairly satisfactory. I see however, that there is some difficulty in re-

spect to the winter service performed by this department.

Now, when the province of Prince Edward Island was admitted into the confederation, it was agreed that the government of Canada should maintain a steam navigation service between the island and the mainland. This obligation has been fulfilled, perhaps not absolutely to the letter, perhaps the service has not been all that was desired or intended. But at the present time, at least, we have what I may call an absolutely daily service. In fact, last year, the two vessels we had on that route, the 'Stanley' and the 'Earl Grey,' were able to cross daily, and this year the 'Earl Grey' has been able to cross throughout the season with the exception of one day, if my information is correct. So in that regard, we may say that the obligation which was undertaken by the government of Canada when Prince Edward Island entered the confederation, has been entirely carried out. We must not forget that for many years past a great deal has been done for the purpose of improving that service. Before the province entered confederation, communication with the mainland was made by iceboats tha is to say, a service that is still resorted to when absolutely necessary, was maintained to carry the mails. But after the entrance of the island into the confederation the government acquired a vessel called the 'Northern Light,' for the purpose of making the service. Later on, we produced an ice-breaker, the 'Stanley,' about 1888; then we procured the 'Minto,' in 1899-1900, and lastly we got the 'Earl Grey,' during the year 1908.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the service which is being maintained today is far more satisfactory than that which existed prior to confederation. I suppose nobody will undertake to deny that not only has the obligation entered into at confederation been maintained, but we have provided the best available vessels to carry out our obligation. Three or four years ago serious complaints were made to the department, and in the House, to the effect that the service performed by the 'Stanley' and the 'Minto' was far from being satisfactory. In one year, I remember, the two vessels were caught in the ice, and the service was suspended for a considerable length of time. The result was that a serious agitation was started to improve the service, and we began to examine the question, and to ascertain whether it would not be better to put on a stronger ice-breaker than the 'Stanley' and the 'Minto' which were then in service. I remember that in 1907, when I visited Europe, I brought with me Captain Brown, who is certainly a very capable officer, and a man whose advice in a matter of that kind, was of great value. Captain Brown not only came to England with me, but we visited Germany together. We were advised that there were in Germany some very good shipyards which turned out ice-breakers of a high class, which were used in the Baltic. We thought it advisable to visit Hamburg, in order to acquire all the information we could. The result of our visit showed that the best ice-breakers were not built in Germany, but could be built in England. About the same time, we called over from England, a naval architect, to study the situation on the spot, and also to give us advice as to the best class of ships we could secure to perform that service. These things show you, Mr. Speaker, that we have taken all the necessary steps to obtain the best possible advice in regard to ships capable of maintaining that service. I am glad to say to-day that the expectations we had with regard to the 'Earl Grey' have been absolutely fulfilled. I have now in my hand the report of last year, which, as I have already shown, demonstrates that during every day of last year—it is true that last winter it was rather mild—that vessel has been able to cross between the island and the mainland.

We have found this year, which has certainly been one of the worst years that we ever had, a year, I think, without many precedents, that the result has been absolutely satisfactory. The 'Minto' which was the running mate of the 'Earl Grey' was caught in the ice and was obliged to stop her trips, but the 'Earl Grey' was able to cope with the situation all the time excepting, as I said, for just one day. On that day she could have crossed over but it was somewhat dangerous, and it was thought by the captain and by our agent at Charlottetown that it would probably be better that she should not attempt to cross. The great difficulty that exists with regard to crossing in these boats is the northeast wind. Northeast winds come through the strait and cause a blockade which almost prevents vessels from getting through at all I have here a list of the different days on which this north or northeast wind was encountered during this season, and I am going to give the House the dates and temperatures. Hon. members will find that in spite of the low temperatures and gales which were prevailing on many days, this boat has been able to cross at all times with the exception of one day. The boat started on the 17th December. During the month of January she was able to cross over from Charlottetown to Pictou. On the 21st December there was a northeast wind and also on the following days; on the 21st December the temperature was 30 degrees above zero; 26th December 10 above zero; 31st December zero; 6th January 13 above; 7th January 13 above; 12th January 25 above; 16th January 4 above; 17th Janu-

ary 12 below; 18th Januarv 12 below. For three consecutive days a northeast wind was prevailing, but during the whole of that time the boat was making a trip every day. I have extracted the following statement from the report which I have received:

January 18.—The ice was very heavy; the boat had to back up three times. So far the straits are full of ice from Pictou west and very heavy in places. 'Earl Grey' in good trim and is doing splendid work.

On the 20th January.—Still northeast wind with 7 above zero; they met heavy ice on that day, too; Jan. 21, there was a northeast wind; 23rd, through heavy ice, 8 above; 25th, 15 above, heavy ice at Point Prim; Feb. 4, 'Minto' was caught in ice but 'Grey' passed through; Feb. 7, ice close packed and very hard fighting, 2 above; Feb. 8, 20 above; Feb. 18, the two boats started running.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think these temperatures show the difficulty of the situation, and also show that the 'Earl Grey' has been running all the time, with the exception of one day. I understand the suggestion which has been made that we should try to get a sister ship to the 'Earl Grey' and be better able in that way to have a continuous service. I do not know whether it would be advisable to build a new ship right away or not. I think, on the contrary, that we had better wait a little. We have gained a great deal of experience, and we are gaining experience in connection with that service. We have improved our service from the 'Stanley' to the 'Minto', and from the 'Minto' to the 'Earl Grey'. It is possible that we might still be able to improve the construction of the 'Earl Grey.' We are studying the question. We are continuing our inquiries in that respect, and it may be that a stronger ship even than the 'Earl Grey' can be constructed. Let us examine that point very carefully, and perhaps some day the government of Canada may find itself in a position to suggest the construction of even a stronger ship than the one now in existence. I think I have carried out the promise that I made some years ago that I would get a ship that would be capable of performing this service continuouslv without any interruption.

We have been discussing to-day the question of changing the winter route. Many suggestions have been made. I see that my hon. friend from Prince, Prince Edward Island, (Mr. Richards), would have no objection to the establishment of a service between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse. We have also the suggestion that a service should be put on between Charlottetown and Brulé. Some others are suggesting Georgetown and Pictou, and another member has been proposing a service from Georgetown to Cape George. That means that there is a great difference of opinion between the members of this House who have spoken about the route. I am not going to give my views upon this question, though, having had to deal with this subject for many years, I might have a personal opinion upon the matter. But I may perhaps be permitted to lay before the House some facts, some statements or some reports which might be of interest to hon. members. We will discuss first the question of the Cape Tormentine-Cape Traverse route. This question has been before the department for a great many years. Many many years ago, statements were made to the effect that if trials were made on that route it would be found that the service could be very much improved. Trials have been made between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse, but the results do not seem to be very much in favour of the opening of the route. The reports on this subject have been brought before parliament, and they can be consulted. In the last two years my hon. friend from Prince has brought the question before me on several occasions. He is still urging upon me that we should open that route and that we should have a vessel plying during the whole of the winter between Cape Tormentine, or Summerside, and Cape Traverse.

Although I have not been able to go as far as the hon. gentleman would wish, still I think the proposition I made last year meets with general approval among the people of his county. It was stated to me by my hon. friend that when the summer boats ceased operating between Pointe du Chêne and Summerside a great quantity of freight was left lying on the wharf, and it had to be reshipped to Charlottetown or Georgetown and sent to Pictou. I endeavoured to come to the relief of the people of Summerside, and I wrote the following letter on the 26th November, 1909:

26th November, 1909.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 30th ult., with respect to the winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

After a careful consideration of the representations which have been submitted to me, I have authorized an extension of this service, as follows:—

1. From the time the summer steamers go off the Summerside route, until the summer steamers cease running on the Charlottetown-Pictou route, the department will give (ice conditions permitting) a service from Summerside to Tormentine, if possible, and when not possible, then from Summerside to Pictou.

2. After the date on which the summer steamers cease running on the Charlottetown-Pictou route, the department will continue the service on the Summerside route, until all the freight then in Summerside, or which, on or prior to said date, has been shipped, or billed in carload lots to Summerside for transportation to the mainland, but which has not yet reached Summerside, shall have been carried over to the mainland.

3. The department will not undertake to carry any freight to the mainland, which shall have been billed or shipped, even in carload lots, to Summerside, later than the date on which the summer steamers cease running on the Charlottetown-Pictou route.

4. In case of emergency, the department will if necessary, immediately withdraw the winter steamer on the Summerside-Tormentine route, whether freight is at or on its way to Summerside for transportation to the mainland or not.

Instructions are being sent to the agent of the department at Charlottetown, to have the 'Minto' prepared to give a service in accordance with these conditions.

Yours very faithfully,
(Sg.) L. P. BRODEUR.

D. K. Currie, Esq.,
Secy. Board of Trade,
Summerside, P.E.I.

That arrangement, as I understand it, proved satisfactory last year, but, unfortunately, there was a hitch this year. The freight was taken from Summerside in accordance with the arrangement, but when it arrived at the mainland the wharf was not in a proper condition to unload the freight on it, and arrangements had not been made for its transit on the railway, which is owned by a private company. I am quite sure that next year these difficulties will be removed, and I assure the hon. gentlemen that it is the intention of the department to carry out to the letter the arrangement detailed in this letter of the 26th of November, 1909. My department has communicated with the Department of Public Works, asking them to take steps to see that the wharf will be in good condition next winter. I do not think it is altogether desirable that the boats should remain longer on the routes, as has been requested by some, because so long as the boats ply freight will be sent there, and in the end it will be necessary to send the steamers by the Georgetown and Pictou route, and the freight will have to be reshipped all the same and dissatisfaction ensue. I think the arrangement we have made ought to meet the legitimate wishes of the people living in that section. The question as to a winter route between Charlottetown and Brulé was brought to our attention by the hon. members for Queens (Messrs. Warburton and Prowse). They have represented to us that the entrance to Charlottetown harbour was easy of navigation, and that Brulé harbour, or Tatamagouche bay would furnish a desirable port on the mainland. Acting on the request of these hon gentlemen, we gave instructions to the hydrographic survey branch to make surveys of Tatamagouche bay, and as the chief question was not whether the bay was navigable or not, but whether the ice conditions would not be as difficult as in Pictou harbour, Mr. Stewart, the officer in charge of the bay, sent us the following interesting report:

MEMORANDUM FOR MINISTER.

In accordance with your instructions a survey in detail was made of the northeast shore of John bay, in Tatamagouche bay, between Cape John and the mouth of John river, for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not it would be feasible to construct wharfs off the shore and a branch line from the Intercolonial railway, in the vicinity of the village of River John, to one, or all of these wharfs.

The survey shows that there is very little water inside the bay more than 30 feet deep, and that the 18-foot contour line generally skirts the shore, examined at a distance of 700 feet from the points and about 1,400 feet from the heads of the bays between.

This 18-foot contour line is nearly straight, and the bottom between the shore and it deepens very gradually, there being no sign of rock outcropping nor of reefs.

The bottom is nearly all mud outside of a narrow fringe of sand off the beach. This condition of affairs exists for a distance of two miles inside of Cape John.

The land inside the shore line is slightly hilly, but is nowhere higher than 50 feet above low water. The banks close to the beach are generally steep, about 20 feet high, so that there would be no difficulty in constructing wharfs or a railway line to meet them.

In addition to this survey, instructions were issued to make an examination of the bay in the vicinity of Peninsula point, this being on the south shore about 7 miles northwest of River John village.

This examination shows that the 25-foot contour reaches to within one-quarter mile off Peninsula point at best; that the bottom is rocky, and that there is a rocky reef uncovering at low water situated about one-quarter of a mile northwest off Peninsula point.

Whilst a wharf built here would have a good foundation, there would require to be a considerable amount of expensive dredging to enable vessels to reach it. The 30-foot contour does not reach within a mile of the point.

A blue print of the work done is attached.

WM. J. STEWART,
Hydrographer.

January 16, 1911.

But there are other matters to be considered in connection with this proposal. To make the change proposed would require a new branch railway, a spur line, some wharfs, and better accommodation than exists to-day. The port referred to is on the Oxford branch of the Intercolonial railway. On that branch, I understand, no large business is done and the passenger trains are very few. I am afraid that if the route of the steamers were changed, there would be required at the same time to be some very important changes made in the running of the passenger trains in that direction. We also instructed the superintendent of lights in Nova Scotia, Mr. P. C. Johnson, to make a report on this question of the conditions of the ice at Tatamagouche and Brulé. In his report, which is dated December 10, 1909, Mr. Johnson says:

Regarding my knowledge of the conditions at Tatamagouche and Brulé harbours, the body of water known as Amet sound and at the entrance to Brulé and Tatamagouche harbours freezes over generally about the latter part of January, and some winters it freezes right out to Amet island. They have often teamed material on the ice to Amet island, but some winters they cannot do this. After Amet Sound is frozen over there is teaming every winter from River John past Brulé harbour to Tatamagouche, bushes being put into the ice to mark the track to prevent teams from going astray on the ice in snowstorms. There are also trees staking off the road from River John to Cape John or nearly to the end of Cape John as far as Reef Point. I have driven myself over this ice as far as Tatamagouche many times.

Not satisfied with that, we thought it would be very important to have a man on the spot who would make a full inspection during the last winter, and Captain Robinson of the steamer 'Vigilant' was instructed to go to River John and stay there for some months to study the conditions of the ice. His report is here. I am not going to read it, because it is rather lengthy, but it will be laid on the table with the other papers. In the face of the difficulties which these various reports show, and in the face of the divergence of opinion which exists among members and others on this question, would it be advisable on our part to change the route? It is certainly not our intention at present to do so. We would require further information before we could take such a step. The situation at present is this. Immediately after the summer boats have ceased running from Charlottetown to Pictou, we have the two ice-breakers run between those two points as long as possible. It has been suggested that these vessels should start at a fixed time from Charlottetown to Pictou and at a fixed time from Georgetown to Pictou. I may say that I had that idea myself at one time—that it would be more satisfactory to the people of the island if they knew that at a certain date the vessels would be at Summerside or Charlottetown and on a certain date at Georgetown; but after having ascertained the views of the people on the island, I find that generally speaking they preferred that the vessels should continue to sail from Charlottetown to Pictou as long as possible, and only then be changed to the route from Georgetown to Pictou. In view of this general expression of views, I had of course to recede from the position I had taken because the people of the island were more conversant with its needs than I am, and I was very willing to submit my personal views to theirs.

My hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Fraser) says that the conditions under which Prince Edward Island came into confederation have not been carried out in the matter of communication and that they are to-day where they were 50 years ago. I think that is going a little too far.

Mr. FRASER. I do not think I said that. I said that the conditions to-day with respect to the carriage of mails, is just as it was 50 years ago. I did not say that some progress had not been made, but that, on account of the frequent storms and severity of the winters, the conditions so far, as regards the crossing in little iceboats, are the same as they were 50 years ago.

Mr. BRODEUR. True, the iceboats have been in use a few days, but according to the report I have read to-night, the 'Earl Grey' has been running all the time in spite of the severity of the winter, except one day, and consequently, I do not think that we are open to much blame. The criticism I refer to, was not made so much by my hon. friend as by the newspaper he read, and I submit it is a little outside the true note that should be struck in the circumstances. My hon. friend agrees with me in the decision I have taken that in the running of these boats, whether from Charlottetown to Pictou or Georgetown to Pictou, or Cape Travers to Cape Tormentine, that should be left entirely to the discretion of the captain.

Mr. FRASER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODEUR. I made up my mind a few years ago that the captains should be the men to decide. They are men of great experience, honesty and devotion to the service. There are no better men in the service of the country than Captain Brown and Captain Finlayson. They are both old officers, and I hope will remain much longer with us. Some criticise them, and say they are too cautious, but those men have been in the service many years, and during all that time, not one casualty has happened. That is the greatest record which could be made in circumstances so difficult for any navigator. I prefer to see these men cautious, than to be more risky and perhaps meet with some serious disaster.

My hon. friend called my attention to the question of a telephone at Georgetown. This is the first information I have had on that matter. I have taken note of his representations, and will bring them to the attention of my officers and see whether a remedy can be affected.

My hon. friend called my attention to the government reducing the rates.

Mr. FRASER. I meant the rates charged on the little iceboats between the capes.

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought my hon. friend was speaking of the rates on the boats. According to a statement I have in

my hand, since we have had that service under our control, the government has expended on it $1,313,334, and the revenue has only been $385,744, showing a net loss of $930,864, and that includes only the working expenses. It does not include the cost of construction. If we take the cost of construction of the four boats devoted to that service, the amount expended on them has been $870,915.

Mr. FRASER. What four boats ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Northern Light', The 'Stanley', The 'Minto' and the 'Earl Grey.' I do not wish to detain the House any longer. I was very glad to hear what has been said to-day. Some very important statements have been made which will not fail to be taken into most serious consideration. I may say that the questions which have been discussed to-day will be considered by the department and we shall take all the necessary steps to give Prince Edward Island the best service possible.

Mr. WARBURTON. I have listened with much pleasure to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). I have no desire to flatter my hon. friend at all, but I think that my colleagues from Prince Edward Island will agree with me that we never had a Minister of Marine and Fisheries—and we have had some very good ones—who has taken more active interest and shown greater sympathy with the difficulties which we have to contend against, than the present minister. Should he ever run short of a constituency, he would have a mighty good chance on the island, because we believe he is in earnest, and doing his best. For that reason, I am always trying to impress these matters upon him, knowing as I do, that in him we have a sympathetic listener, who will do his best to remove any grievances under which we may suffer.

I was astounded at some of the remarks made by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). He told us that the trouble was not in the harbour of Pictou, but out side in the straits. But I never have said that the trouble lies in the harbour, because steamers can break the harbour ice, but where the trouble lies, is off the mouth of the harbour. If it is not, how comes it that the steamers are stuck inside the harbour from a day to two months at a time, not able to get out? That statement, which I have proved up to the hilt, is sufficient to show that the trouble is with Pictou harbour. My hon. friend read a long pronouncement from the pilot of the 'Earl Grey' and he also referred to Mr. Hyndman, who, he said, would take a very different view, regarding the coal. Well, Mr. Hyndman is, as has already been said, an agent for the company that supplies the coal, but he is a high minded gentleman, and I do not think he would declare that that coal was of the best quality for steam purposes. We can quite understand however, why Mr. Hyndman was referred to. There is an old saying: Divide and conquer. If my hon. friend can create dissention among the people of Prince Edward Island, that will enable him to still further postpone the time when we can get clear of Pictou harbour. But the gentleman whose letter he read at great length, the pilot of the 'Earl Grey', is himself also a resident of Pictou, and has been for years and has no desire whatever to go into any other port, if he can help it. He is a very good man, but it is not in his interests to go to any other port; and as to his opinion on the value of steam coal, I do not think it should carry very much weight. I would prefer an opinion from the engineers who use the coal and work the engines, and I would be glad if the hon. minister would have the logs of the engineers brought down some of these days and see what power they get up, although that is not included in the resolution.

We are told that in February Pictou is the only place where the steamer can run. I absolutely take issue with that. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) had to make up a case and how did he go about making it up? I said and I say now, that the harbour of Georgetown in Prince Edward Island is an excellent harbour, I never said anything else. In the winter when we have storms and east winds, if you have four days' northeast wind Pictou harbour becomes an impossible harbour. But because I admitted that Georgetown was a good harbour my hon. friend had to make up some premises on which to oppose the argument I was using and he said that because Georgetown harbour was a good harbour therefore Charlottetown is a bad harbour, and then it was easy to go further and say it was the worst harbour in Prince Edward Island. As a matter of fact my hon. friend does not know anything about any harbour in Prince Edward Island. He knows nothing of Charlottetown harbour. I proved from the charts last year that the entrance to Charlottetown harbour at its shallowest part is 37 feet in depth and within the harbour there is 75 feet of water. We could take all the water of Pictou harbour from the bottom of Charlottetown harbour and still have water enough to float those ships. My hon. friend says that if you go into Tatamagouche you have no conveniences and no wharf. I know that perfectly. One of the reasons why I bring this matter up is to try to get the conveniences there. I do not believe it would cost more to do so than to keep up the enormous erections you have in Pictou, the work would not require to be anything like as extensive.

He says we cannot get out of Charlottetown harbour to-day. I say you can get out of Charlottetown harbour to-day with the 'Earl Grey.' I am accused of taking up the time of the House with impossible proposals. I would like to know where the impossibility of my proposals has been tested. We have had the entrance to Charlottetown harbour tested and the ice bored year after year at the expense of the people there and it has been found in all those years that the ice has never formed in such thickness as to prevent the 'Earl Grey' going there. I have not the same personal knowledge of the harbour at Tatamagouche, but I believe there is no difficulty with ice, and that Tatamagouche is protected from all winds. The longest sweep of the wind they can get at Tatamagouche is from Prince Edward Island and it is guarded by Pictou island and different points up the straits, it is guarded in every direction, as any hon. member can see by consulting a chart. The gentleman who supplied information as to no northern ice coming in there was prepared to make up a case. I can quite understand the strong desire to make up a case, but the information I had was from men who had as good information as he had. The hon. gentleman speaks of Mr. Hyndman being the centre of information. Mr. Hyndman is a first-class hydrographer of the British navy and spent years surveying this part of the sea and many of the charts now in use were plotted with his own hand. You cannot say that a man who holds that position is not capable of saying something of currents and the way the wind blows. I had that information from him that the northern ice came down with the northeast wind and if you look at the map you will see that it stands to reason it must come down. I have had the same information from seafaring men and the only information we have to the contrary is from the pilot of the 'Earl Grey,' who resides in Pictou and does not want to leave that port. If it is not the case why have we always been troubled in Pictou when there has been a day or two of continuous northeast wind? He says we cannot get out of Charlottetown to-day. He probably means that we cannot get backwards and forwards from Pictou and that is about it. The reason is that when you get east of Point Prim you get into the ice that is drifting in. As Mr. Desbarats, the late Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, pointed out, if you once get past Point Prim you will have no difficulty about Charlottetown harbour and its entrance. I admit that if you try to go from Pictou to Charlottetown to-day you will have trouble, but it will not be at the Charlottetown end, it will be at Pictou in the eastern end of the straits. We all know something of this in the island, because we are forced by our circumstances to become acquainted with the conditions.

The hon. gentleman says his reason for speaking warmly was to resent aspersions on Pictou. I do not propose to cast aspersions on Pictou, I have a great regard for Pictou, but the fact that the hon. member gets warm over Pictou or that I have a personal regard for it, is no reason why we should be compelled to stop in a port and have people and mails sent down to the capes and brought across on iceboats, and our business held up for anything of that kind. That is what has happened, notwithstanding the statement of my hon. friend. If they get a few days of northeast wind that will happen again.

The hon. member undertook to say where I was when I spoke about my own experience of being tied up at Pictou, he says I was not on the ship but on shore. In 1898 I did live up in the hotel, but in 1905 the town of Pictou was so full of people trying to get over to the island that I went on board the ship and was there the whole 14 days and I saw the efforts that were made to get out. Any one who had eyes could see that it was an impossibility to get out of Pictou harbour. You could get out of the harbour, past the lighthouses but not out into the straits, you had three or four miles of solid ice through which no vessel could go. My hon. friend says I was having a good time in Pictou. I must give my Pictou friends credit for always trying to make it as pleasant as they can and I thank them for it but that does not affect the question we are discussing.

Because my hon. friend from Kings said that Georgetown is a good harbour, my hon. friend from Pictou takes that up to again force his contention that because Georgetown is a good harbour Charlottetown is necessarily a bad one. We have more than one good harbour in Prince Edward Island, we have more than there are on the corresponding section of the mainland. In Charlottetown harbour and Georgetown harbour you could float nearly all the ships of the British navy; they are splendid harbours, both of them. My hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) spoke strongly saying that Georgetown was the only harbour in Prince Edward Island and Pictou was no harbour at all, and that we should therefore go over to Ballentine Cove. I do not suppose my hon. friend was serious about that. At the same time I shall not kick up much of a row if you can get a good harbour which you can enter all the time, even if it is Ballentine Cove but Georgetown would not be the Prince Edward Island harbour it would be Souris in Kings county where with a little work you would have a harbour open all the year round.

My hon. friend says that evidence has

been obtained to show that Tatamagouche harbour would be impossible. My hon. friend spoke of the harbour of Brulé. The harbour of Brulé is a harbour inside the harbour, I believe there is a bar across the mouth. The place I spoke about lies in the outer harbour of Tatamagouche bay where you have plenty of water. Brulé, of course, is a place difficult to reach. The hon. member for Pictou said that no one ever dreamed of going to Brulé. I tell him that in summer the steamers plied to Brulé fifty years before they plied to Pictou, within my memory, and it was only because the railway was brought down to Pictou landing that they left Brulé so as to get to the railway. In Charlottetown harbour, one hundred yards from the wharf, the water is 50 feet deep. The water at the wharf itself where the 'Earl Grey' lies now is 26 feet in depth. In Pictou we have sufficient water for boats. They had to dredge a considerable cutting at the entrance to the harbour in order to get enough water. I believe originally they had 18 feet, now they have 24 feet, which compared with Charlottetown or Tatamagouche, seems rather shallow.

I regret that I was a few minutes late in coming in, but I have been informed that my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said that these boats at certain times draw thirty feet of water, and that there is only 17½ feet of water a mile from the shore at Tatamagouche. These boats never drew thirty feet of water. Ordinarily the draught of those boats is 17½ feet of water. It is true that neither the 'Minto' nor any other of those vessels ever drew thirty feet of water, no matter how it was trimmed, she never drew 22 feet of water. If she drew thirty feet of water, she could not get into Pictou harbour at all. Last year the 'Earl Grey' went up and down between Charlottetown and Pictou backwards and forwards when there was no ice in the straits. Last year the 'Earl Grey' lost only two days, but that was more on account of the thick weather than on account of ice. Last year was not a year to test a vessel at all; this year being severe will afford a better test.

Now, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us that when the 'Earl Grey' started out this year on the 17th of December she ran to the 16th of January, between Charlottetown and Pictou. That is perfectly right. I crossed in the 'Earl Grey' myself from Charlottetown on the 14th of January when there was no ice or anything else to interfere with navigation. When I crossed over on the 14th of January you might have passed in a good sailing boat. It is true that the weather changed on the following day, but there was no ice at that time. I desire to thank the minister for the care with which he has investigated this matter, and I hope that he will do whatever lies in his power in order to remedy the grievous condition of affairs under which we labour. I do not believe that the expenditure of a little money at Tatamagouche or anywhere else is going to stand in the way of removing this grievance, once the minister is convinced that it exists. More than that, I believe that the main reason why my hon. friend from Pictou argues so warmly upon this matter, is that he himself is beginning to see that sooner or later, and I think sooner than later, this route will have to be changed. He sees now that, with the conditions as they exist in the other harbours, it is almost certain that in the course of time when this great change is made we will have a good system, with a harbour in Prince Edward Island accessible throughout the winter, and a harbour on the mainland also accessible throughout the winter which now we have not.

Motion agreed to.

ACCIDENTS ON CANADIAN RAILROADS.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey) moved:

That, whereas it is stated that on Canadian railroads last year one trainman in every 199 was killed and one in every 33 was injured, in the opinion of this House it is the duty of the government to cause to be made a most thorough investigation as to the facts and conditions, as a result of which some means may be devised for the better protection of railway employees, and of preventing so great a loss of life and so great and frequent accidental injury.

He said: When I read in a Canadian paper that on Canadian railroads last year one trainman in every 199 was killed, and one in every thirty-three was injured, the figures seemed to me startling. There are no men in Canada, I think, more worthy of our consideration, or whom the government ought to try harder to assist and protect, so far as they can be assisted and protected, than the trainmen who run our railway trains. These men work very hard, they expose themselves to great dangers, they endure great hardships. After putting that resolution upon the Order Paper, I made a somewhat careful study of our Canadian legislation and of United States legislation having in view the protection of trainmen. I find the requirements of Canadian laws and of United States laws to be very much the same. I will with your permission point out the similarities of the laws in the two countries, and then point out the important differences, and make two or three suggestions.

The United States Congress in 1892 passed an Act intituled 'The Safety Appliance Act.' That has been since amended at different times. The Safety Appliance Act of the United States sets forth in detail

what brakes, ladders, couplers and other devices and apparatus shall be used on United States railway trains for the protection of employees. The Canadian Railway Act, section 264 provides that certain safety appliances therein defined shall be provided. Section 30 of the Canadian Railway Act provides that the Board of Railway Commissioners may order regulations, among other things, with respect to the rolling stock, apparatus, cattleguards, appliances, signals, methods, devices and structures to be used upon the railways so as to provide means for the due protection of employees of the company and of the public. Section 414 of our Railway Act stipulates that every train employee intoxicated while on duty shall be subject to a fine not exceeding $400, or imprisonment not exceeding five years. In both Canada and the United States, the laws provide that railway companies shall give notice of all train accidents. In the United States this notice is to be given to the Interstate Commerce Commission ; in Canada the notice is to be given to the Minister of Railways. In both countries, under and by virtue of their legislation, inspectors are to be employed and inspection is provided for, with this marked difference, that in Canada our inspectors perform all their duties when they inspect the cars and the devices made to protect the lives of the railway employees. But in the United States their legislation provides that the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission shall enforce the law. In each country penalties are provided for the infringement of the laws, or for disobedience of orders of, in the one country the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the other of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Section 30 of the Canadian Act, subsection 3, says that :

> The Board of Railway Commissioners may by regulation provide penalties where none are provided by the Railway Act, but these penalties shall not exceed one hundred dollars.

Now, Sir, I have pointed out where, in the main, the laws of the two countries are similar. I have said that in the United States their laws better provide for the enforcement of their statutes and regulations. As I have said, our board has no power to lay any information, to bring any action against an offender. The Act I have referred to as the 'United States Safety Appliance Acts' provides as follows:

> That any such common carrier using any locomotive engine, running any train, or hauling or permitting to be hauled or used on its line any car in violation of any of the provisions of this Act, shall be liable to a penalty of $100 for each and every such violation, to be recovered in suit or suits to be brought by the United States district attorney in the district court of the United States having jurisdiction in the locality where such violation shall have been committed; and it shall be the duty of such district attorney to bring such suits upon duly verified information being lodged with him of such violation having occurred; and it shall also be the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to lodge with the proper district attorneys information of any such violations as may come to its knowledge.

These two sections disclose a most important difference between the legislation of our own country and that of the United States. In Canada it is not the duty of any member of our Board of Railway Commissioners, nor is it the duty of any employee, or member of the staff of the board, to bring any action, or to lay any information. It rests with the person aggrieved, or with some other person not having any personal interest in the matter. It is reasonable to suppose that a railway employee will hesitate very much about bringing action against a railway company because of the fact that one of the likely consequences will be the loss of his situation, thus depriving him of his employment. The United States Sundry Civil Act, passed June 28, 1902, authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to employ inspectors to execute and enforce the requirements of the Safety Appliance Acts. The Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized, then, to employ and does employ two sets of inspectors, one to make a careful inspection of the cars used by the various railway companies of the republic, and the other to see to the enforcement of the laws that they provide. There is, Sir, other important legislation in the United States that we do not have in Canada. It is not upon our statute-books, it is not contained in any order of the Railway Commission, and I do not think that our Board of Railway Commissioners have any power to make such an order or law to limit the hours of service. The United States have an Act, passed on the 4th March, 1907, one section of which reads as follows:

> That it shall be unlawful for any common carrier, its officers or agents, subject to this Act to require or permit any employee subject to this Act to be or remain on duty for a longer period than sixteen consecutive hours, and whenever such employee of such common carrier shall have been continuously on duty for sixteen hours he shall be relieved and not required or permitted to again go on duty until he has had at least ten consecutive hours off duty; and no such employee who has been on duty sixteen hours in the aggregate in any twenty-four hour period shall be required or permitted to continue or again go on duty without having had at least eight consecutive hours off duty; provided, that no operator, train despatcher, or other employee who by use of the telegraph or telephone despatches, reports, transmits, re-

ceives or delivers orders appertaining to or affecting train movements shall be required or permitted to be or remain on duty for a longer period than nine hours in a twenty-four hour period in towers, offices, places and stations continuously operated night and day, nor for a longer period than thirteen hours in towers, offices, places and stations operated only during the daytime, except in case of emergency, when the employees named in this proviso may be permitted to be and remain on duty for four additional hours in a twenty-four hour period not exceeding three days in any week.

The next section provides as follows:

And it shall also be the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to lodge with the proper district attorneys information of any such violation as may come to its knowledge. In all prosecutions under this Act the common carrier shall be deemed to have had knowledge of all acts of all its officers and agents.

I think that is very important legislation. I am informed that in Canada the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway have regulations of their own for limiting, in some such way as the United States statute does, the hours of labour. I do not know how carefully or how carelessly the orders of these two railway companies are enforced, and I do not know whether any other Canadian railways except these two have such regulations. I believe that a few years ago the Canadian Board of Railway Commissioners was asked to make an order, or to obtain legislation, limiting the hours of labour in some such way as the American statute does. I am told that the engineers and firemen were in favour of such legislation, but that the conductors and trainmen, meaning, I suppose, the brakesmen, were opposed to any such legislation. It might very well be that the employees of a railway company are opposed to any statute which will limit their hours of labour. It is very natural that a conductor, or brakeman, for the sake of making the greatest possible earnings, of receiving the utmost wages, would be willing to work longer hours than he ought to be permitted to work, having consideration for his own safety, those who labour with him and those riding upon the trains of which he is in charge. I think that oftentimes, when an accident occurs upon a Canadian railway, if it has been due to the negligence of any railway employees, the excuse or reason is given that the employee had been on duty so many hours that he could not possibly be in his normal condition, or as alert as he otherwise would have been. There is too rather novel legislation upon the American statute-books passed in February, 1905, and I will quote shortly from that Act. This Act, passed in 1905 by the American Congress, since amended and still remaining upon the statute-books, is entitled 'An Act to promote Security of Travel upon Railroads engaged in the Interstate Commerce and to encourage the saving of Life.' The first part of the first section of the Act reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that the President of the United States be and is hereby authorized to cause to be prepared bronze medals of honour, with suitable emblematic devices, which shall be bestowed upon any persons who shall hereafter, by extreme daring, endanger their own lives in saving, or endeavouring to save, lives from any wreck, disaster, or grave accident, or in preventing or endeavouring to prevent such wreck, disaster, or grave accident, upon any railroad within the United States engaged in interstate commerce.

If we had not read the title of that Act one might suppose it to be merely philanthropy. The title indicates the purpose of the United States Congress had in view in passing the Act: An Act to promote the security of travel upon railroads engaged in interstate commerce and to encourage the saving of life. It may be questioned as to whether or not that would effect the desired end and yet if the United States Congress think it wise to pass it and allow it to remain on the statute-book after six years experience, it is perhaps worthy of our consideration. Complaint has also been made that many of our Canadian railways do not employ a sufficient number of section men to keep the track in condition so as to ensure the greatest degree of safety to employees and the travelling public, and that matter might perhaps be worthy of inquiry. I am pleased to note that in Canada and in the United States as well, those whose duty it is to protect railway employees are encouraged, with the result of their efforts. At page 352 of the report of our own railway commissioners, Mr. A. J. Nixon, chief traffic officer, reports that last year 51 passengers, 194 employees and 211 other persons were killed; while 211 passengers, 745 employees and 167 other persons were injured. Mr. Nixon says:

Investigations were made by the board's inspectors in 282 of the above cases and reports on same were handed to the board. General inspections have been made by the inspectors of equipment, stations and crossings of all railways under the jurisdiction of the board.

The commissioners at page 112 say:

The schedules to the report of the chief operating officer give a full analysis of the accidents during the year, which would have been a record one had it not been for the unfortunate accident at Spanish river. This has been and is being most carefully investigated.

I turn to the last obtainable report of the United States Interstate Commerce Commission and I read:

As showing the care with which the safety appliances demanded by the law are being maintained, it may be noted that while the railroads dispensed with the services of a great many employees to meet the economies necessitated by falling off of business in 1907, the force of men employed to maintain safety appliances suffered the least curtailment of any. As a result the condition of equipment continued to improve during the slack period of 1908-9, the year just closed, showing the least percentage of defective equipment of any year since the law became operative, notwithstanding that the number of cars examined by our inspectors was 125,000 greater than in any previous year. As indicating the great improvement that has taken place within the past five years, it may be stated that the defects per 1,000 cars inspected in 1905 numbered 309·56, while for the year 1909 the figure is 74·65.

The report of the Interstate Commerce Commission indicate that their efforts are meeting with great success and that their inspection of cars and equipment is very thorough. I trust that the inspection by the inspectors of our own board is equally thorough. Let me call the attention of the House, but particularly the Minister of Railways to three or four things: In the first place I think our Railway Act might well be amended after consultation between the Minister of Railways and the Board of Railway Commissioners, so as to give us something like the same machinery for enforcing our laws and regulations as prevails under the legislation of the United States. Notwithstanding that some of the employees oppose this, while others favour it, I believe it would be a step in advance if our Railway Act did contain provision that would limit as the United States law does, the hours of service of trainmen and of telegraph and telephone despatchers. Then, there is legislation in the United States as to the granting of medals, and the Minister of Railways might deem that worthy of consideration. I have no desire to push the resolution unduly, my object being to bring the matter to the attention of parliament, of the Minister of Railways, and of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). The subject brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) is very important. In this country railway operation is much more difficult than in a country where there are not the same extremes of heat and cold. The accidents to employees may be divided into several classes, among which might be mentioned cases in which the employee becomes so accustomed to his work that he ignores conditions of danger, and no care on the part of the company can prevent accidents from that cause. I have in my mind a case where a few weeks ago two employees were working on a car in the yard, and they carelessly stepped in front of an incoming express and both were killed. No sort of regulation or rule can protect men against their own carelessness. Then, a number of employees are killed while on board trains as crews. Accidents arise from defects in the track or roadway, and others are caused by the neglect of some officials connected with the operation of trains. Then there are accidents arising from defective rolling stock. The extremes of heat and cold in Canada render railway operation very difficult. To-day the track may be in good condition and examine it carefully as you will you find no defect, but a heavy frost comes followed by a thaw, and the track heaves and accidents occur. It is almost impossible in a climate like ours to prevent this, but I think I may say that in recent years more care has been taken than formerly. As to the number of section men that should be employed, I have studied that matter somewhat carefully and while there is a difference in the number of section men employed on different railways, the differing traffic of the lines may account for that. On a trunk line carrying heavy traffic a greater number of men per track mile are needed than on a branch line on which there is only one or two trains a day. It is difficult to make a law that would apply absolutely to the number of men that should be employed per section on a railway. The sections differ in length, some are longer than others, and one section will carry more traffic than another section.

I discussed that at some length with one of the officials of the brotherhoods recently, and he agreed with me in thinking that in Canada at the present time a sufficient number of men on the average was being employed to keep the tracks in fairly good condition, considering the traffic on the various lines. But this must be remembered, that the brotherhoods themselves have a very strong influence in determining how many men shall be employed, their hours of labour, and all that kind of thing. No railway company is allowed itself to say how many hours a man shall work, and scarcely how many men shall work. The railway companies have to make contracts with the various brotherhoods as to all these things, and my experience is that they arrive at a pretty fair solution as far as the men and the keeping of the tracks in condition are concerned. Then, in the last few years the rolling stock has become so much heavier and the trains so much longer that a heavier rail and a better roadbed are required than was the case a few years ago. The rolling stock also is being improved very rapidly. It is heavier than it was, and no new rolling stock is allowed

to come out of the shop, and to be used unless it complies with the requirements of the Railway Commission, and all old rolling stock is being brought up to those requirements. Then, there has been a great advance in the last few years in the protection of railway men by the introduction of the automatic brake and other improved appliances; so that if the railway employee is careful, unless there is a collision or a broken rail, his life is not nearly such a risky one as it was a few years ago. The requirements of the Commissioners are stringent and even if they were not the rolling stock of Canadian railways has to be up to the standard in these respects, because it is interchangeable with the rolling stock of United States railways, and a Canadian car that does not comply with the conditions of the laws prevailing in the United States is not allowed to go on a United States road. Our railways are in such close intercourse with the United States railways that even if we had no regulations of our Board of Railway Commissioners, we would be compelled to comply with certain regulations imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Then, every railway company is practically compelled to make arrangements with the different brotherhoods as to the terms under which they shall work. It is a mistake now to suppose that all these arrangements have reference to wages. The schedules agreed upon cover every phase of a man's employment—his hours of labour, his holidays, his transportation, what he shall do, when he shall do it, how much he shall get if he does something else. Of this I know something, because I have had to make some of these arrangements. What we are after in Canada are results. I am not so sure about medals which might encourage philanthropic effort to rescue those who are injured. I would rather do something to obviate the use of medals by reducing the number of accidents. What can we do? The United States have various laws. Their conditions are different from ours. Their best railways have double tracks. The Grand Trunk railway has double tracks on its main line. On these double track lines the accidents are reduced to a minimum; and I think that a careful examination of the records, bearing in mind that the greater amount of business in Canada is done on single track lines, will show that there are far fewer accidents in Canada than in the United States. I think that on the whole greater care is exercised in Canada than across the line, and that rather than the making of laws tends to the reduction of accidents. I think that in Canada we perhaps make the mistake of thinking that the cure for any evil that exists is to pass a law of some kind and then forget it. What we are trying to do is to work out, through a practical board which has much greater power than the United States board, something that will encourage care on the part of the railway employees as well as on the part of the railway companies. Has this result been attained? To a large extent it has. After all, it is not so much a question of the laws that we should put on the statute-book as a question of the quality of the men engaged in the work. I have had a good deal to do with the railway men in Canada, and I believe I am safe in saying that in any country there is no more intelligent class of men employed than we find on the railways; and the more we encourage such men to go into the work on our great railway systems, the fewer will be the accidents and the greater will be the satisfaction of the people. The Railway Commission in Canada is in a somewhat different position from the Interstate Commission in the United States. Under their system the railways are chartered by the states, and the Interstate Commission has power only to regulate traffic that passes from one state to another, not traffic in each state. It has a greater power than our commission as to prosecution, and it is more in line with their constitution for the federal power to undertake prosecutions than it is with us in Canada, where the enforcement of the laws is left largely to provincial jurisdiction. In the United States there is a fine for a violation of the law. We have not the same procedure or the same fine, but if a railway company is found running a car against the order of the board, it is not allowed to run that car again until it conforms to the regulations of the board. No company dares to break that order, because the board can go much further; it can prevent the railway company doing any business until it complies with the order of the board. It could issue an order that this railway could not run a train except with properly equipped cars and that becomes an order of the court. I think that would be equivalent to an injunction issued against any one to prevent his doing something. So that the power given our railway board is much greater that that possessed by the United States board. There are appeals from the decisions of the latter in every case to some court or another.

Last year our Board of Railway Commissioners disposed of over 3,000 cases without almost a hearing, without any formality, in many cases after hearing the story by mail; and the results in Canada, whatever our laws may be, are as beneficial, or more so, than the results in the United States with their laws. But if we can improve our laws in any way, I should be delighted to do so. The Board of Railway Commissioners has appointed a certain number of inspectors in every section of the

Dominion, and whenever an accident occurs, one of these inspectors is on the ground as rapidly as he can get there.

Mr. MILLER. Have the inspectors the authority to prosecute, and if not, would it not be well that they should have it?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a question for argument. The result is what we are after, and I believe that we have better results than in the United States. Although our inspectors have not the power to prosecute, they can be ordered to lay an information, but that is not part of their duty Under our system, when an accident occurs, if the circumstances warrant such an investigation, the coroner holds an inquest, and where there is any negligence, the coroner's jury lays the foundation for criminal prosecution and the provincial authorities prosecute the party supposed to be guilty. Therefore, I am not sure that we would gain anything in that regard, although the suggestion might be worth thinking about. His suggestion would make it imperative to institute a prosecution before some authority, but possibly that would take out of the hands of the coroner and the provincial authorities the machinery amply provided in cases of fatal accidents. We have appointed these inspectors, they are on the ground at every point, and give a full report of every accident. They do not make a speciality of saying that the company is guilty, but they go along these lines, if I remember rightly. Was the accident caused by a spread rail, a broken wheel, a misinterpreted order, by wrong orders, by something wrong with the locomotive, by some fault in the rolling stock or negligence of somebody. And they investigate on the spot, where every one knows all about the circumstances, and ascertain just what the reason was, and that practically tells us, so far as it can be told, who is the party in fault. This information is compiled and brought to the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the board immediately takes the matter up with the company, if the accident was due to a faulty track, the board discusses that fairly with the company, and the result has been that tracks are kept in better condition. The railway company, knowing the workings of our railway board, in their own interests as well as the interests of the public, are very careful that all rolling stock now undergoes a thorough inspection. They do not even trust their own officials to inspect the cars, but there are certain companies which make a business of inspecting rolling stock, and the railway company engage their services. When an order is given for rolliny stock, such as cars or locomotives, these are not taken over by the railway company until these experts, independent of either the manufacturer or the purchaser, give a certificate that the stock is up to standard and specification, and fit for service.

There is a question discussed a good deal in the House and the country, and that is as to the further inspection of locomotives in this way, and I think my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), has a Bill introduced in this connection. Railway men say that a locomotive may appear to be in good condition in the shop, but after it is on the road a little time, something becomes faulty to a greater or lesser degree. They think it would be in the interest of all parties, if there were inspectors who had authority at any time to jump on board one of these locomotives and inspect it. They think also that if there were men possibly who would jump on a train more frequently than at present and inspect the rolling stock in motion, that would be a good thing. If the board has not the power now to do that—and I am not sure that it has not—we may give it to them. My opinion, however, is that the board has the power under the Act to engage any official it sees fit to employ for any purpose whatever. However, the department will be glad to receive any suggestions to perfect the Act, because whatever will protect the employee, will of course, protect the traveller as well. We have a young country with a large expanse of territory and a great mileage of railways developing very rapidly and with our climatic conditions and other difficulties to face we have a greater problem to solv than they have to the south and much greater than they have in Europe. Still we are making good progress, and we are glad to take suggestions as to how we can improve conditions.

We hear a great deal about the Act being defective in protecting live stock from being killed by trains. As a matter of fact the original idea of all these provisions about fencing, &c., was not so much to protect the cattle as to protect the employees and passengers. The chief thing in the minds of the framers of the Act was, tha if cattle or horses or other obstructions got on the track, there was liable to be death for the employees and passengers and destruction of property. But we are asked now to legislate rather with the view of protecting the animals who get on the tracks from being killed. Of course, the one works as well as the other, but there is a double reason why cattle should be kept off the tracks, first, for the protection of the passengers and employees, and secondly for the protection of the animals themselves. That is one of the reasons why the old style of having a pit at the crossings, which is the only absolute way of keeping animals off the tracks, has been abandoned.

The employees complained that there was danger to the animals getting into these pits and thus throwing the locomotive off the tracks and injuring the employees and perhaps the passengers as well.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Are there any statistics to show the percentage of accidents in that way?

Mr. GRAHAM. At the time these pits were in vogue, our statistics were very incomplete, but the consensus of opinio is that these pits are not the safest kind of cattle guards to have on the railway. We are doing a great deal for the protection of life. Our rolling stock is being rapidly brought up to as high a standard as possible. It is being tested as it never was before. Our roadways in Canada are in better condition to-day than ever. More money is being spent, heavier rails are being used, double track is being installed, interswitching devices which wer not known a few years ago are being installed.

Level crossings are being protected by hundreds as never before. In all of these things we are moving along pretty well in the way of protecting life in all possible positions. But we live pretty fast in this country and are moving rapidly. Those of us who are most eloquent about the danger of trains are the most anxious to get on the fastest trains we can, and those who insist that we must not allow trains to travel rapidly through villages or towns are loudly indignant if a train even slows up in passing through a village. Our rolling stock and roadbeds are being improved, and, as far as we are concerned we are anxious that lives of passengers and trainmen and public should be protected to the fullest extent, and in that respect we are glad to receive suggestions from the hon. member or any one else.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). After the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), it may be unnecessary to add anything to what has been said, but this question of industrial accidents is one of such very great importance to the nation not less than to labour that I feel I should like to add just a word or two to what has been said by the mover of the resolution and the Minister of Railways.

In the first place, I should like to endorse what the minister said when he pointed out that although as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) has said, the United States has excellent legislation, has put many statutes on the books, the result goes to show that there are fewer persons killed on the railways of the Dominion of Canada than on the railways of the United States in proportion to the total number of employees in the respective countries. I have here statistics which have been carefully compiled from the railway statistics of the Dominion, from the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States, and from the Home Office reports of Great Britain, and these statistics throw a good deal of light upon the effect of legislation and the enforcement of legislation in the different countries. I regret to notice that the showing as to the number of accidents is even larger than that indicated by the mover of the resolution. In his resolution he has stated that it appears that one in every 199 trainmen was killed in Canada, and one in every 33 injured. That seems a very large percentage, but the records, unfortunately, show that the percentage is even larger than that, that the number of employees killed on railways in any one year is more than one in every 199, and the number injured than one in every 33. That, of course refers to all the railways of the Dominion.

The following tables are self-explanatory:

Statement showing the number of railway employees of all classes for one killed:—

	Canada.	United States.	Great Britain.
1909..	650	576	.....
1908..	499	422	.....
1907..	478	369	1,221

Statement showing the number of railway employees of all classes for one injured:—

	Canada.	United States.	Great Britain.
1909..	132	20	..
1908..	91	17	..
1907..	106	19	29

Statement showing the number of trainmen (engineers, conductors, firemen, baggagemen, brakemen) for one killed:—

	Canada.	United States	Great Britain.
1909..	172	205	.....
1908..	168	150	.....
1907..	136	125	1,084

Statement showing the number of trainmen (engineers, conductors, firemen, baggagemen, brakemen) for one injured:—

	Canada.	United States.	Great Britain.
1909..	28	9	..
1908..	23	8	..
1907..	26	8	35

It will be seen that the percentage of employees killed in Canada in proportion to the total number employed is lower than in the United States. The difference, on the other hand, between Great Britain and Canada and the United States, is very marked. This difference is, of course, doubtless accounted for in part by the facts mentioned by the Minister of Railways, that we have in this country climatic con-

ditions to contend with, vast stretches of territory which are much more difficult to safeguard and protect, and considering the difficulties and problems that nature presents in this country, it is natural to expect that the percentage will be considerably higher than in the old land.

These figures will come somewhat as a surprise to the public generally, who can hardly be familiar with the extent to which industrial accidents occur with respect to railway employees of the different countries.

Summarizing the figures, it would appear that the total number of railway employees killed in Canada in the past three years has been 633, the total number injured 3,134, making a total of 3,767 fatal and non-fatal accidents in this period.

Giving the House the figures in another form, of the 19,443 trainmen in Canada in 1909, 1 out of every 172 was killed, and one out of every 28 injured. In 1908 the proportion of killed was one out of every 168, and of injured one out of every 23. In 1907 the proportion of killed was one out of every 136 and of injured one out of every 26.

My hon. friend from East Grey has referred particularly to the United States legislation, and to results which have been achieved there. The figures I have read to the House go to show that with such legislation as we have, and with the facilities afforded particularly in connection with the Railway Commission, the number of accidents are fewer, and the number of fatalities are fewer, relatively. But the following figures taken from reliable sources in the United States, will help to bring out the significance of the loss of life in that country. I think they are worthy of being read to this House, because they help to show what is inevitably incident to the calling of railway employees. Mr. Daniel L. Cease, in an address before the fourth annual meeting of the American Association for labour legislation, in St. Louis, December 29, 1910, says:

> The railroad casualty statistics for the last year showed that 9 men were killed each 24 hours, and that 1 was injured or killed every 7 minutes. One man was killed for each 205 employed, and one was injured for every 9 employed. The working life of a brakeman is estimated at only 7 years.
>
> Full statistics covering other occupations are lacking, but the miners claim that 4 men are killed in America to one in Europe; and it is admitted that mining ordinarily and normally ought to be accomplished with less danger here than abroad.

Then I find the following statement, which is no less striking, in a book entitled 'Perils of Peace,' published in 1906, by the American Institute of Social Service. I will read one or two paragraphs:

> Our peaceful avocations cost more lives every two days than all that we lost in battle during our war in Spain. It has been pointed out that the Pennsylvania coal fields alone furnish 'an industrial Bull Run' annually.
>
> In these piping times of peace, we in the United States kill in four years some 80,000 people more than all who fell in battle and died of wounds, on both sides, during the four years of our civil war; that is, in the same length of time, we are now killing 53 per cent more people than two great armies could destroy, equipped with all the weapons that ingenuity could then devise, and making destruction their eager business.
>
> We are killing more than twice as many every year as perished by violence in both the French and English armies during the three years of the Crimean war. There are more killed and wounded on our railroads every year than the entire losses of the Boer war on both sides in three years.

That is a record of loss of life which ought to impress the minds of all who take an interest in the preservation of a people. Speaking only of the railroads in the United States, we are told that there are more killed and wounded every year than the entire losses of the Boer war on both sides in three years. Then I have here a reference taken from an article on the loss of life on the United States railways, by John W. Gitterman, which appeared recently in McClure's magazine for June, 1910:

> It is difficult to realize that in the fiscal year 1908 the railroads of the United States killed, in addition to passengers, 3,470 of their own employees, an average of 328 deaths each month since 1903.
>
> Injuries are twenty times more numerous than deaths. Last year six and four-tenths per cent of all the railway employees in the United States were injured: thus the chances are that no man can escape accident for nine years. No wonder that most of the life insurance companies refuse to insure a railroad man on any terms, while in any sort of company a switchman can be insured only at a rating twenty years in advance of his actual age.
>
> Where, twenty years ago, the employee had an even chance of remaining uninjured for more than fifteen years, his expectation has sunk nearly to eight. In spite of double-tracking and safety devices and palliative legislation, matters have come to such a pass that if the injured of one bad year could all wait in line before one hospital door, the queue, if laid side by side, would make a row nearly two miles long.
>
> In twenty-one years the percentage of employees killed or injured on the railroads of the United States has nearly doubled. At the present rate it would take only seventeen years to kill or injure all the employees now on the rolls. If the number of railroad employees remains constant for fifteen years, 1,300,000 men, at the present mortality rate, will be

killed or injured. But the number, of course, will greatly increase. It is, therefore, probably no exaggeration to say that, unless the railroads radically improve their present methods of safeguarding their employees' lives, they will either kill or injure, within the next fifteen years, not far from 2,000,000 men.

These figures are reliable statistics, illustrating conditions on United States railways, notwithstanding the excellent legislation to which my hon. friend has made reference. I might make mention of one feature which he seemed to regard as important and as existing in the United States, but wanting in this country. My hon. friend referred to an Act to promote the security of travellers and tend to the safety of life, and if I understood him rightly, medals of honour were to be awarded under that statute by the President of the United States. Two or three years ago his late Majesty King Edward offered a similar medal for precisely the same purpose, and extended this offer to the self-governing dominions of the British Empire. So at the presnt time any man in Canada who performs an heroic act of that kind, is entitled to receive, not a medal from some local authority, but to receive the Albert medal, as it is called, from His Majesty the King. In fact, one such medal was awarded last year to a Canadian. I have here an account given in the Labour 'Gazette,' of 1910, page 1350, of the award of a medal to Mr. Thomas Reynolds, in connection with the Spanish river accident. This communication is dated Whitehall, April 25, 1910, and has the following:

> The King has been pleased to confer the Albert medal of the first class upon Mr. Thomas Reynolds, railway conductor, of North Bay, Ontario, Canada, for conspicuous gallantry in saving the lives of eleven persons on the occasion of the disaster on the Canadian Pacific railway at the Spanish river bridge, near Webbwood, Ont., on January 21 last, as detailed below.

Then follows an account of the action performed by Conductor Reynolds, and concludes:

> The presentation of the medal, in the name of His Majesty, was performed by His Excellency the Governor General of Canada at Montreal, on the 16th ultimo.

I believe it has since been arranged that this medal shall be presented for acts of heroism on the part of miners and men in other industries, as well as on railways, so that in so far as marks of honour or royal recognition may prove an incentive to acts of heroism a very strong incentive has been provided by His late Majesty. But while I think the hon. member for Grey has rendered a great service to the workingmen of this country in bringing out the facts which he has brought out in connection with industrial accidents, he might have rendered even a greater service if he had extended the scope of his resolution beyond industrial accidents on railways, to cover loss of life and limb which occurs in industrial accidents generally. This is a matter to which the Department of Labour has been devoting some attention for years past. By gathering from as many sources as possible the record of industrial accidents occurring in the Dominion we are in a position to lay before the country a statement of what the loss of life in industry amounts to in Canada. By referring to the annual report of the Department of Labour hon. members will find there statistical tables showing the number of fatal and non-fatal accidents which have occurred in Canada during the last few years. We have the figures for 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909 and 1910. These figures are gathered from a great variety of sources, from the press of the country, from labour organizations, from railway boards and from any sources which the department can find it possible to communicate with. Whenever the account of a fatal accident to a workingman in the course of his employment is brought to the attention of the department, the department communicates with responsible parties and obtains accurate information with regard to the accident. It is from information gathered in this way that these statistics relating to deaths have been compiled. Without attempting to give the House in any detail the figures contained in these tables, I might just mention that, taking industrial callings generally, the figures go to show that in the year 1907, having regard to the different trades and callings, 1,353 persons were killed outright in the course of their employment; in 1908, 1,272, and in 1909, 1,278; or an average of about 1,300 a year of deaths of workingmen in Canada occasioned in the course of their employment. I emphasize these last words because it is only such accidents as occur to men while they are actually working that are recorded in these statistics. These are necessarily incomplete. In a very large number of cases employers naturally try to conceal from the public the fact that men have been killed in their particular businesses and there are men killed in trades of whom the public never learns. Then again there are men who meet with accidents and are taken to hospitals or their homes where they die later. The department may get an account of the accident but never learns of the death of the man. I think we would be safe in saying that if we get a record of half the accidents we are doing about as much as can be expected. But,

assuming that we get more than half, assuming that we get about three-fifths, the showing would be that something like 2,000 workingmen are killed outright in Canada every year in the course of their employment. That does not include, for example, men who may be going to work and being killed by a train but includes only men killed while actually working at their particular trades. The number whose industrial efficiency is impaired for all time through loss of limb or through some other impairment of physical health is at least five times the number killed. Hence it would appear that two thousand of the workers of the Dominion are killed outright every year, and that there are 10,000 whose industrial efficiency is impaired for all time. Take that average for a period of ten years and what is the result? As far as Canada is concerned we kill outright in our industries 20,000 men and we permanently impair the industrial efficiency of something like 100,000 others. That is a tremendous loss to the nation. In ten years 20,000 of its wealth producers killed and 100,000 whose industrial efficiency is impaired for all time to come.

Mr. SPROULE. What distinction do you make between killed and killed outright?

Mr. KING. I did not intend to draw any particular distinction. I presume that what I had in my mind when I said killed outright was that a man was killed immediately upon the accident occurring. A man who is injured and dies in a couple of weeks would not be killed outright.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand it is from secondary causes.

Mr. KING. However, the point I was trying to make is that while we are trying to conserve our natural resources, which is a worthy object, the conservation of human life, of human resources, is something of equal if not greater importance not only from the point of view of economic wealth but also from that of national strength and well being; and to the extent which the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) has helped to direct public attention to the significance of loss of life in that connection and the necessity for the state doing all in its power to help to reduce this death toll and this massacre of human beings he has rendered to the people and especially to the working classes of this country a very, very great service.

But there is one other phase of the question which I would like to bring to the attention of the House. It is not mentioned in the resolution of my hon. friend but it is suggested by the figures which I have given. My hon. friend said something about the appointing of a prosecutor on the part of the state to prosecute railway companies and, in that connection, he has drawn attention to the fact that the compensation which is to come in the case of loss of life or loss of limb frequently comes only as the result of some legal action. I think it is worth the while of members of this House and of other legislators in the country to consider whether or not there is not a necessity for remedying in some shape or form that circumstance. We can say with certainty at this moment that a year hence another 2,000 lives will be swept off the list of workers in Canada, and in another year there will be 10,000 men whose industrial efficiency will be permanently impaired as a consequence of accidents occurring in the callings in which they are engaged. We know that loss of life is incident to a calling itself. If that is so does it not appear that in some way the industry itself should be made to bear what is inevitable to it? Take the case of a railway company with its cars; so much is allowed for broken cars or for repairing damage done to cars. I am just suggesting this thought because it is a large subject and it would involve much consideration before anything in the shape of legislation could be based upon it, but it is not worth considering whether human life is not entitled to the same amount of protection and kind of provision as is afforded to what is part of the rolling stock of a company and whether in some way the industry could not be made to bear part of the cost of its inevitable loss of life and limb with the result that those who are left behind, those who belong to the family of the man who may have been killed outright, shall not, in consequence of his death, be put in the position that in order to get some compensation for the loss of his life they must enter upon litigation and add to the distress which they already have? These are the suggestions that I thought I should like to make because I think they are points which are attracting considerable attention among the industrial workers of the country and, having regard for the conservation of human life, for the upbuilding of the strength of the nation as a whole, too much attention cannot be given to a very serious aspect of this very serious question.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose at this hour to add very many words to what has already been said. It appears to me that the importance of this subject entirely warrants my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) in bringing it to the attention of the House. The remarks made by the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Railways and Canals show that they both had notice that this motion would be pre-

sented this evening while some of us who desired to speak on it had no such notice.

Mr. KING. The only notice I had was seeing the resolution on the Order Paper and my hon. friend (Mr. Crothers) had precisely the same opportunity.

Mr. CROTHERS. I must congratulate the Minister of Labour upon his great ability in delivering such a well prepared speech without any previous study. The Minister of Labour took considerable pains to gather details of the appalling loss of life, but I regret that he is not in a position to suggest a remedy, as his duty would seem to demand. He told us he had been collecting statistics for years, but to what purpose is all this discussion if we let it drop without taking any action. The Minister of Railways has no suggestion to make, the Minister of Labour has no suggestion to make, but the subject seems to be of sufficient importance to warrant the government entering into a special investigation as to the means that should be adopted to lessen the deplorable loss of life which we have heard so much about. No reason is given why the fatalities are higher in Canada than in England, and it seems possible that our death rate from this cause could be lessened if proper methods were adopted. The Minister of Railways told us that we were improving all the time, but I know from mingling with railway men day after day that a great many of them complain that they are compelled to serve too long hours, that they have not sufficient time for rest between runs, and some railways have so many branches that a man is sent out and is sometimes on the go for three or four days with practically no rest except what he may obtain when his train is on a siding. The railway men of this country will expect the government to take some reasonable action on which to base legislation with a view of lessening the appalling death toll on Canadian railways.

Mr. MILLER. There was no intent of discourtesy on my part in not informing hon. members that the resolution would be gone on with to-night because I did not know myself that it would be called. I gave no notice to the Minister of Labour. He asked me to-day if I would go on and I told him I would if the motion were reached. Neither did I give notice to the Minister of Railways. One of the whips on the other side asked me if I would proceed with the resolution to-night and I told him I would if it were reached.

Mr. KING. I think it was to-night that I asked you if you would go on with the motion?

Mr. MILLER. It was. I somewhat agree with the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Crothers) that we should have more than words and that there is something that should be done in this direction. I am glad to hear from the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Labour that in Canada as great interest is being taken in this question as in the United States, and that we are doing much, as they are, in preventitive measures. Still, I think there is something more that could be done. The Minister of Railways told us that Canada was a very difficult country in which to operate railway trains, because of the climatic conditions, and my answer to that is that the greater the difficulty the greater the effort should be to overcome that difficulty. He told us that certain accidents were due to the neglect of somebody connected with train operation, but in the United States, there is not only legislation to punish that somebody but there are officials whose duty it is to enforce it. That we have not in Canada. The minister also told us that accidents occurred through faulty rolling stock, but he himself gave the evidence that greater care is taken in the United States than in Canada because he told us that certain cars which were used in Canada would not be permitted in the United States and particularly in the state of New York. It is not sufficient protection for Canadian employees that faulty cars of Canadian railroads will not be interchanged by American railroads, because if the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk Pacific had such defective cars they need not send them to the United States ; there is nothing in the world to prevent them sending them through Canada to the Pacific coast. The Minister of Railways told us that the coroner was the first to take action, and that the Board of Railway Commissioners followed, but the proper time to prevent accidents is before there is an accident, and before the coroner is called in. The Minister of Railways also told us that it doesn't do any good to pass a law and then forget it, and that is exactly my contention. In the United States they pass the law, and then they appoint an official whose duty it is to see that nobody is allowed to forget or neglect that law.

As to the hours of labour, the Minister of Railways has pointed out that there is always an arrangement between the railway brotherhoods and the railway companies that limits the hours of labour. One of the officials of the Board of Railway Commissioners in Ottawa informed me that some years ago there was a request from the railway men for legislation to limit the hours of labour, and that it was supported by the engineers and firemen and opposed by the trainmen. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Crothers) has stated that the railway men in his city have complained of the long hours that they have to work, and of the disastrous consequences to them

and to the people in the trains. It is not sufficient protection to the employees and the passengers that an arrangement has taken place between the brotherhoods and the railway companies. That is too elastic; it is too easy to evade it, and many a railway employee is tempted, by the larger wage he receives, to work longer hours than his own safety or the safety of those in his charge ought to allow him to do. I contend that, though it is a fortunate thing, and a thing on which, perhaps, we may congratulate ourselves, that the percentage of accidents is somewhat greater in the United States than in Canada, yet we may safely copy their legislation in so far as safety appliances and limiting the hours of labour, and particularly means of enforcing legislation are concerned. These are two matters of importance, which, if attended to, would reduce the number of accidents. Mr. Speaker, having brought this matter to the attention of the House, I would, with your permission, withdraw the resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. Why should the hon. gentleman do that, if he wants an expression of the opinion of the House? It is probable that the House would pass the resolution, and then we would be put in possession of the information sought for.

Mr. MILLER. I am willing that that should be done.

Mr. JAMESON. Might I ask the hon. gentleman whether there is any information as to the percentage of accidents per mile of railway operated in Canada by the different railway companies?

Mr. MILLER. If there is any such information, I am not aware of it.

Mr. JAMESON. Perhaps the Minister of Labour has that information?

Mr. KING. I cannot say that the statistics are compiled in that way. I think it would be easy to so compile them, from the records we have from the railways.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the motion is not withdrawn, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's, Montreal) moved second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. PERLEY. This is a very important Bill, and it should hardly be passed at this hour. It was brought up last session or the session before, and a great deal of objection was taken to it in the House.

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's). I have an amendment to move in committee to meet the objection.

Mr. MILLER.

Mr. PERLEY. I think it should stand until we get some notice of the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's). Last year the Bill was referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals. It was said that the workingmen had never asked for it, but this year a large delegation of the men working on the Canadian Pacific railway have asked for it. It is proposed by the amendment that the men should be paid every two weeks. We know that if men have to work for a month without getting their pay they have to buy many things on credit. So I think the Bill is quite reasonable.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest that the Bill be read a second time and be sent to the Railway Committee, where both the railway men and the railway companies could be heard.

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's). This is a public Bill, and I do not see why we should refer it to the Railway Committee. It was referred to that committee last year, and the railway companies represented that the workingmen had never asked for this. Well, I have a letter here, and a petition signed by over 1,000 men, and this petition was signed five years ago. The answer which Sir Thomas Shaughnessy gave was that as soon as the Angus shops would be built, and the Montreal Bank have a branch at the works, the company would be willing to pay every two weeks. That was the answer given by the Canadian Pacific railway four years ago, but last year in the Railway Committee they said that the workingmen had never asked for it. I do not see, therefore, why we should refer this Bill to that committee. We all know what happens when a Bill is referred to it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that in the face of the fact he has just given.

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's). I have the letter and petition here. I do not want to mention the name of the writer of that letter, because he has worked for the company 25 years, and if I disclosed his name he would be discharged. Here is the petition which was circulated around these shops. I have counted the number of names, and I find that 1,071 men have signed it. There is no reason why these men should not be paid every two weeks; and if this Bill be referred to the Railway Committee, it will not pass this session. This is the fourth session I have brought it up. All I ask is that any railway company, which has been given any aid by the government, should pay its employees every two weeks.

An. hon. MEMBER. How many men have signed?

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's). Some 1,200 or 1,300, or 89 per cent of those employed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time.

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's) moved that the House go into committee on the Bill.

Mr. PERLEY. This matter should be referred to the Railway Committee. Last year it was given a very full discussion in that committee; and if we are going to change the decision then arrived at, both parties ought to be given a hearing before the committee. It was said then that the men were not making any demand for this change; and we must bear in mind that a railway company is very different from another corporation. Any company in which I am interested pays its men every two weeks, and it is easy for us to do so because the men are within reach. But with a large railway company the case is different. The Grand Trunk railway for instance extends all over this country, and has to make up its pay sheets in Montreal or Toronto. It sends out its pay car all over the line, and it takes the company really a month to get the sheets made up, and have the pay car out and back again ready to start the next month. I move that this Bill be sent to the Railway Committee for consideration. While I have every sympathy with the men, I do not think it is right to force a measure such as this through the House at this hour of the night when so few members are present, and when the matter is one which was before the Railway Committee last year.

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's). It is a very poor reason to say that the members are not in the House. If they are not, it is through no fault of mine. I have taken out the clause to which objection was made, and which provides that the companies shall pay back any money they had retained. I have done this because I have been made to understand that it would be impossible for the companies to do otherwise than keep part of the money back. The men will, therefore, have to work four weeks before they can draw two weeks pay, and that will give ample time to the companies to prepare their pay-lists every two weeks. In the old country the railway companies pay every two weeks although they have 65,000 employees at work. In New York also, and in Canada we have some railway companies which pay every two weeks.

Mr. PERLEY. What railways in Canada pay every two weeks?

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's). I cannot mention the name, but it is one which was mentioned to me by Senator Casgrain.

Mr. PERLEY. It is a short railway line?

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's). If the men are two weeks behind, the company has plenty of time to make up its pay sheets every two weeks; and as to the point that a company's lines extend over a long distance, it takes only four days to get to Vancouver.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This Bill cannot be moved to a final stage to-day, but it can be passed through the committee. I sympathize with the object of the Bill which is that the men should be paid every two weeks if possible; but I would suggest that the third reading should stand over in order that the railway companies may be given a hearing before the measure finally passes.

Mr. PERLEY. How can the railway companies be heard, if the Bill is not sent to the Railway Committee?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They can communicate with my hon. friend, I am sure.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This clause which will be the whole Bill is amended to read as follows:

Section 259 of the Railway Act is amended by inserting the following as subsection 3 to said section 259.

And that the salary or wages of every person employed in the operation, maintenance or equipment of any railway company to which the parliament of Canada has granted aid by means of subsidy or guarantee, shall be paid not less frequently than once in each two weeks during the terms of his or her employment.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Railways ought to be present when this Bill is being considered. Would it apply to the Intercolonial railway, and what views would he have in regard to it?

Mr. KING. The Minister of Railways asked me to say that he has seen the amendment to be proposed by my hon. friend and entirely concurs in it and is quite prepared to support the Bill in its amended form.

Mr. SPROULE. Then he would think it feasible to pay every two weeks on the Intercolonial?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He approves of the amendment.

Mr. PERLEY. Have the government consulted the railways in regard to this matter?

Mr. KING. The Bill has been before the House a couple of years, and I think the

minister has discussed it fully with the representatives of the railways.

Mr. PERLEY. I think the government should take the responsibility for such a Bill and make it a government measure if they decide to pass it, particularly at this hour of the night when it is forced through without discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. Would railways to which aid had not been given be affected by this?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is there such a railway?

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps not any railway in its entirety, but I think, for instance the Canadian Northern has lines under lease which did not receive aid. Would they be regarded as a portion of the Canadian Northern system, and would this Bill apply to the whole system?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That would be my view.

Mr. JAMESON. Would this refer to employees on board ships operated by railway companies?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think it applies to ships at all.

Bill reported.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all telegrams, letters, papers and documents in any department of the government, or elsewhere under their control, relating to the payment of a sum of five hundred dollars, or any sum, to assist in the construction of a bait freezer, situated at Barrington Passage, N.S., and of all letters, telegrams, papers and documents relating to any proceedings taken or proposed in connection therewith.—Mr. Jameson.

For a copy of all applications made by employees of the North Atlantic colleries for a conciliation board within the past six months, and of all letters, telegrams, documents, statements and other papers and documents touching the same, or having any relation thereto, including all correspondence received by the government or any department of the government from the said North Atlantic collieries or from the employees thereof touching the matter aforesaid.—Mr Maddin.

For a copy of all letters, correspondence and agreements between the city of Ottawa Municipal Electric Light Company and the Department of Public Works relating to the lighting of public buildings in the city of Ottawa, and between the Department of Public Works and the Ottawa Electric Light Company.—Mr. Sharpe (Ontario).

For a copy of all memorials, reports, resolutions of boards of trade and of other bodies, and of all correspondence in the hands of the government, both for and against the continuance of granting bounties to the steel and iron industries in Canada, covering a period of the past fifteen years.—Mr. Sharpe (Ontario).

For a copy of the application by or on behalf of the Glace Bay Bait Association, Glace Bay, N.S., for moneys in connection with the cold storage building for the storage of bait, at Glace Bay, N.S.; also a copy of all correspondence between the said Bait Association or any one on its behalf, and the government, any department of the government, or any one on behalf of the government, or any of its departments.—Mr. Maddin.

For a copy of all correspondence, recommendations, orders in council, or other documents relating to the case of R. E. Curran, a railway mail clerk, who was fatally injured in an accident at Owen Sound, on the 29th May, 1908, and with regard to which application was made for a compassionate grant or allowance to his heirs or family.—Mr. Macdonell.

For a copy of the correspondence, memoranda and documents of every nature exchanged between the governments of Canada and Great Britain showing the part taken by the latter in the negotiations relating to the recent customs convention between the government of Canada and that of the United States; a copy of commissions, credentials and other documents of every nature giving official authority to certain persons, as well on the part of Canada as on the part of Great Britain, to negotiate the recent customs convention of the 21st January, 1911, between Canada and the United States; and a copy of instructions of every nature, given by the government of Canada or that of Great Britain to the persons officially authorized to act in their name for the negotiation of this customs convention. —Mr. Turcotte (Quebec).

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11.44 p.m.

INDEX

INDEX

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1910-1911.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2° 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass.; Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider, Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., Northwest Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ALLEN, Mr. H. E., *Shefford.*

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9619 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7661 (iv).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Alcoholism International Congress, Delegates to (Ques.) 5632 (iii).

Aliens Naturalization, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 2666 (ii).

Australian and Can. Reciprocal Negotiations since 1900 (M. for stmt.*) 1501 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2440 (ii).

Charing Cross Bank, and Atlantic Quebec and Western Ry. Co. (M. for cor with Govt) 1726 (i).

Chemin Gouin, Postmastership, Name of, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 7038 (iv).

——— Postmaster A. C. Miquelon, Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Colonial Conference, 1911, Canada's Proposals, &c. (Ques.) 1280 (i).

Customs Tariff with Foreign Countries, Arrangements by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 981 (i)

G.T.P. Lake Superior Division, Construction Limit, Penalty *re* (Ques.) 1492 (i).

See 'N. T. Ry.'

Half Breed Scrip, Cor. with Rt. Rev. George Holmes (M. for copy*) 1912 (i).

Harbours and Rivers Expenditures by Public Works (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).

N. T. Ry., Changes in Original Specifications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

N. T. Ry., Change in Structures to the amount of $10,000 (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Commission, List of Members of Engineering Staff who have resigned, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Construction Work, Change in Concrete used, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1499 (i).

——— Contractors, Amounts paid on Force Account, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Contracts, Estimated Quantities *re* (Ques.) 1491 (i).

——— Moncton and Winnipeg Contracts, Original Estimates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Shops, Plans and Specifications for Machinery (Ques.) 1569 (i).

——— Shops, Specification *re* Emplymt. of Mr. W. J. Press (Ques.) 2157 (ii).

——— Total Expenditure to 31st Dec., 1910, Estimated Cost of Completion of Winnipeg and Moncton Section (Ques.) 1497 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1727 (i).

——— Train Hauled Filling, Payments *re* (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

North Shore Taxpayers and Voting at Federal Elections (Ques.) 1082 (i).

Post Office Buildings, Total Value, Expenditure, Subsidies *re* Mails, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).

Preferential Tariff, Concessions granted to G. B. (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Quebec Bridge and Labour Organizations (M. for cor.*) 7039 (iv.)
——— Fair Wage Clause for Bridge Workers (Ques.) 6757 (iv).
——— Payment of $100,000 to Phœnix Bridge Co. (M. for cor.*) 981 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4083 (iii).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6786 (iv).
See 'Australia.'
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5051 (iii).
St. Johns Postmaster, Refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir' (Ques.) 1089 (i).
Six Nation Indian Reserve, Grant to Merrill to bore for Natural Gas, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1863; (Montreal, P.O., alterations) 1862; (Montreal postal station) 1861 (i).
Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Interest paid, &c. (Ques.) 814 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6293 (iv).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1947 (i).
Atlantic Fast Service and All Red Route, Establishment of (M. for cor.*) 1726 (i).
Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of (Ques.) 2371 (ii).
Banking and Commerce Com., Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2364 (ii).
'Canada Farthest South,' Cost of Printing and Preparing (Ques.) 2885 (ii).
Canada-Japan Trade Treaty, Expiration of (Ques.) 5638, (iii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3455 (ii).
——— Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8805 (v)
Canned Pease, Impure, Importation of into Canada, Number of Cases (Ques.) 3279 (ii).
Canso and Guysborough Mail Service, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 8994 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9046 (v).
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 206 (Mr. D. A. Gordon) in Com., 8970 (v).
Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6206 (iv).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2513 (ii); in Com., 8677 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8726 (v).
——— (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8908, 8924 (v).
Copyright Act B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8899 (v).
Coronation Stamps, Inquiry *re*, 9247 (v).
Dixon Post Office, Pets. *re* Change of location (Ques.) 4669 (iii).
Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re* (Ques.) 662 (i).
'Earl Grey,' Ice Breaker, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6475 (iv).
Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Transfer to Canada (Ques.) 799 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number established in the past year (Ques.) 656 (i).
——— Number operated, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1102 (i).
Farmer's Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5453 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* (remarks) 7560 (iv).
Favoured Nation Treaties before Imperial Conference, Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (remarks) 5292 (iii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4367 (iii).
Franking System, for Private Business (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Grand Bend, Ont., Right of Way, Purchase of (Ques.) 1287 (i).
Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 7038 (iv).
Indian Act (Treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7828; in Com., 7848 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8744 (v).
King, Dr., Residence at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 804, 1349 (i).
Live Stock Industry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1200 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence, on M. for Sup., 2894 (ii).
Mail Delayed and Mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c. (Ques.) 2371 (ii), 4667 (iii).
Mails, Illegal Use of for Fraudulent Schemes (Ques.) 802 (i).
——— remarks, 1356 (i).
See 'Sheldon, C. D.'
Manitou Lake Fishing Privileges, Lease *re* (Ques.) 1348 (i).
Montreal Govt. Weir, Inquiry for Ret., 2065 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Naval Service, Number of Battle Ships withdrawn from Canada by G.B., during the past five years (Ques.) 1092 (i).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 3°, 8963 (v).
Parcel Post Rates, Reduction *re* (Ques.) 5934 (iv).
Parcel Post Service between Canada and G.B., Colonies, &c., Loss *re* (Ques.) 805 (i).
Postage Stamps, Canadian Design, Refusal of Imperial Design (remarks) 6908 (iv).
See 'Coronation.'
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Short-Date Newspapers, &c. (remarks) 10340 (v).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increase to, Classification of Offices, &c. (Ques.) 5934 (iv).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8070 (v).
Post Office Buildings, Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1870 (i).
Post Office, Deptl. Money Orders, Printing of (Ques.) 1101 (i).
Post Office Estimates, Objection to Passing (remarks) 4297 (iii).
Public Buildings, Inquiry for Ret., 5541 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders *re*, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies, 3072 (ii).
——— Supervision, Expenditure (remarks) 6672 (iv).
Railway Mail Clerks, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
——— Names of those compensated for Accidents (Ques.) 9537 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3737 (ii).
Reciprocity—British Ambassador's Warning to Can. Mins., 6200 (iv).
——— Britain's Demand from U.S. for Tariff Concessions (remarks) 6574 (iv).
——— Dairymen's Association of Western Ont., Denial of Stmnt. of Min. of Customs, 4570 (iii).
——— Papers, Comparative Prices, Printing of (remarks) 10469 (v).
——— Res. of Toronto Anti-Reciprocity League *re* Annexation (read) 4141 (iii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, 6802 (iv).
'Review of Reviews,' Collection of Extra Postage (Ques.) 2371 (ii).
Richelieu and Ontario Nav. Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 8969 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Stamps and Postcards manufactured, &c. (Ques.) 806 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery Routes, Number in Operation, &c. (Ques.) 983 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) 10365 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, &c. (remarks) 1364 (i).
——— Action of Government *re* Returning to Canada (remarks) 6200 (iv).
See 'Mails:.
Soil Fertility, Memorandum from Experimental Farm (read) in Com. of Sup., 5965 (iv).
Stamp Cancelling Machines, Cost, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 806 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (animals health) 5964; (dairying) 6249 (iv); (exhibitions) 9079 (v).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1051; Mines (salaries) 1480; Post Office (contingencies) 6068 (iv); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 1485 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 6457 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subsidies (Canada and Australia) 8765; (Canada and Cuba) 8778; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 8786; (Canada and G.B.) 8775; (Canada and Mexico) 8781; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8783; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784 (v).
Post Office (Curren ,R. C., gratuity) 4283; (mail clerks) 4281 (iii), 6082 (iv); Outside Service (magazines) 6080; (mails) 6077 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ontario (Brantford drill hall) 2098 (ii); Ottawa (McGillivray's contract) 5994 (iv); (Printing Bureau) 2362 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8877 (v); Ontario (Peterborough) 2608 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ontario (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Railways—Intercolonial Railway (freight service) 5988 (iv); (Halifax) 5924 (iii); Miscellaneous (official cars) 6447 (iv).
United States Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations re (Ques.) 984 (i).
See 'Review.'
Wireless Stations, Number, Location, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2678 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1340 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

ARTHURS, Mr. J. E., *Parry Sound.*
Callender Lighthouse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6498 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work (remarks) 7220 (iv).
Explosives Importation, Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8457 (v).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5155 (iii).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co's. incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 3°, 8965 (v).
North Bay, Burk's Falls and Maganatawan Wharfs, Total Cost, &c., (M. for ret.*) 981 (i).
Parry Sound Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).

ARTHURS, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Porcupine Disasters by Fire, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 9695 (v).
Port Perry Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1880 (i).
Reciprocity with United States, Resolutions *re*, M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 9646 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Mines (salaries) 1479 (i).
Immigration (agents) 5195 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses &c.) 6455, 6497; (Midland and Tiffin) 6502 iv).
Unorganized Districts in Northern Ont., Deferred Elections (remarks) 10100 (v).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. Sir Allen B., K. C. M. G. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*
Address, The, 664 (i).
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2168 (ii).
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., ref. to Justice Department. (Ans.) 926 (i).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7578 (iv).
C. P. R. Land Tax, Decision of Privy Council (remarks) 2992 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Investigation Commission, on Inquiry for Judge's Rep., 9594 (v).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4582 (iii).
Clarry, L. F., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 813 (i).
Constantineau, Judge, Number of Motions heard, Travelling Expenses &c. (Ans.) 982 (i).
Convicts liberated from Kingston Penitentiary without Clothing or Means (remarks) 1913 (i), 2067 (ii).
——— (statement) 1986 (ii).
Coronation Celebration at Ottawa, Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10352 (v).
Dini, Victor, Release from Penitentiary (Ans.) 8582 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston (Ans.) 4826 (iii).
——— Royal Commission re Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5498 (iii).
Fedorenko, Extradition of (remarks) 10 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Use of by Americans (Ans.) 7804 (iv).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8971 (v).
Hague Arbitration, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Fundy Bay) on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup., 4593, 4603 (iii).
——— (explanation) *re*, on M. (Mr. Jameson) 4683 (iii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. Sir Allen B.—*Con.*
Hague Arbitration, Counsel, Names, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 797 (i).
——— Fisheries Regulations with U. S., Conference *re* (Stmnt) 1988 (ii).
See 'North Atlantic,' 'Supply—Justice.'
Hudson's Bay, Position *re* Hague Award (remarks) 673 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 970 (i).
International Prison Congress, Canadian Representative (Ans.) 5405 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9158 (v).
See 'Waterways.'
Judges appointed since 1896, Residences, &c. (Ans.) 8095 (v).
Judges in Yukon Ter., Annuities (M.) for Com. on Res., 8790 (v).
Justice, Deputy Minister acting as Counsel in outside Cases (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 1014 (i).
Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 469 (i).
Juvenile Deliquents, Act 1908, (B. 189) 1c*, 8187 (v).
Legal Agents appointed for Govt., Precautions *re* acting for private Parties (Ans.) 813 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2902 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3256 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'
Markey Fishing Leases, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 4209 (iii), 6761 (iv).
Marriage Laws in prov. of Quebec, Action of Roman Catholic Church (Ans) 7208 (iv).
Marriage Laws, Parliamentary Powers, Govt.'s intention (Ans.) 10196 (v).
Marriages, Power of Parlt. to Legalize (Ans.) 8585 (v).
Marriages, Validity of, Law respecting (Ans.) 6269 (iv).
Masonic Property stolen, Verdict of Montreal Jury (Ans.) 7207 (iv).
Ministers, Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 7441 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Land Damages, Fiats *re* Land Damages, Compensation (remarks) 3949 (iii).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriages.'
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10489 (v).
New Westminster Penitentiary Employees, Increase of Salaries, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor, 2186 (ii).
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, Arbitration at The Hague, on Address, 664 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. Sir Allen B.—*Con.*
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor, 4337 (iii).
—— Distribution of copies (remarks) 8094 (v).
See 'Hague.'
Offensive Weapons, Pets. *re* Legislation (Ans.) 3064 (ii).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8331 (v).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 2740 (ii).
Pecuniary Claims *re* Hay Claims, Objections, &c. (Ans.) 803 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot) on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7899 (v).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 963 (i).
Reciprocity and North York, Challenge *re* Contest (remarks) 7223 (iv).
Sand supplied to Kingston Penitentiary, Payments to R. H. Fair (Ans.) 5406 (iii).
Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 111 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 3184 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Action of Govt. *re* Returning to Canada (remarks) 6200 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Justice (contingencies) 1020; (salaries) 1014 (i).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6161; Exchequer Court (contingencies) 6160; (printing reports) 6161; Miscellaneous (Hague arbitration) 6164 (iv), 9560 (v).
The Hague: *See* 'North Atlantic.-
U. S. Army Deserters at Niagara Falls, Subjects of Extradition (Ans.) 708 (i).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Delay, &c. (remarks) 9906 (v).
—— on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10144 (v).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 908 (i), 9158 (v).

BARKER, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5572 (iii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7471 (iv).
Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. as Immigration agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5192 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8850 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9050 (v).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9610 (v).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Fishery Inspectors, Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6631 (iv).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10251, 10272 (v).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9519 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8550 (v).
G. T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 5795 (iii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9305 (v).
Grantham, Gertrude May, Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8974 (v).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Conditions *re* Public Health (remarks) 5535 (iii).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10101 (v).
Hamilton Provident and Loan Society (B. 172) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
I.C.R. Renewal Equipment, Cor. &c. with Aud. Gen., Stmnts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 784 (i).
Military Adviser to Imperial Conference, Apptmt of Mr. S. Hughes (remarks) 9072 (v).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com., 8521 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6147 (iv).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages, &c (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8593 (v).
Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons imported (Ques.) 1721 (i).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8070 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 961 (i).
Railway Act (telegraph, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9315 (v).
Reciprocity Statistics, Accepting as Read and Printing in Hansard (remarks) 6860 (iv).
—— Ques. *re* Vote of Member for Labelle, 6839 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8578, 8967, 9575 (v).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3349 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coins) 6061 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3812 (ii); Ont. (inspectors) 6631 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5192 (iii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5583 (iii).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6161; Exchequer Court (printing reports) 6161; Miscellaneous (Hague arbitration) 6166 (iv).
Legislation—House of Commons (Dep. Clerk Crown in Chancery) 6167; (sessional clerks) 6168 (iv).
Militia (allowance) 8528 (v).
Post Office—Outside Office (mail service) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3201 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 8514 (v).
Unprovided Items (generally) 6160 (iv).
Unorganized Districts, Deferred Elections (remarks) 10101 (v).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H., *Victoria, B.C.*
Alien Labour Law, Employment of Foreigners on Public Contracts Works (remarks) 10367 (v).
Babcock, Mr., Payments *re* Extra work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6108 (iv).
Beddington, Mr., Pension to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7872 (iv).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10433 (v).
Clayoquot Life Saving Station, Investigation *re* Irregularities (M. for reps.*) 785 (i).
Customs Free Goods entered at Vancouver, by Kelly & Co. (M. for copies) 931 (i).
See 'Vancouver.'
Esquimalt Guns, Removal of (Ques.) 3220 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (compensation for injuries) Amt. (B. 25) 1° m., 663 (i).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms (remarks) 9005 (v).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8458 (v).
Fisheries Act (salmon licenses) Amt. (B. 58) 1° m., 1343 (i).
Fish Poachers on Pacific Coast, Protective Service *re* (remarks) 2080 (ii).
—— Par. in Victoria 'Daily Colonist' (remarks). 1458 (i).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8631 (v).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 2879, (ii).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7863 (iv).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9470 (v).
Jardine, Mr. John, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 4670 (iii).
—— Par. in 'Daily Times' *re* Claims on Govt. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).
—— Payment by Govt. in excess of Work (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
Shipwrecks on B. C. Coast, Inspection *re* Loading, &c. (remarks) 7257 (iv).
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7251 (iv).
See 'Indian Act.'
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6108 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6491; (buoy steamers) 6550; (Lime Kiln Crossing) 6546; (pensions to pilots) 6534 (iv).
U.S.. Tax on Canadian Shipping, Legislation at Washington (remarks) 9247 (v).
Vancouver Customs Entries, by Robt. Kelly, &c. (M. for copies) 713 (i)
See 'Customs.'
West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 811 (i).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. res. (Mr. Meighen) 1946 (i).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8936 (v).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1312 (i).
Coronation Day in Ottawa, Absence of Ministers, &c. (Ques.) 9989 (v).
—— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 10351 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) (personal explanation) 5316 (iii).
Flags, Regulations by Govt. *re* Flying with Foreign Flags (prop. res.) 4347, 4379 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1438 (i).
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 1277 (i).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s (B. 75) 1°*, 1488 (i); in Com., 3024, 3181, 3389 (ii).
Newspaper Trains, Cost of Operation *re* Special Trains (Ques.) 9982 (v).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9925 (v).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5258 (iii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Railways, Transportation Problem, on Stmnt, (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5119 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res. (Mr. Fielding) 10535 (v).
——— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10042 (v).
Senate, Reform of, on prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4311 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6629 (iv); Post Office (mail clerks) 4281, 4284 (iii).

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Census Taking System, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4341 (iii).
Civil Service Act (garnishee) Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 195 (i).
——— Garnishee of Salaries, on M. for Sup., 4571 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Compensation to (Ques.) 658 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7450 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3793 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 1697 (i).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*
Address, The, 172 (i).
Arthabaska and Drummond Election (remarks) on Address, 172 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, *re* Statements in 'Le Devoir,' 146 (i).
Horses Diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada (remarks) 7427 (iv).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 3389 (ii).

BEST, Mr. J., *Dufferin.*
Aud. General, Cor. *re* over-payments by Govt. (remarks) 1010 (i).
Census Enumerators, Pets, in Favour of Reciprocity, Circulation of (remarks) 6507 (iv).
Eucharistic Congress, Number of Buildings decorated by Govt. (Ques.) 4667 (iii).
——— Reception to by Federal Govt., &c., (Ques.) 5935 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Stock *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1528 (i).
Mica Exports, 1900 to 1910 (Ques.) 5290 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of, Members paying for Speeches, &c., 1355 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 9885, 9891 (v).
——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8367 (v).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6812, 6828 (iv).

BEST, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6190 (iv).
Shelburne Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3795 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6069 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Combines Investigation Act) 4280 (iii).
Legislation—Senate (salaries) 6166 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8691 (v).
Post Office (rural postmasters) 4281 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3159 (ii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238 (v).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt (B. 39) 1° m., 924 (i).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 4383 (iii).
La Banque du Canada incorp. (B. 123) 1°*, 4109; on M. for Com., 5631; in Com., 5776 (iii), 6120 (iv).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 3180 (ii), 7720, on M. for 3°, 7717 (iv).
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1453 (i).
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.'s (B. 192) 1°*, 8187; in Com., 8969 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s (B. 214) 1°*, 8955; in Com., 9167 (v).

BLACK, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*
Canada Medical Act Amt. (B. 15) 1°m., 309 (i); 2° m., Ref. to Special Com., 2253 (ii); in Com., 6067 (iv).
Dog Fish Industry (remarks) 8048 (v).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8048 (v).
Fruit Duties *re* Reciprocity (remarks) 3377 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1134 (i).
Medical Council Bill, Par. in "Globe," Correction *re*, 2991 (ii).
See "Can. Medical."
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2533 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, Dufferin Res. *re* (remarks) 5547 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8756 (v); Post Office—Outside Service (magazines) 6080 (iv).
Typhoid Epidemic in Ottawa, Pollution of the City Water, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4475 (iii).

BLACK, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*
Typhoid in Ottawa, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' 4656 (iii).
—— (explanation) 4720 (iii).
Ventilation of the House of Commons (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4473 (iii).
Windsor Letter Carrier, Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 355 (i).
Advertising Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).
See "I.C.R."
Agricultural Expenditures in Ontario, for 1910 (Ques.) 6668 (iv).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6311 (iv).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3181 (i).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3600 (ii).
British Preference (remarks) 5620 (iii).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 201) in Com., 8982 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8828 (v).
Casualty Co. of Can. incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8568 (v).
Cattle Exports to the U.S., bonded to G.B. (remarks) 7426 (iv).
—— Reshipped to G.B. (remarks) 7558 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Apptmt. by Liberal Associations (remarks) 7021 (iv).
—— Apptmt. of (remarks) 2887 (ii), 4933 (iii).
—— Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9053 (v).
—— Enumerators in Peel County, Number, Apptmt. &c. (Ques.) 10335 (v).
Census Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9725 (v).
Census, System of Taking, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4341 (iii).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2508 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7872 (iv).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8717 (v).
Civil Service Appointments from South Grey since 1904, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1912 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 2555, 3059 (ii).
Continental Fire Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. B. 196 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 8968 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage (remarks) 4659 (iii).
Electric Railway Charters, Number since 1896, Extensions *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4043 (iii).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3504 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8121 (v).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8996 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5431 (iii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8215 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Freeman, Cecil Ernest Relief (B. 143) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10252 (v).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5127 (iii).
Govt. Goods purchased in U.S., Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).
G.T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 5796 (iii).
—— Investigation by Judge Barron, Remuneration to (remarks) 1805 (i).
—— Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1073, 1507 (i).
—— Settlement *re* (remarks) 9692 (v).
—— Status of men Reinstated (remarks) 3377 (ii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1409, 1545, 1729, 1746 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6938 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2962 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8744 (v).
I.C.R. Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
—— Working Operations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1295 (i).
Justice, Deputy Minister, acting as Counsel for outside Cases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Labour Strikes, Conflict *re* (remarks) 6366 (iv).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6000 (iv).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. res. (Mr. Sproule) 1239 (i).
Lunenburg Tower Clock, Specification *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2359, 2578 (ii).
Matches, Phosphorus, Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2023 (ii).
Milk and Cream shipped in Western Ontario, Accommodation *re* Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).
National Battlefields in Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9498 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5947 (iv).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 3°, 8965 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6133 (iv).
—— on M. to introduce, 2829 (ii).
Opium Importation of, Prohibition of Sale B. 22 (Mr. King) on M. for 1°, 468 (i), in Com., 2539 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. by Govt., Censure *re* (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2271, Neg. (Y. 61; N. 104) 2358 (ii).
Peel County Mail Service (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
See 'Postal.'
Pork Packing Industry Delegation, Inquiry for Rep. 3530 (ii).
Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).
Port Credit Public Works, Expenditures for 1909-10 (Ques.) 5638 (iii).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of certain Newspapers (remarks) 10341 (v).
Postal Service in Peel County, Rural Mail Delvery (remarks) 10355 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Post Office Buildings, Advertisements for Tenders, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1882 (i).
Printing Bureau Irregularities, Money Loss *re* (Ques.) 794 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen's. Rep., 831 (i).
Quebec Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 1639 (i).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt), to sit during Sittings of the House, 10190 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Railway Freight Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4167 (iii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) 7550 (iv); Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7618 (iv); Original Resolution (remarks) 7668 (iv).
—— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8369 (v).
—— Berlin Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5728 (iii).
—— Letter from the 'Globe' Reporter on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7677 (iv).
—— Negotiations, Letter of J. A. Macdonald in Stratford 'Herald' *re* visit to Washington (remarks) 4299 (iii).
—— Oleomargarine, Admission of (Ques.), 6668 (iv); (remarks) 6504 (iv).
—— Protests *re*, Inquiry for, 3951 (iii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of, (remarks) 5951 (iv).
—— Special Interests in Can., (remarks) 3058 (ii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6812, 6892 (iv).
—— Statistics, Accepting as read and Printing in 'Hansard)' (remarks) 6859 (iv).
—— Statistics, Reply of Trade and Commerce Dept. *re* Return (remarks) 6514 (iv).
Returns, Notice to Members *re* Bringing Down (remarks) 5938 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery: *See* 'Postal,' &c.
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2662, 3844 (ii).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6191 (iv).
South Grey Govt. Appointments, Inquiry for Ret. 3344 (ii).
See 'Civil Service.'
Speeches of Ministers distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
Springhill Mine, N. S., Strike, (remarks) *re* Militia, 2641 (ii).
Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price paid, &c., (Ques.) 10335 (v).
Supply, Schedule of Votes, Proportion, &c., (remarks) 9567 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c., (dairying) 6243 (iv); (exhibitions) 3776 (ii); 9078 (v); (seeds) 6221 (iv); (tobacco production) 6262 (iv); Quarantine (animals health) 5960 (iv); (public health) 5979 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (tugs) 6388 (iv); St. Peter's (improvements) 6419 (iv); Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6392 (iv); Welland (Jane St. bridge) 6425 (iv); Williamsburg (machinery) 6426 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1475 (i); Customs (salaries) 5992 (iv); Justice (salaries) 1018 (i); Labour (salaries) 1484 (i); Militia (salaries) 1029 (i); Mines (salaries) 1476, 1478 (i); Public Works (salaries) 1033 (i).

Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6617 (iv); (legal expenses) 6661 (iv).

Immigration (agents) 5168 (iii).

Indians—Man. (annuities) 8886 (v).

Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6162 (iv).

Labour Dept. (technical education commission) 3801 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 6549; (maritime road) 6543 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8770 (v).

Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6570 (iv).

Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6555 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 3211; (fire escapes) 3160 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3157; (immigration buildings) 3157; (sundries) 3161 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fredericton pavement) 1614 (i); (Hampton) 1615; (Hartland) 1620; (Hillsborough) 1622; (Moncton armoury) 1623 (i).

Public Works—Buildings— N.S. (Lunenburg) 1592; (Parrsboro) 1598, 1629; (Wolfville) 1599 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2604; (Seaforth) 2626; (Sudbury) 2627; (Tilbury) 2627; (Uxbridge) 2630; (Wallaceburg) 2633; (Waterloo) 2634; (Wiarton) 2636 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 3164; (heating, &c.) 2590, 3162; (H. of C. improvements) 2592; (lighting) 3202 (ii); (McGillivray's contract) 5994 (iv); (pavements) 2594 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8872 (v); (steel cases) 2582 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1666; (Aylmer) 1673; (Grosse Isle) 1675 (i); (Montreal barracks) 2575 (ii); (Napierville) 1866; (Quebec immigrant) 1887; (Rigaud) 1888; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1893; (St. Lambert) 1895; (Three Rivers) 1902 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2972 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3215; (salaries) 3214 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 9556 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9502 (v); Ont. (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R (air brakes) 5913; (bridge strengthening) 5914; (rolling stock) 5927 (iii); (working expenses) 6340 (iv)

Railways—Miscellaneous (Ry, Commissioners) 6428 (iv)

Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6559; (meteorological service) 6563 (iv)

Western Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9706 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Woods Building Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3188 (ii).

See 'Supply—Public Works—Ottawa.'

Wentworth, Number of Govt. Appointments since 1904 (M. for ret.) 2162 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2557 (ii).

BLONDIN, Mr. P. E., *Champlain.*

Address, The, 169 (i).

Arthabaska and Drummond Election, *re* Disloyal Speeches (remarks) on Address, 169 (i).

——— Statements in 'Le Devoir,' Denial, &c., 145 (i).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 471 (i).

Lanctot: *See* 'Richelieu.'

Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 7590 (iv), 8103 (v).

Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot, on Amt. (Mr. Monk), on M. (Mr. German), to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 8027 (v).

Richelieu, Member of, Charges *re* Emplymt. of Govt. Work men from Sorel Ship yards, Ques. of Priv., 4645 (iii), (M.) for Com., 4654 (iii).

St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 2674 (ii).

Sorel Naval Shipyards, Investigation, Dismissal of A. Senecal (remarks) 5732 (iii).

Thibodeau, Mr. Frank, Salary as Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 8100 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Militia), *Kings, N.S.*

Alberta Rangers, Macleod, Squadron, Capt. D. J. Campbell's connection therewith (Ans.) 7341 (iv).

Annual Drill, Number of Men, Officers, &c. (Ans.) 8700, 9353 (v).

Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Baby Farm, Sale of, Competition *re* (Ans.) 2155 (ii).

Bear River Rifle Range, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3606 (ii).

Bliss, Lt. Col. D. C. F., Emplymt. by Govt. &c (Ans.) 8100 (v)

Canadian Veterans at Coronation (Ans.) 3608 (ii).

Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of (remarks) 9997 (v).

Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage (remarks) 4660 (iii).

——— Canadian Cadets, &c. (Ans.) 706 (i).

——— Names of Officers, Cadets, &c. (remarks) 7106 (iv).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Coronation Contingent, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3277 (ii).
—— Regulations *re* Selection (Ans.) 3220 (ii), 4464 (iii).
—— Selection of Officers (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Esquimalt Guns, Removal of (Ans.) 3220 (ii).
Eucharistic Congress and Guards of Honour (Ans.) 704 (i).
—— Militia Officers at Reception, Uniform, &c. (Ans.) 707 (i).
—— Attendance of Militia, Authority for (Ans.) 3219 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Compensation to (Ans.) 658, 1089 (i).
—— Number surviving, Pensions, &c. (Ans.) 1715 (i).
See "Veterans."
Flags Flying on Military Buildings (remarks) 4725 (iii).
Fort Osborne Barracks, Negotiations *re* Purchase by Man. Govt. (remarks) 4470 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6055 (iv).
French, Gen.'s, Report (presented) 76 (i).
—— on Inquiry for Rep., 10 (i).
Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c. (Ans.) 2886 (ii).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10349 (v).
Militia and Agriculture Expenditure from 1867 to 1910 (Ans.) 9371 (v).
Militia, Annual Drill, Number called out from 1894 to 1910 (Ans.) 8700 (v).
Militia Dept., Showing of Passes by Members of Parliament (Ans.) 1003, 1090 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Militia Expenditures, Total Amount since Confederation (Ans.) 3467 (ii).
—— Regiments, Number in Montreal, Quebec, &c. (Ans.) 7595 (iv).
—— Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1003 (i).
—— Supplies, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4667 (iii).
—— Surveys, Expenditure in last five years (Ans.) 1102 (i).
—— Total Annual Cost from 1867 to 1910, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).
Montreal and Mar. Prov. Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
N.B. Artillery Regiment, Annual Drill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Associations, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7340 (iv).
Petawawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Force Training (Ans.) 4465 (iii).
Porcupine Fire Sufferers, Request for Tents, Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 9984 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Boston Speech (remarks) 5751 (iii).
—— Kentville Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5548, 5750 (iii).
Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own Regiment while in England (Ans.) 1088 (i).
—— Number issued to Queen's Own (Ans.) 9781 (v)
Ross Rifles loaned by Canada to G.B., Use at Bisley, &c. (Ans.) 1087 (i).
—— Recommendation to British Govt. (remarks) 7553 (iv).
Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price paid, &c. (Ans.) 8583, 10335 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Militia—(salaries) 1021 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8758 (v).
Militia (allowance) 8514, 8528 (v); (customs duties) 6054; (R.M.C. maintenance) 6054; (Winnipeg rifle range) 6053 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 3156; Que. (Montreal barracks) 3145 (ii).
Toronto Barracks, Erection of (remarks) 7558 (iv).
—— Purchase of Site (Ans.) 2154 (i).
Veterans, Grants to by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5214 (iii).
See 'Fenian.'
Veterans of 1866, Compensation *re* (remarks) 9999 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Halifax, N.S.*
Address, The, 22 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Naval Policy, 218, (amt.) 228 (i).
—— on Ques. of Order, Member asked to apologize for using word "liar," 463 (i).
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2173, 2183 (ii).
Agricultural Implements, Valuations for Duties, Manipulation of, &c. (remarks) 1360 (i).
Arthabaska and Drummond Elections, Cartoons used by Min. of Marine, published by "Le Canada" in 1904 (remarks) on Address, 223 (i).
See 'Drummond.'
Atlantic Mail Contract, Question *re* (remarks) 2373 (ii).
Bahama Islands, Annexation to Canada, rumours *re* (remarks) 9373 (v).
Bank Act, Consideration by Govt. (remarks) 6674 (iv).
Bank Curators Reports (remarks) 4569 (iii).
Birthday of Prime Minister, Congratulations, &c., 8 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
British National Songs in N. W. Schools, Remarks of Mr. Armstrong (remarks) 4932 (iii).
Budget, The, (remarks) 6439 (iv).
Business of the House, Inquiry, 4117 (iii).
—— Adjournment for Coronation (remarks) 9310 (v).
See 'Coronation.'
Cable, G.B. and Canada State-owned, Proposal *re* G.B. and Can. (Ques.) 1905 (i).
See 'Telegraph.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8804, 8813, 8841; in Com., 9256 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re* Mr. Oliver on Proposed Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8191 (v).
See 'Oliver.'
C. P. Ry. Reduction of Rates, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com., 1848 (i).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work (remarks) 7219 (iv).
—— Cor. *re* Apptmt. of Enumerators (M. for copy*) 9994 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9056 (v).
Census, Inquiry for Information, 9694 (v).
—— Progress *re* (remarks) 9594 (v).
Census Omissions in Enumerations, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9717 (v).
—— Further information *re*, 9897 (v).
Census, Systems of Collecting (M. for papers, &c.) 4337 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (remarks) 6669, 7556 (iv).
China-Japan SS Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10401, 10450 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9838-9 (v).
—— Discussion *re* Rep., 9929 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8723 (v).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com on Res., 8906 (v).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re* (M. for cor.) 2218 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 7553 (iv).
—— (notice of motion) 1912 (i).
Coal Strikes, Settlement of (remarks) 6914 (iv).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7808 (iv); in Com., 8896 (v).
Copyright Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 9595 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8711 (v).
—— Definite Date (remarks) 9090 (v).
See 'Business,' 'Imperial Conference.'
Customs Act Schedules, Average Value in 1896 and 1910 (Ques.) 801 (i).
See 'Duties.'
Customs Officer at Ingram Dock, Dismissal of *re* Municipal Elections (M. for O. Cs. &c.) 2218 (ii).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7017 (iv).
Deptl. Expenditures of Public Moneys, Investigations *re* (remarks) on Address, 37 (i).
Dog Fish Industry, (remarks) in Com., 8044 (v).
Dom. Lands Act, O. Cs. in Com., 8087 (v).
Drummond, &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 476 (i).
Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value of articles in Schedules of Customs Act (M. for ret.) 1105 (i).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3480 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8111 (v).
English Mails to Mar. Provs.: *See* 'Mails.'
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'
Fanny Louise Land Patent, Cancellation of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2191 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2251 (ii).
—— Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5387 (iii).
—— Proceedings *re* Commission, Inquiry for, 10471 (v).
Farmers' Delegation from the West, Control of Rates, &c. (remarks) 1598 (i).
—— (remarks) *re* Printing of Speeches, &c., 1454 (i).
—— Stmt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Grain Growers' Guide (remarks) 1575 (i).
Fedorenko, S., Extradition of (remarks) 10 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9627 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, Speech of P.M.G. at Montreal (remarks) 2269 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8044 (v).
Fisheries, Newfoundland: *See* 'Hague.'
Fishery Officers in Victoria Co., on Inquiry for Ret., 6672 (iv).
Fisheries Protection Service, Seizure by 'Rainbow' (remarks) 4208 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup., 8501 (v).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4352 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 8086, 9346 (v).
French, Gen., Rep., Inquiry for, 9 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4115 (iii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).
See 'Business.'
Grain Act Amt. B., 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9514 (v).
Grand Falls and St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5705 (iii).
G.T.R. Trainmens Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1071 (i).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B., 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306 (v).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8978 (v).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Agreement *re* (remarks) 1725 (i).
——— Bay of Fundy, on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Sup., 4614, 4701 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Speech on Address, 24 (i).
——— Fisheries Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1804 (i).
——— Stmt. *re* (remarks) 1913 (i).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Halifax Customs Officials, Complaints *re* Treatment *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com., 8723 (v).
Halifax Pier at Cunard Wharf, Construction of (remarks) 2150 (ii).
Halifax Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ques.), 653 (i).
Homestead Regulations in B.C., on M. (Mr. Taylor) for Ret., 2861 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1411, 1536, 1739, 1765 (i).
House of Commons Appointments (remarks) on M., 5288 (iii).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1564 (i).
Imperial Conference, Attendance of Prime Minister, Position of the Opposition, Compromise, &c. (remarks) 8033 (iv).
——— Cor. with Mr. Harcourt, &c. (remarks) 10340 (v).
——— Precis *re* Proceedings (remarks) 9693 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Imperial Conference, Precis Rep. and Verbatim Rep. (remarks) 9783 (v).
——— Printing and Distribution in Canada (remarks) 9691 (v).
——— Rep. presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10114 (v).
Indian Act Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 7020; on M. for 2°, 7825, 7832; in Com., 7852 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2956 (ii).
I.C.R., Construction at Grand Narrows, O. Cs, &c. *re* Claims of Contractors (M. for copies*) 5640 (iii).
——— inquiry for ret., 10470 (v).
——— Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1179 (i).
——— Excursion Trains *re* Political Meetings, (remarks) 3000 (ii).
——— Freight Transfer, Letter to Agent at Moncton (Ques.) 653 (i).
——— Halifax Terminals, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham 2647 (ii).
——— Terminals, at Halifax, Dock Accommodation (remarks) 2376 (i), 9561 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 1301 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 971; in Com., 976, 1295: in Order for Com., 1407 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 871 (i); on M. for 2°, 9132; in Com., 9157 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations B. 224 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9452; on M. for 3°, 9533 (v).
See 'China and Japan.'
Japanese Treaty, Action *re* (remarks) 9076 (v).
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Prime Minister's Birthday, Congratulations, &c., 8 (i).
Lemieux, Hon. Mr., Speech at Montreal. *See* 'Fiscal.'
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop, Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1199 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence, on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).
——— Cor. between Govt, and British Ambassador, Inquiry for 3530 (ii)
——— Rep. of American Commissioners, Canada's action, &c., (remarks) 1651 (i).
See 'International Waterways Bill,' 'St. Lawrence.'
Mail Service to Mar. Provs., English Mails, &c., (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9543 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Mail Service to Maritime Provinces, Representations by Board of Trade at Halifax (remarks). 2376 (ii).
—— (remarks) 8794 (v).
Mails, Illegal Use of, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* M. to adjn. hse., 1358 (i).
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6202 (iv).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c., (remarks) 6764 (iv).
Matches, White Phosphorus Manufacture, Prohibition B. 10 (Mr. King) on M. for 2°, 1576 (i).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2800 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8888 (v).
See 'Business,' &c., 'Govt. Business.'
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9498 (v).
N. T. Ry., Eastern Div., Total Cost up to 31st Dec., 1910 (Ques.) 2434, 3064 (ii).
—— Land Damages, Delay *re* Fiats for Compensation (remarks) 3949 (iii).
—— Payments *re*, on Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
—— St. Lawrence and Moncton Div, Completion of (Ques.) 1711 (i).
Naval Defence, Government Proposals (remarks) on Address, 34 (i).
Naval Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Address, 218 (amt.) 228; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 126) 649 (i).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5947 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co.'s Investments in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) for Com., 782 (i).
Niagara Falls Water Power, Treaty Obligations, &c., Par. in Press (remarks) 8791 (v).
—— Power, Regulations, &c., (remarks) 8893 (v).
See 'International.'
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration at The Hague, (M. for cor.) 4337 (iii.)
—— Hague Award (remarks) 689 (i).
—— Distribution of Copies (remarks) 8093 (v).
See 'Hague.'
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 8309; (amt.) 8314, Neg. (Y. 69; N. 102) 8347 (v).
—— Inquiry for Meeting of Com., 9899 (v).
See 'Can. Northern,' &c.
BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill (Mr. Conmee) on M. to introduce, 2831 (ii).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2534 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2344 (ii)
Oyster Culture, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor. (remarks) 725 (i).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c., (remarks) 9917 (v).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages Damages (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8591 (v).
Perley, Mr., Cor. *re* Riordan Paper Co., (remarks) 10201 (v).
Postoffice Act. Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9579 (v).
Prime Minister's Tour Through the West, (remarks) on Address, 25 (i).
P. E. I. Judicial Vacancy, Apptmt. of, Delay, &c. (remarks) 6928, 7428, 7803 (iv); 8375 (v).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission 7698, 7794 (iv).
—— Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Murphy) to print (remarks) 8 (i).
Privileges and Election Com., Charges *re* (Mr. A. Lanctot) on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 7884 (v).
Priv., Ques. of (Mr. Lake) on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5746 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Aud. Gen's. Rep., 860 (i).
—— (remarks) 309 (i).
Public Buildings, Erection, &c. (M.) to discharge Order, 4319 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Contract, Advertisement *re*, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copy, 1497 (i).
—— Contract *re* Construction, Resignation of Chairman (remarks) 4205 (iii)
—— Date of Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
—— Information *re*, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4334 (iii).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 700 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 966 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9331, 9391 (v).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5235 (iii).
Railways, Transportation Problem in Canada on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5044 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2497 (ii), 4830; (amt.) 4844; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 111) 4875 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. of Res., 3294 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4058 (iii).
Reciprocity, British Preference, Increase of, Readjustment of Tariff, &c. (remarks) 7210 (iv).
——— Articles *re* Obstruction (remarks) 10004 (v).
——— Free Trade Offer by U.S., Speech of Presd't Taft (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 5293 (iii).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 2990 (ii).
——— Fruit Duties in B.C. (remarks) 3771 (ii).
——— Importations into Canada from Favoured Nation countries, Entry of Canadian Goods into their Markets, 4134 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 2555 (ii).
——— Manufactured Products and Agricultural Products (stmnt) *re* Mr. Clark's Speech *re*, 4196 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Best) to adjn. debate, 9886 (v).
——— Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1506 (i), 2271 (ii).
——— Negotiations with U.S. and Can. (remarks) on Address, 32 (i).
——— Obstruction by Opposition (Mr. Fielding) on M. to adjn. debate, 9886 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 4125 (iii).
——— on Question of Order referring to previous debate, 8256 (v)
——— (remarks) *re* Better Order, 3705 (ii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5950 (iv).
——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609 (i).
——— Statistics of comparative prices, 6807 (iv).
——— Statistical Tables, Inquiry for 2985, 3059 (ii).
——— Statistics from U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 4931 (iii).
——— on handing in Statements (remarks) 6955 (iv).
——— Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2643 (ii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7672 (iv).
——— letter from 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7676 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 5733 (iii), 8093 (v).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Limited incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
R.N.W.M. Police, Death of Inspectors on Northern Patrol (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service at public function (remarks) 938 (i).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service (remarks) 9995, 10095 (v).
St. John Valley Ry: *See* 'Grand Falls,' &c.
St. Lawrence River, Damming the Long Sault (M. for cor. pets, &c.) 3228 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2887 (ii).
——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).
See 'Long Sault.'
St. Peter's Canal Construction, Answer to Question (remarks) 8355 (v).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6189 (iv).
Senate, Cost of, amended Motion (Mr. Foster) 1453 (i).
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7825 (iv).
Springhill Coal Strike, Information *re* Present Situation (remarks) 6362 (iv).
Statutes, French Edition, Correction in Translation (remarks) 8088 (v).
Supply for Public Works, Objection *re* Vote in full, 9554 (v).
Supply, Schedule of Votes, Proportion, &c. (remarks) 9567 (v).
Supply B. 225 on M. for 3°, 9580 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9080 (v).
Interior (boundary surveys) 9546; (Dom. Lands surveys) 9547; (seed grain) 9551; (water investigations) 9551 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8753; (Baddeck and Iona) 8763; (Bonaventure River and N.B.) 8764; (Canada and Mexico) 8781 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 1592; (Halifax post office) 1583; (Lunenburg) 1595 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 8872 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9501, 9507 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 9561 (v).
R.N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8598; (subsistence) 8600 (v).
Tariff Negotiations, &c., Prime Minister's remarks in the West (remarks) on Address, 26 (i).
See 'Reciprocity.'
Taylor, Geo., Retirement as Chief Whip (remarks) 6 (i).
Telegraph and Cable Services Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9644 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Trade, Imports and Exports, between B.N.A. Possessions and U.S. (M. for ret.°) 4383 (iii).
U.S. Warships in Great Lakes, Armament of, &c (Ques.) 7026; (remarks) 6362 (iv).
——— Information from Official Sources, Delays, (remarks) 6611 (iv).
——— Manœuvres at Chicago, Permission of Can. Govt. *re* passing through Canadian Canals, 6116 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of, on Stmnt. of Sec. of State (remarks) 10455 (v).
——— Inquiry for Stmnt., 10096 (v).
Water Carriage of Goods Act Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9348 (v).
Water Carriage of Goods, on M. (Mr. Brodeur) to refer Complaint to Com. on Marine and Fisheries, 6905 (iv).
'Wanda' Yacht, Valuation by Customs (remarks) 5627 (iii).
West Indies Trade with Canada, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6387 (iv).
Whips, Chief, Retirement of Mr. Geo. Taylor (remarks) 6 (i)
Waterways Treaty Bill: See 'International.'

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *Algoma West.*
Algoma, Timber Permits, Amounts paid *re* Dues (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
Alien Labour Law, Administration at Sault Ste. Marie, on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).
——— Emplmnt. of Foreigners on Public Contracts (remarks) 10372 (v).
See 'Sault Ste. Marie.'
Electricians Protest *re* Dismissals at Sault Ste. Marie, Alien Labour Law Administration, on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigatin *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5322, 5508 (iii).
Farm and Garden Products, Imports at Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 7034 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9621 (v).
Fishery Inspectors, Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6646 (iv).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull,' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1559 (i).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10350 (v).
Lt. Governor, N.S., Apptmt. of, Cor. *re* Director of N.S. Steel and Coal Co. (Ques) 2670 (ii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials, Acceptance of (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2747; Neg. (Y. 63; N. 118) 2826 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, 2768, 2814 (ii).
——— (explanation) 2438 (ii).
——— Notice of Discussion, 2150, 2254 (ii).
Obabikong and Sabiskong Indian Reserves, Tenders *re* Burned Timber (Ques.) 1344 (i).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6121 (iv).
Reciprocity Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10011, 10026 (v).
Reciprocity Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6782, 6900 (iv).
——— Trade and Commerce, Reply to Ret. for Statistics (remarks) 6511 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Labour Strike, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in 'Sault Express', 6359 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Cor., 6365 (iv).
See 'Alien.'
Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Seagull Dock, St. Joseph's Island, Date of Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1349 (i).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1400 (i).
Steel Wire, &c., Bounties, Intention of Govt. *re* (remarks) 6613 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (concrete walls) 6358; (mooring posts) 6397; Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6646 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 3001 (ii).
Technical Education Commission, Completion of Work (remarks) 1661 (i).
Veterans, Grants to (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5214 (iii).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Proclamation *re* Earlier Date (remarks) 9900, 10142 (v).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 880 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6329 (iv).
Carillon Canal, Water Powers, Names of Lessees, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 2668 (ii).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4578 (iii).
Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of, &c. (Ques.) 2852 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Claim for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin (Ques.) 2852 (ii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H., *Selkirk.*
Agricultural Products of Canada, Total Product (Ques.) 6756 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5083 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9286 (v).
C.P.R. Land Tax, Information *re* Privy Council's Decision, 2992 (ii).
Census Enumerators for Man. and N.W. on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9029 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8928 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to Prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3506 (ii).
Fish Poachers in Lake Superior, Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (remarks) 1459 (i).
Fishery Regulations, Proclamation *re* (remarks) 5035 (iii).
See 'Lake Winnipeg'; 'Manitoba,' &c.
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4372 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8608 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9530 (v).
Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 1722 (i).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1545 (i).
Immigration—Farmers sent to G.B. from Man. (Ques.) 1489 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7833 (iv); in Com., 8404 (v).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries Investigation Commission, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 796 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Navigation, Icebreaker *re* Res. from Board of Trade (read) 4217 (iii).
Light-House Keepers Salaries, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 773 (i).
Manitoba Fisheries Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 4207, 5035 (iii).
New Westminster Employees, Increase of Salaries, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2185 (ii).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8596 (v).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5068 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 6680 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Pets, &c., 3057 (ii).
—— Letter from Market Gardeners (read) 4130 (iii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., Stmnt. of Mr. Clark *re* Opposition to, Ques. of Priv. 4227 (iii).
St. Andrew's Dam, Fishway, Correction in Stmnt. *re*, 1650 (i).
—— Fish Ladder &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3033 (ii).
St. Andrew's Dam, Bridge, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3035 (ii).
—— Sums for Completion (remarks) 1508 (i).
St. Peters Indian Reserve, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5837, Ques. of Order, 5865 (iii).
—— Amounts received from Sales, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 787 (i).
—— Chief Justice Howell's Commission (M. for copy of evidence*) 7039 (iv).
—— Investigation by Rev. Dr. John McDougall (Ques.) 787; (M. for copies) 1292 (i).
—— Moneys paid by Govt., Complaints &c. (Ques.) 1974 (ii).
—— Original Documents &c. (remarks) 8192, Cor. *re* Original Documents &c. (read) 8109; on Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 8478 (v).
—— Rep, in Winnipeg 'Telegram' *re* Speech on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Oliver) 3841 (ii).
—— Request by Commission for Official Documents (remarks) 9899 (v).
Selkirk Postoffice Box (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Emplymt. of (Ques.) 6272 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3789 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6039 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5175 (iii); (agencies) 6047 (iv).
Indians, N.W.T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6036, 6039 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9549 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (pavements) 2593 (ii); (Sussex Street Block) 3172; (water supply) 2586 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (repairs) 9553 (v).
R.N.W.M. Police (subsistence) 8600 (v)
Whitemouth River Fishway (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Winnipeg River Water Powers, &c., Inquiry for Ret. 3955 (iii).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6292 (iv).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1944 (i).
Agricultural Implements imported into Can, Valuations &c. (remarks) 1362 (i).

BRODER, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Dairy Industry, Memorials *re* &c. (Ques.) 2671 (ii).
Elevator Terminals &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2390 (ii).
Elevator Terminals &c., Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1497 (i).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8240 (v).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1559 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1221 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2816 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6739 (iv).
Rideau Canal Lockmen, Increased Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6414 (iv).
Sheet Steel Co., Emplymt. of men *re* ice blockades (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Rapide Plat (dredging) 6413; (iv) Williamsburg (electric power) 6396; (iv); Public Works—Buildings, N.B., (Fredericton pavement) 1613 (i).
Waddington Power Development, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7210 (iv).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P., (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), *Rouville.*
Address, The, 135, 152 (i).
Aids to Navigation *re* St. Lawrence, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c., (Ans.) 800 (i).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4240 (iii).
'Alva' Str., Purchase of, Dimensions, &c., (Ans.) 1909 (i).
'Arctic' Rep. of Capt. Bernier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Barrington Passage Bait Freezer, on Inquiry for Ret., 5293 (iii).
Bay of Fundy Fishing Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).
Beddington, Mr., Pension *re* Pilotage Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Brier Island Light, Application *re* new House (Ans.) 4929 (iii).
—— Salary, &c., (Ans.) 4929 (iii).
B. C. Fisheries Regulations (M. for Com. on Res.) 4201 (iii).
See 'Fisheries Act,' 'Govt. Steamers.'

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3859 (ii).
Canadian Naval Service, Boot Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1723 (i), 2675 (ii).
—— 'Bristol' Type, Specifications, &c. (Ans.) 1279 (i).
—— Building of Cruisers, &c. 197 (i).
—— Cruisers, Article in Naval Annual *re* Scrapping (remarks) 931 (i).
—— Coal Consumption by Niobe, (Ans.) 7209 (iv).
—— Cruisers manned by Canadians, Names, &c., (Ans.) 805 (i).
—— Cruisers ordered for Canada, Stmnt., in the 'Navy' (Ans.) 793 (i).
—— Date and Port of Sailing of 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' (Ans.) 1091 (i).
—— Fisheries Protection Service, Seizure by 'Rainbow,' (remarks) 4117, 4208 (iii).
—— Loan of Cruisers by Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 983 (i).
—— Names of Employees, Duties, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Stmnt., 935 (i).
—— Naval Expenditures Return (remarks) 4659 (iii).
—— Navy Regulations, Printing, &c., (Ans.) 4665 (iii).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Approximate Cost, &c., (Ans.) 7210 (iv.)
—— 'Niobe,' Contracts *re* Provisions (Ans.) 794 (i).
—— 'Niobe,' Date of laying keel, Repairs in England, &c., (Ans.) 793 (i).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Speed, Result of Official Trials (Ans.) 7209 (iv.)
—— 'Niobe,' Wages of Seamen, Discontent, &c., (remarks) 531 (i); (stmnt. read) 664 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' and 'Niobe,' Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c., (Ans.) 792 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price paid, &c., (Ans.) 788 (i).
—— 'Rainbow,' listed as ineffective (remarks) 1071 (i).
—— 'Rainbow,' struck off Effective List, (Ans.) 1081 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' and 'Niobe,' Total Cost to date, Price, Repairs and Maintenance (Ans.) 791 (i).
—— Recruiting by Postmasters (remarks) 7262 (iv).
—— Recruiting Regulations, O. C. *re* Remuneration, &c., (Ans.) 7804 (iv).
—— Roper; *See* 'Roper.'
—— Ships ordered by Govt., Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (remarks) 867 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Canadian Naval Service, Tenders for Cruisers, &c., (Ans.) 8706 (v).
—— Total Cost of Cruisers (Ans.) 791 (i).
—— Total Expenditure since October 31, 1910 (Ans.) 5638 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (registration) Amt. (B. 155) 1° m., 6112, 2° m., and (M.) to ref. to Committee on Marine and Fisheries, 6675 (iv).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4581 (iii).
Civil Service, Apptmt. of Colcured Persons (remarks) 4930, 5039 (iii).
Coronation, Naval Cadets, Methods of Selection (Ans.) 9986 (v).
'Crissie Toomey,' Purchase of, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5833 (iii).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re* (Ans.) 9374 (v).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7018 (iv).
Dog Fish Industry, (remarks) 8044 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Speeches *re* Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 135, 152; Cartoons displayed to House (remarks) 146 (i).
'Earl Grey,' Str.. Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c. (Ans.) 1972 (ii).
—— Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters (Ans.) 1080, 1092 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Transfer to Canada (Ans.) 799 (i).
Falconer System of Bookkeeping, Adoption of by Depts. (Ans.) 1904 (i).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt (B. 185) in Com. on Res., 8043; in Com., 8419 (v).
Fisheries Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret 5836 (iii).
Fisheries of Can., Extent in Marine Miles, Amount realized, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).
Fisheries on the Great Lakes, Regulations *re*, on M. (Mr. Wilcox) to Com. of Sup., 5224 (iii).
Fisheries Officers in Ontario, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6158 (iv).
Fisheries Protection Service, Number of Vessels (Ans.) 805 (i).
—— Control by Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 983 (i).
Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Taylor) 8484 (v).
—— on Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8479 (v).
—— Date of Operations *re* (Ans.) 3465 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Fisheries Treaty, Penalties *re* Violation of, on Inquiry for Ret., 1806 (i).
—— Printing of Documents (remarks) 4207 (iii).
—— Proclamation *re* (remarks) 5035 (iii).
—— Trap Nets (remarks) 2070 (ii).
Fishery Regulations, Violation of by C. K. Golden, &c. (remarks) 2368 (ii).
Fisheries Treaty, 1908, Non-fulfilment by U.S. (remarks) 6531 (iv).
Fishery Commission *re* Saskatchewan and Alberta, Interim Rep. laid on Table, 10590 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Fish Hatcheries under Dom. Control, Applications *re* Fish Fry (Ans.) 1494 (i).
Fish Hatcheries in East Elgin, Construction *re* (remarks) 5137 (iii).
Fishing Bounties in Kings Co., P.E.I., Names of persons receiving Pay (Ans.) 7246 (iv).
Fish Poachers on Pacific and Lake Superior Coasts (remarks) 1460 (i), 2085 (ii).
Fishing by Steam Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling.'
Fish Transportation, Expenditure annually, Value, &c. (Ans.) 6271 (iv).
—— Amounts paid out of Aiding Fund, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) 6506 (iv).
Fish Transhipment from Mar. Provs. (remarks) 6092, 6102, 7106 (iv).
—— Statement (read) 7259 (iv).
Fishing Vessels and Customs Regulations Bill, on Request (Mr. Jameson) to place on Govt. Orders, 3374 (ii).
Fish Wardens in Victoria, N.B., on Inquiry for Ret., 5629, 5732 (iii), 6672 (iv).
Fishways on Pembina River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
—— Placing of Ladder (Ans.) 1090 (i).
Glace Bay Bait Association, Amounts paid from 1906-10 (Ans.) 3670 (ii).
—— Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c. (Ans.) 4044 (iii).
Govt. Goods purchased from U.S., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).
Govt. Steamers of Marine Dept., Winter Commissions (Ans.) 5833 (iii).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Grand Manan Fisheries, Weir Licenses &c. (Ans.) 2367 (ii).
Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock (Ans.) 1976 (ii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries, Regulations, Papers laid on Table, 2365 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Hague Tribunal, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Bay of Fundy) on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Sup., 4593, 4678 (iii).
Herring Traps, Close Season (remarks) 2086 (ii).
Immigration Officers of U.S. residing in Canada (Ans.) 1724 (i).
Imperial Defence Conference Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 2216 (ii).
—— Premier's Reception from Conference, Amount expended (Ans.) 9781 (v).
See 'Laurier.'
Imperial Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) on Senate Amts., 6610 (iv).
International Fisheries Commission, Regulation *re* (remarks) 7260 (iv).
—— Regulations, Mess. from Washington (remarks) 6504 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'
'Iroquois' Str., Report *re* Wreck (remarks) 7104 (iv).
James Bay Fishing Lease to Ach. McNee, Duration of (Ans.) 4830 (iii).
'John B. Young' Str., Stranding of, Govt. Assistance *re* (Ans.) 2368 (ii).
Lafleur, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt., Interference in Elections (Ans.) 1907 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries, Investigating Fisheries, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 797 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Icebreaker (remarks) 4223 (iii).
Lanctot Charges: *See* 'Privileges,' &c.
Laurier Reception at Montreal, Montreal Harbour Commission's Expenditure (Ans.) 9982 (v).
See 'Imperial Conference.'
'LeDevoir,' Quotations from *re* Drummond Election, Ques. of Priv., 469 (i).
Life Saving Awards, Names of Recipients (Ans.) 3849 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Date of Appmt. &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 772 (i).
Lobster Fishery Regulations laid on Table, 529 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Manitoba Fisheries Commission, on Inquiry for Rep., 4207, 5035 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'
Manitou Lake Fishing Privileges, Lease *re* (Ans.) 1348 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
—— Investigations, Prosecutions, &c. (remarks) 10243 (v).
—— Purchase of Ships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6473 (iv).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 4208 (iii), 6763 (iv).
—— (remarks) on Inquiry for Ret., 6120 (iv).
Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, Dates, Examiners, &c. (Ans.) 2376 (ii), 5637 (iii).
Menzie, Wm., Payments to *re* Meteorological Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).
Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 4929 (iii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses for 1908-9-10 (Ans.) 817 (i).
'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 1724 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 48) 1° m., 1070 (i); in Com., 8451 (v); on Senate Amts., 9534 (v).
Montreal Legal Firms, Amounts paid for Services (Ans.) 984 (i).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B 45 (Mr. Ecrement) on M. for 3°, 7718; in Com., 7723 (iv).
Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmt., &c. (Ans.) 1105 (i).
Navigation Licenses, on Great Lakes, Regulations from Washington (Ans.) 2376 (ii).
Navy of Canada: *See* 'Can. Naval Service.'
Negroes in Govt. Employ: *See* 'Civil Service.'
Northwest Fishing Co., on Inquiry for Ret. 5630 (iii).
Owl's Head Lighthouse, Construction, Apptmt. of Lightkeeper (Ans.) 5832 (iii).
—— Pet. *re* (Ans.) 3465 (ii).
Oyster Culture, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor. 760 (i).
'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew, &c. (Ans.) 3605 (ii).
Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 9782 (v).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3908 (ii).
—— Contracts *re* Coal, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2677 (ii).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7979 (v).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Emplymt. of Mr. Cooper *re* Inspection (Ans.) 6663 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Members *re* (Ans.) 2437 (ii).
Reciprocity, Fishing Bounties, Payments *re* (remarks) 6670 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5737 (iii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Rhodes) 1001 (i).
Revised Statutes—Chapter 142, French Version, Correction (B. 136) 1°*, 4740 (iii).
Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 799 (i).
——— Speech *re* Naval Service, Approval by Govt. (Ans.) 1289 (i).
——— (remarks) 935 (i).
——— Meaning of Word 'Faction,' Incomplete Answer (remarks) 1353 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Depth of Water at Low Tide below thirty feet (Ans.) 1718 (i).
Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c. (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
Sevigny Island, Change of Name (Ans.) 1491 (i).
Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3607 (ii).
Shipwrecks on B.C. Coast, Inspection *re* (remarks) 7258 (iv).
Sick Mariners' Funds, Amount in Trust, Investment &c. (Ans.) 9993 (v).
——— Law *re* Payment of Dues (Ans.) 1904 (i).
Smelt Fishing in Nova Scotia, Pet. *re* Change of Open Season (Ans.) 9984 (v).
Sorel Marine Shops, Complaints *re* Thefts (Ans.) 1089 (i).
Sorel Shipyards, Official Inquiry, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6758 (iv), 9995, 10096 (v).
——— Charges *re* stealing Buoys (Ans.) 7026; (remarks) 7217 (iv).
——— Dismissal of A. Senecal (remarks) 5732 (iii).
——— Instructions to Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 7039 (iv).
See 'Privileges.'
'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 1910 (i).
Steam Trawler, Application *re* Fishing Bounty (Ans.) 4046 (iii).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3118 (ii).
Steam Trawlers, 'Wren' and 'Croquette,' Registration in Canada (Ans.) 4046 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1463 (i).
Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 6661; (fish transportation) 6092, 6102; (fishways) 6659; (legal expenses) 6661; (modus vivendi licenses) 6160; (Ont. inspectors) 6613 (iv); (overseers) 3809 (ii); (oyster culture) 6661 (iv); (protection service) 3807 (ii); (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6105, 6159 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, (Agencies, rents, &c.) 6454; (aids to navigation) 6455; (Barret, M., payments to) 6091;
BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
(buoys in Bay of Fundy) 6458; (Eureka) 6503; (Harling, Mr. Thos., compensation) 6092; (Kerr, Mrs. Elizabeth, compassionate allowance) 6091; (lighthouses, repairs) 6455; (lightkeepers salaries) 6454; (Lime Kiln Crossing) 6546; (maritime road) 6542; (pensions) 6091; (pensions to pilots) 6533, (signal service) 6502; (steamers) 6546; (telephones, life stations) 6539; (Thunder Bay) 6500; (wharfs) 6538; (wireless stations) 6457 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (shipwrecked seamen) 6572; (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6554 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic) 6089 (iv); (cattle inspection) 5828; (Govt. steamers maintenance, &c.) 5811; (masters and mates) 5821; (life saving awards) 5822 (iii); (life saving stations) 6090; (Moodie, Maj. J. D., compensation) 6090 (iv); (obstructions in navigable waters) 5826; (patrol boats in North) 5829; (registration of shipping) 5826; (schools of navigation) 5823; (winter mail service) 5828; (wrecking plant subsidy) 5829 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks 3152 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6557; (meteorological service) 6561, 6564 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 6572 (iv).
Telegraph Act (wireless) Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 3453 (ii).
Tetagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishway (Ans.) 7807 (iv).
Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal (Ans.) 2367 (ii).
Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling'.
Treaty of 1871, *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters (correction) 7023 (iv).
Vessels Registered in Canada, List (presented) 9690 (v).
Vessels transferred between Canada and Newfoundland, Names, &c. (Ans.) 3464 (ii).
'Wanda' Yacht, Change from American to Canadian Register, &c. (Ans.) 4301 (iii).
——— Motive Power, &c. (Ans.) 5834 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods, Complaints *re*, Investigation by Committee on Marine and Fisheries, 6905 (iv).
West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 812 (i).
Westport Signal Stations when and where Erected, &c. (Ans.) 1092 (i).
Whitemouth River Fishway (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Wireless Stations, Number, Location, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
See 'Telegraph Act.'
Wood Island Life Boat, Dimensions, Accommodation, &c. (Ans.) 3225 (ii).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Reciprocity Treaty, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6818 (iv).

BUREAU, Hon. J. (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8460 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) Ques. of Order, 9525 (v).
Immigration Act Amt B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2008 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1512 (i).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9219 (v).
Miner, Bill, Capture of (remarks) 4384 (iii).
Railway Act (accidents) Amt B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1800 (i).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1382 (i).

BURRELL, Mr. M., *Yale-Cariboo.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 303, 311 (i).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Inquiry for Copy, 7255 (iv).
British Columbia and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7872 (iv).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1315 (i).
Elections Deferred (remarks) 10376 (v).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c. (remarks) 8999 (v).
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8105, 9251 (v).
Fruit Clause in Reciprocity Treaty, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 3283 (ii).
Fruit Duty, Res. from B.C. Inland Board of Trade (read) 3377 (ii).
Fruit Growers from B.C., Report, Inquiry for, 6120 (iv).
See 'Reciprocity'.
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1418, 1793 (i).
Immigration into Western Can., Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1555 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7855 (iv).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9433 (v).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 1640 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2456; in Com. on Res., 3579, 3611 (ii).
—— Editorial in 'Summerland Review,' and Res., from Fruit Growers in Okanagan Valley (read) 4126, 5549 (iii).

BURRELL, Mr. M.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., Negotiations, Minister's Visit to Washington, Par. in 'Citizen' (remarks) 4566 (iii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5949 (iv).
—— Statistics *re* Prices, Information *re* (remarks) 6518 (iv).
—— Tel. from Fruit Dealers *re* Duty affecting B.C. (read) 3770 (ii).
—— *See* 'Fruits.'
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c., Quarantine (animals health) 5968 (iv).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 5206 (iii).
Postoffice (postmasters salaries) 4289 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Grand Forks) 3015 (ii); (Greenwood) 3015 (ii); (Vernon) 3018 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (meteorological service) 6563 (iv).
U. S.—Japanese Treaty, Inquiry for Copy, 7256 (iv).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 886 (i).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L., *Dauphin.*
Address, The, 640 (i).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s. incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5083 (iii).
Aylwin Irrigation Co.'s Grant, Inquiry for Papers, 6445 (iv), 8192, 9076 (v).
See 'Percy.'
Canadian Navy *re* Home Rule (remarks) 1461 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re* (Mr. Oliver) Personal Explanation, 8188 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man., and N. W., Apptmt. of, on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9032 (v).
Clock in Tower of Parlt. Buildings, Complaint *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3510 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8126 (v).
Fish Hatchery at Snake Island, Winnipegosis, Apptmt. of Keeper (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Fishery Inspectors, Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6642 (iv).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4368 (iii).
Fort Churchill and Nelson River Survey, Inquiry for Ret., 5954 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9529 (iv).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*
Homestead Entries, Irregularities *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5587 (iii).
Homestead Infractions, Punishment *re*, on Ques. of Order, 'Liar,' asked to withdraw, 5561-2 (iii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7852 (iv).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet., *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iv).
Leach, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).
Lethbridge Speech of Member for Pictou, Denial of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res., (Mr. Sproule) 1270 (i).
Man. Swamp Lands, Concession to Province, (remarks) 6759 (iv).
Markey Fishing Rights on Nelson River, Extension of, Cancellation of, &c., (Ques.) 4664 (iii).
——— O. Cs., &c., (M. for papers) 4382 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5630, 5954 (iv).
——— (remarks) 4208 (iii), 6761 (iv).
Militia Dept., Showing of Passes by Members of Parlt., (Ques.) 1090 (i).
Mossy River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10528 (v).
Northwest Fishing Co., Inquiry for Ret., 5630 (iii).
Oliver Charges: *See* 'Can. Northern Land Grant.'
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c., (remarks), 9924 (v).
Percy Aylwin Irrigation Grant, O.Cs. &c., (M. for cor.*) 6158 (iv).
Railway Rates in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6435 (iv).
See 'Parcel Post.'
Railway Shelters for Workmen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup. 5058 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6916 (iv).
——— Assurance of member for North Oxford *re* Farmers' Interests (remarks) 5541 (iii).
Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5952 (iv).
St. Andrews Dam Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3044 (ii).
Saskatchewan Capital City, on Ques., of Priv. (Mr. Neely) 5561, 5622 (iii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*
Selkirk Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9077 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1403 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6241 (iv); (exhibitions) 3785 (ii), 9077 (v); Quarantine (animals health) 5974 (iv).
Canals—Williamsburg (iron mooring posts) 6426; (machinery) 6426 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Indians (contingencies) 4725; Interior (salaries) 4727 (iii).
Fisheries (fishways) 6660; (legal expenses) 6661; (Ont., inspectors) 6642 (iv).
Indians—N.W.T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6040 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5556, 5582 (iii).
Labour Dept. (technical education commission) 3802 (ii).
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8692 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers) 3212; Ont., (Mitchell) 2147; (Peterborough) 2608; Sask. (Battleford) 2971, 3006; (Humboldt) 3007 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6563 (iv).
Swan Creek Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
Address, The, 512 (i).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5571 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9271 (v).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Com. of Sup., 4588 (iii).
Civil Service Act, (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8937 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage (remarks) 4661 (iii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5481 (iii).
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. Subsidy, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 9371 (v).
See 'St. John Valley.'
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1528 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. (B. 9) 1° m., 150; 2° m., 1300; in Com., 1526 (i); on Senate Amts., 3460, 3845 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1147 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 969; in Com., 979, 1515 (i).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9482 (v).
Naval Policy, on The Address, 512 (i).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 8961 (v).
Ontario Northern and Timagami Ry. Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 4109 (iii).
Potato Barrels; *See* 'Inspection,' &c.
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7783 (iv).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) 1° m., 4110 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 964 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9329, 9391 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 4496 (iii).
—— Dufferin Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5547 (iii).
—— Treaty Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6805 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5646 (iii); in Com., 8413 (v).
Saskatoon & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 111) 1°*, 2983; 2° m., 3184 (ii).
Saunderson, Pauline Winslow Relief (B. 181) 1°*, 7666 (iv).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2658 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3447 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Hartland) 1618 (i).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) on Senate Amts., 6469 (iv).
Canadian Northern Branch Lines incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1640 (i); on Senate Amts., 6468 (iv).
Elevators, Terminal &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3494 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9525 (v).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 19) 1°*, 376 (i).
Reciprocity wih U. S., in Com. on Res., 6952 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. A. W., *Inverness.*
Otter, Beaver or Steam Trawling in Northumberland Strait (M. for cor*) 980 (i).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiation *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3112 (ii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *Huron East.*
Address, The, 246 (i).
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1363 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3514 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Representations to Fin. Dept. *re* Stability, &c., (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Food Supplies and Cold Storage B. 112 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 2985 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S, in Com. on Res., 7517 (iv).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers, on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10131 (v).
Small Pox Epidemic, Condition of House of Commons, (remarks) 7255 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (enlargement) 6407 (iv).
Typhoid Epidemic, and Prorogation &c. (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Wingham Public Building Clock, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 6664 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*
Conciliation Board *re* Strikes, Remarks of Judge McGillivray (remarks) in Com of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4378 (iii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps. 3904 (ii).
Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6904 (iv).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3089 (ii).

CLARE, Mr. G. A., *Waterloo South.*
Three Rivers Post Office, Temporary Building (Ques.) 8934 (v).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *Essex South*
Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 187) 1°*, 8187; in Com., 8969 (v).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7563 (iv).
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 206 (Mr. D. A. Gordon) 1°*, 8582; in Com., 8971 (v).
Conduits Co. Limited Patent Relief (B. 43) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Globe Printing Co.'s (B. 121) in Com., 5127 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 55) 1°*, 1277 (i).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s. (B. 223) correction of clerical error (M.) 9305 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co. Ltd., incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8547 (v).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H.—*Con.*
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1513 (i).
Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of into N.W. (remarks) 5911 (iii).
Oliver, Hon. Frank, Charges *re*, Meeting of Com. (remarks) 9900 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6144 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 829 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9403 (v).
Revillon Frères Trading Co., Limited, incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7148 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6616 (iv).
Tilbury Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).
Trussed Concrete Steel Co. Patent Relief (B. 188) 1°*, 8308; in Com., 8970 (v).

CLARK, Mr. M., *Red Deer.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 297 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8713 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3496 (ii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4376 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1754 (i).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1561 (i).
Militia Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1009 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S. in Com. on Res., 4143 (iii).
Reciprocity, *re* Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) on U.S. Manufactures &c., 4197 (iii).

CONGDON, Mr. F. T. *Yukon Territory.*
Beatty, Mary Jane Relief (B. 163) 1°*, 6756 (iv).
British Columbia and White River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2318 (ii).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Crothers) for Royal Commission, 7765 (iv).
Reciprocity Treaty, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7624 (iv).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2731 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2174 (ii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3028 (ii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2223 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (ry. trainmen) Amt. (B. 38) 1° m., 924 (i).
Electricity, &c., Exportation Act Amt. (B. 101) 1° m., 2254 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2415 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s (B. 109) 1°*, 2983; 2° m., 3184 (ii); in Com., 6121, 6124 (iv).
——— M. to introduce, 2828 (ii).
——— Documents *re*, placing on Hansard, 2829 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com of Sup., 2275 (ii).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1640 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2621; Ottawa (water supply) 2589 (ii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H., *Vancouver.*
Chinese Investigation Commission, Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9864 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9456 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9574, 9576 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9388 (v).
Reciprocity Treaty, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6795 (iv).
———Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10063; Ques. of Order, 10008 (v).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3201 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*
Bathurst, N.B., Dredging Total Quantity and Cost (Ques.) 803, 1285 (i).
Builders Woodworking Co., Expropriation of Land for Moncton Extensions (M. for cor.*) 6158 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8805 (v).
Census Commissioner for York County, N. B., (Ques.) 8704 (v).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re* (remarks) 9247, 9374 (v).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*
Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for current year (Ques.) 814 (i).
Eastern Dredging Co., Letting Contracts to (Ques.) 813 (i).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, (Amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10203, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 92) 10308 (v).
Grand Falls Ry: *See* 'St. John Valley Ry.'
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1777 (i).
I.C.R., Moncton Extensions, Acquisition of Land from Builders Woodworking Co., (Ques.) 6157 (iv).
See 'Builders.'
—— Moncton Station, Site purchased, &c., (Ques.) 1291 (i).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2026 (ii).
Mercier, Mr. Geo., Customs Official, Dalhousie, N.B., Member of Town Council, (Ques.) 4044 (iii).
Miramichi Bay, N.B., Dredging Contract, Specifications, Cor. &c., (M. for copy*) 1340 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 2556 (ii).
N. T. Ry., N. B. Section, Standard, Estimated Total Cost (Ques.) 4047 (iii).
Ottalie Stream, N.B., Public Works, Construction, &c., (Ques.) 1287 (i).
Ottlecock Dam, Construction of, &c., (Ques.) 2852 (ii).
Petit Rocher Spur, I. C. Ry., Cost, Revenue, &c., (Ques.) 6156 (iv.)
Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April 1910 (Ques.) 6267 (iv).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 120 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 1°, 4110 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., (remarks) 4523 (iii).
—— Boston Speech of Minister of Militia (remarks) 5751 (iii).
—— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10010 (v).
St. Croix River, N. B., Construction of Public Works, Proposal *re* (Ques.) 1348 (i).
St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, Completion, &c., (Ques.) 814 (i).
—— Rental of Office, &c., (Ques.) 2673, 3065 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5644 (iii); in Com., 8413 (v).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Fergus) 2111 (ii); Ottawa (McGillivray's contract) 5993 (iv.); (Printing Bureau) 2361 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers —N. S., (Argyle Sound) 9505 (v); (Cribbons Point) 6029 (iv); (L'Ardoise) 6029 (iv); (Margaree) 6029 (iv); (Upper Prospect) 6030 (iv); (West Dublin Bay) 6030 (iv); (Yarmouth) 6031 (iv).
Public Works —Harbours and Rivers — Ont., (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R., (rolling stock) 8514 (v).
Victoria Electoral Division, Convictions, Fines, &c., (M. for ret.*) 7602 (iv).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 869 (i).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B., *Halifax.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8843 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9066 (v).
China-Japan S.S. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2517 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8729 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8947 (v).
Coasting Trode Act, Changes *re* (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
'Crissy Toomey' Schooner, Purchase of, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5833 (iii).
Crooks, Mr. Wesley, Postmaster at Peggy's Cove, Increase to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Dog Fish Industry (remarks) 8044 (v).
East Chezzetcook Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
English Mail Service to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 8793 (v).
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Depts. (remarks) 2995 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8044; in Com., 8419 (v).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie), 4373 (iii).
Govt. Steamers of Marine Dept., Winter Commissions, &c. (Ques.) 5833 (iii).
Grand Trunk Strike, Payment to Judge Barron (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4261 (iii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Conference re (remarks) 2002 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1439, 1772 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Repeal of (remarks) 6934 (iv).
I.C.R., Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. *re* Construction (Ques.) 5832 (iii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Dismissals from Nov. 1908, Number reinstated (Ques.) 3666 (ii).
—— Eastern N.S. Extension, on Prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1170 (i).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2058 (ii).
Militia Supplies, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4667 (iii).
Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse. (remarks) 2261, 2265 (ii).
Naval Coronation Contingent, Names of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 9375 (v).
'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Names of Officers (remarks) 9090 (v).
Owl's Head Lighthouse, N.S., Construction, Apptmt. of Lightkeeper (Ques.) 5832 (iii).
—— Pet, *re* Light (Ques.) 3465 (ii).
'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew, &c. (Ques.) 3605 (ii).
Post Office Act (stamp vending machines) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 8068 (v).
Railways-Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5091 (iii).
Reciprocity—Kentville Res. *re* (read) 5548 (iii).
Springhill Mines Strikers, and Conciliation Board *re* Labour Dept. (remarks in Com. of Sup.) 4236 (iii).
Steam Trawling, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3108 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1052; Public Works (salaries) 1045 (i).
Fisheries (fishways) 6660; (inspectors) 6627 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4236 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 6548; (maritime road) 6544; (pilots) 6538; (wharfs) 6538 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Anapolis and London) 8754; (Baddeck and Iona) 8764; (Canada and Cuba) 8777 (v).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6555 (iv).
Ocean and River Service—('Earl Grey') 6481 (iv); (life saving awards) 5822; (maintenance, &c.) 5812; (masters and mates) 5821; (obstructions in navigable waters) 5827; (schools of navigation) 5823 (iii).
Post Office (ry. mail clerks) 4285 (iii).
Public Works--Building--Alberta (Macleod) 3003, 3005; Ont. (Athens) 2089; (Chesley) 2104; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2134; Ottawa (telephones) 3170; (Woods Building lighting contract) 3175 (ii); Que (Montreal barracks) 1864; (St. Lambert) 1901 (i); Sask. (Battleford) 3002 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers--N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9504 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's cars) 6446 (iv); I.C.R. (Halifax) 5920 (iii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Vessels transferred between Can. and Newfoundland, Names, &c. (Ques.) 3464 (ii).
West Indies and Halifax SS Service, Arrangements *re* Contract (Ques.) 4674, 4925 (iii).
Woods Building Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3175, 3192 (ii).
Yukon Beer Import Tax Repeal B. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res. 1981 (i).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W., *Elgin West.*
Address, The, 462, (M.) to adjn. debate, 468, rsmd., 491 (i).
Alberta Railway and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 51) in Com., 3024, 3181, 3391 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8836 (v).
Canadian Railways, Accidents, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3940 (ii).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9050 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8737 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8944 (v).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission re Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5377 (iii).
—— Treasury Board, Ref., Ques. of Priv., 5552 (iii).
—— Mr. Calvert's Connection *re*, Ques. of Priv., 5730 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1766 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com. 1516 (i).
Lethbridge Speech of Member for Pictou (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on the Address, 492 (i).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) *re* Royal Commission, 7751 (iv).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7943 (iv).
Public Buildings, System adopted *re* Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7077 (iv).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5873 (iii).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3347 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6493 (iv).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Fredericton pavement) 1614 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax post office). 1588 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2098; (Chesley) 2104; (Dresden) 2108; (Dundas) 2109; (Elora) 2109; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2134, 3156; (Midland) 2145; (Tilbury) 2627 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 3162; (pavements) 2602; (water supply) 2589 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Aylmer) 1674; (Napierville) 1866, 1873 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2974 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (tobacco curing stations) 3161 (ii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.,*Simcoe, North.*
Accounts Outstanding, Total Amounts *re* Financial Statement (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Adjournment for Coronation, Definite Date (remarks) 9090, 9311 (v).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3460 (ii).
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1360 (i).
Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re* (remarks) 10350 (v).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1342 (i).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2430 (ii).
Business of Private Members, Thursdays Routine (remarks) 1550 (i).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co..'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3458 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827; in Com., 9223, 9279 (v).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2513 (ii).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10438 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9840 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8941 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Regulations *re* Selection (Ques.) 4464 (iii).
—— Selection of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).
Coronation of King George V., Invitation to Members of Parlt., (remarks) 1580 (i).
See 'Adjournment.'

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Estimates of Depts., Procedure *re* Discussing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8467 (v).
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel.'
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt, (Mr. Crocket) 10229 (v).
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s (B. 72) 1°*, 1488 (i).
G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 73 (Mr. Turriff). in Com., 3024 (ii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1545, 1731 (i).
Hydro Electric Power Connection across McGann Property, Decision of Minister (remarks) 1598 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amt., 3460 (ii).
I. C. R. Gross Earnings, Cost per Ton, &c. (Ques.) 5129 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 876 (i): on M. for 2°, 9093 (v); in Com., 9157, 9172 (v).
'Labour Gazette' Names on Mailing List, (M. for copy) 1727 (i).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10349 (v).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence, on M. for Sup., 2893, 2916 (ii).
See 'International.'
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024 (ii).
Morrison, N. L., Pocock, H. A., and Stevens, Captains, Dates of Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, &c (Ques.) 5637 (iii).
Newmarket Canal Rep. and Cor. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10491 (v).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9916, 9930 (v).
Penny Bank Act Amt. B. 221 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9221 (v).
Pollution of Navigable Waters (B. 178) 1°*, 7339 (iv).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Newspapers (remarks) 10341 (v).
Potatoes: *See* 'Inspection.'
Printing Bureau Investigation, Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 1364 (i).
—— Printing of (remarks) 1351 (i).
Pure Foods (B. 35) 1° m., 865 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9314, 9317 (v).
Ry. Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Railway Rates, &c., Treaty *re* Control of (remarks) 8357 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2461 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4771 (iii); remarks *re* Pulp in Com. on Res., 3322 (ii).
——— Discussion by reading Extracts, Ques. of Order, 4124 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Ques. of Order, 4055 (iii).
——— Obstruction by Opposition (remarks) 9889 (v).
——— Submission to House for Ratification (remarks) 1805 (i).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt, (remarks) 7612 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 9165, 9167 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9167, 9168 (v).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (survey) 9563 (v).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1475; Militia (salaries) 1022 (i).
Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 8835 (v).
Public Works—N.B. (Fredericton pavement) 1612; (Hartland) 1617; Hillsborough) 1621; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (Tracadie) 1625 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax Citadel) 1582; (Lunenburg) 1595; (Parrsboro) 1629 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (pavings) 8883; (Rideau Hall) 8876 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9506 (v).
Unorganized Districts in Northern Ont., Deferred Elections (remarks) 10100 (v).
Vessels transferred between Can. and Newfoundland (remarks) 3464 (ii).
Veterans, Grants to (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5215 (iii).
Waterways Treaty, Inquiry for Plans, 3681 (ii).
See 'International,' 'Long Sault.'

CURRIE, Mr. M., *Prince Edward.*
Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s (B. 88) 1*, 1710 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John City.*
Absence, Emoluments for (Ques.) 1089 (i).
Administrator of the Govt. during His Ex.'s 'Arctic,' Rep. of Mr. Vanasse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6542 (iv).
Canada and S. America SS. Service, Subsidies to (Ques.) 5290 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8839 (v).
Census System of Taking, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4340 (ii).
Chatham Public Building, Purchase of Site, Name of Owners (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2509 (ii).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8911 (v).
Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons (remarks) 4930, 5038 (iii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2229 (ii).
Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S. (remarks) 4470 (iii).
See 'Negroes.'
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4662 (iii).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues (remarks) 9374 (v).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4354 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4724 (iii).
Fredericton Pavement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Conferences *re* (remarks) 2002 (ii).
Halifax and St. John Wharfage, &c. (Ques.) 7807 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2019 (ii).
Immigration into Eastern Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
I. C. R., Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
——— Branch Lines Bill, (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9583 (i).
——— Mileage, Value of Rolling Stock, &c. (Ques.) 3668 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 868 (i).
Lorneville Wharf, Tenders re (Ques.) 5132 (iii).
Match Factories, Number of Employees (Ques.) 1976 (ii).
Match Factories, using Phosphorus, Number, Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1717 (i).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2061 (ii).
N. T. Ry., N. B. Section, Pusher Grade (remarks) 4051 (iii).
Naval Boots for Marine Dept., Specifications, Tenders, &c., (Ques.) 1723 (i).
N. B. Regiment of Artillery, Annual Drill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5945 (iv).
"Negroes": *See* "Coloured Aliens"; "Civil Service".
Ottawa City Health Conditions, on Amt. (Mr. Lewis) to Com. of Sup., 6370 (iv).
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1101 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contract, Contract *re* Lowest Tender (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Post Office Estimates, Objection *re* passing (remarks) 4297 (iii).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5054 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., (remarks) 4501 (iii).
——— Dufferin Board of Trade Res. (read) 5547 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids Fish Ladders &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3033 (ii).
St. John Drill Hall, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar Contract, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 5129, 5631 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5695 (iii); in Com., 8411 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (animals health) 5974 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (Iberville) 6357 (iv); Lachine (tugs) 6388 (iv).
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coins) 6062 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Indians (salaries) 4725 (iii); Interior (salaries) 4726 (iii).
Dom. Lands—Miscellaneous (parks) 6049 (iv); (Banff water works) 6052; (Buffalo) 6049 (iv); (Forestry Convention) 6052 (iv).
Fisheries (fish transportation) 6092 (iv); fishways) 6660 (iv); (inspectors) 6658 (iv); (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6109 (iv).
House of Commons (charwomen) 6174 (iv); (committees) 6471 (iv); (electric attendant) 6175; (messengers) 6173 (iv); (sessional clerks) 6168 (iv); (stationery) 6176 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5169 (iii); (seed grain) 6048 (iv).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6162 (iv).
Labor Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4230 (iii), 6057 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6496 (iv); (buoys in Bay of Fundy) 6458 (iv); (buoy steamers) 6549 (iv); (Eureka) 6503 (iv); (Harling, Mr. Thos., compensation) 6092 (iv); (Kerr, Mrs. Elizabeth, compassionate allowance) 6091 (iv); (Lime Kiln Crossing 6546 (iv); (maritime road) 6542 (iv); (pensions, pilots) 6533 (iv); (shipbuilding) 6488 (iv); (telephones) 6542 (iv); (Thunder Bay) 6500 (iv); (wharfs) 6538 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8764 (iv); (Canada and Cuba) 6058 (iv) 8775; (Canada and Newfoundland 8783 (v).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6555 (iv).
Militia (allowance) 8517, 8528 (v); R.M.C. (maintenance) 6054 (iv); (Winnipeg rifle range) 6053 (iv).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Ocean and River Service (Moodie, Maj. J. E., compensation) 6090 (iv).
Post Office (clerks) 4292 (iii); (railway mail clerks) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3003 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Nanaimo) 3016 (ii); (Prince Rupert) 3016; (Vancouver) 3018 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax post office) 1590 (i); (Lunenburg) 1597 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3173 (ii); (McGillivray's contract) 5993 (iv); (Printing Bureau) 2361 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1688 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford 2980 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9506 (v); (Yarmouth) 6032 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines (B.C. (Okanagan Valley) 6033 (iv); Sask. and Alberta (Maintenance) 6034 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (working expenses) 6338 (iv).
Senate (casket for address) 6167 (iv).
Scientific Institution (magnetic observatory) 6557 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 6059 (iv).
Water Supply for Parliament Buildings, *re* Typhoid Epidemic (remarks) 2004 (ii).
Wood Island Life Boat, Dimensions, Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 3224 (ii).

DEMERS, Mr. M. J., *St. John and Iberville.*
Bank Act Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 148 (i).
Ques. of Priv., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Apptmt. to Bench, 271 (i).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
E. B. Eddy Co.'s (B. 54) 1° *, 1277 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5149 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1433, 1749 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2011 (ii).
Imperial Conference, Rep. *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 10109 (v).
Privileges and Elections Com., on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., Ques. of Order 7977 (v).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10191 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7064 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4082 (iii).
——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8370 (v).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Revillon Freres Trading Co. Ltd. incorp. (B. 158) 1° m., 6439; 2° m., 7147, 7590 (iv). in Com., 8577, 8966, 9165, 9575 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, &c. (remarks) 1367 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Aylmer) 1672 (i).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J., *Montreal (St. Anne).*
Bank Act Amt B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9222 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8856 (v).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9722 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8738 (v).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7820 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act. O. Cs., in Com., 8087 (v).
Drummond, &c., Elections, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir, 475 (i).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8452 (v).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8421 (v).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8660 (v).
Guarantee Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 3453 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2007 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7859 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8403 (v).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 921 (i); on M. for 2°, 9127; in Com., 9193 (v).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2920 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3259 (ii).
Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B. (remarks) 9375 (v).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2055 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8451; on Senate Amts, 9535 (v).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2530; on M. for 3°, 2742 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8091 (v).
Priv. and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot) on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. and Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7912 (v).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J.—*Con.*
Railway Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9316, 9385 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5891 (iii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1380 (i).
Statutes, French Translation, Corrections, &c. (remarks) 8089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8687 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1864 (i); 2568, 3144 (ii); (Maisonneuve) 1686 (i).

DONNELLY, Mr. J. J., *Bruce South.*
Farmer's Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5461 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1409 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Estimated Cost, Tunnelling, &c., (Ques.) 3278 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. Fielding) 10456 (v).
Supply—
Public Works—Buildings— Ont. (Chesley) 2103 (ii).
Walkerton & Lucknow Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 817 (i).

DOUGLAS, Mr. J. M., *Strathcona.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr McCarthy) in Com., 5080 (iii).
Pacific and Peace Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 1710 (i)
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c., (seeds) 6230 (iv); Public Works — Buildings — Alta., (Strathcona) 3011 (ii).
Western Alberta Ry Co.'s (B.135) 1°*, 4740 (iii).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B.186) 1°*, 8187 (v).

ECREMENT, Mr. A., *Berthier.*
Census Questions, Preparation of Lists, &c., (Ques.) 659 (i).
Commercial Relations, &c., Translations of Documents (Ques.) 3462 (ii).
Conservation of Natural Resources, Number of Copies printed (Ques.) 660 (i).
Industrial Training, Royal Commission, Incompetent Reporting (Ques.) 3463 (ii).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 1069 (i); in Com., 3180, 3389 (ii); 3° m. 7560, 7717 (iv).
Workingmen's Wages, Increased Cost of Living, &c. (Ques.) 3065 (ii)

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W., *Frontenac.*

Agriculture, Govt., Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv)

Agricultural Products and Dairy Produce, Quantity and Value imported from U. S. (Ques.) 9991 (v).

Armouries, &c., in Canada, Inquiry for Ret. 1460 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 24) 1° m., 530 (i).

Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaint *re* (Ques.) 5406 (iii).

Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8938 (v).

Convicts liberated from Penitentiary at Kingston, without clothing or means (remarks) 1913 (i), 2065 (ii)

Dairy and Farm Products, Quantity and Value of Importation from U.S., 9361 (v).

Drill Halls, Generally, Construction &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Echo Lake Post Office, Application *re* Establishment of (Ques.) 8993 (v).

Elevators, Terminal &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3511 (ii).

Exports and Imports from Canada to Australia, Japan, &c. from 1906-1911, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 9369 (v).

Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5412 (iii).

Farm Products imported from U. S. into Kingston Quantities &c. (Ques.) 3668 (ii).

Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U. S. (Ques.) 1496 (i).

Fish Hatcheries under Dom. Control, Location, Applications for Fish Fry, (Ques.) 1494 (i).

Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4359 (iii).

Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U. S., Quantity, Value &c. (Ques.) 8984 (v).

Horses admitted into Canada with U. S. Settlers &c. (Ques.) 8937 (v).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1408, 1546, (i); on M. for 3°, 3527 (ii).

Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8749 (v).

I. C. R., Locomotives purchased since 1896, Prices, from whom purchased (Ques.) 7033 (iv).

Kingston Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

EDWARDS. Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c. (Ques.) 2886 (ii).

Mica Imports, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4827 (iii).

Milk and Cream exported to U.S. for 1910-1911, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 7038 (iv).

Milk and Cream, Value of Export to U. S. for March and April, 1911 (Ques.) 8790

Postal Service, Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) 10356 (v).

Post Office Buildings in Rural Districts, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i)

Post Office Revenue and Expenditure, Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 10335 (v).

Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7774 (iv).

Public Buildings, Cost of for several Years (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7393 (iv).

——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10065, 10090 (v).

———Names of Favoured Nation Treaty Countries (Ques.) 4665 (iii).

——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, (remarks) 6902 (iv).

——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7632 (iv).

Revenue and Expenditure, Total from 1890 to 1911 (Ques.) 9992 (v).

Rideau Canal, Lockmen, Pets. *re* increased pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

——— Removal of Stumps (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery: *See* 'Postal.'

Sand supplied Kingston Penitentiary, Payments to R. H. Fair (Ques.) 5406 (iii).

Sharbot Lake Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).

Sheep and Lambs imported in Canada from U. S. &c. (Ques.) 8987 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6258; (farm bulletins) 6186; (tobacco production) 6263 (iv).

Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6412; Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6413; Miscellaneous (lockmen) 6453; Rideau (bridges) 6413 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1050; Militia (salaries) 1020 (i).

Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6627 (iv).

House of Commons (stationery) 6177 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (pilots) 6537 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8756; (Canada and Australia) 8766, 8772; (Canada and Cuba) 8776; (Canada and Mexico) 8781; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784 (v).

EDWARDS. Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8692 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (quarantine stations) 6027 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax postoffice) 1589 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2093; (Brantford) 2098; (Dresden) 2105; (Goderich) 2115; (Harriston) 2115; (Kingston) 2130; (Kingston, R. M. C.) 2131; (Mount Forest) 2150 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 1698 (i).
Public Works—Telegrapn Lines—Sask., &c. (maintenance) 6034 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (rolling stock) 8514 (v).
U. S. Warships through Canals, Inquiry for Ret., 1571 (i).
Veterans, Grants to, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5211 (iii).
Westbrook Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1103 (i).
Wolfe Island, Customs Official, Apptmt. of &c. (Ques.) 8099 (v).
——— Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
——— Protection to Road (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

ELSON, Mr. P., *Middlesex East.*
Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Government. Remedy, &c. (Ques.) 655 (i).
Reciprocity—Wool in the Fleece omitted from Free List (Ques.) 6264 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1362 (i).
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 220) 1° m., 9224; on M., (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. Orders, 9350 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9260 (v).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup, 1859 (i).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9724 (v).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2222 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8118 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10220 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 223, in Com., 9510 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1764 (i).
I.C.R., Branch Lines (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9584 (v).
———Acquisition of (remarks) 6768 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1151 (i).
International Waters Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9095 (v).
Mail Service to Mar. Provs., English Mails, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8792, 9541 (v)
Militia Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1009 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 48 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 1070 (i); on Senate Amts., 9534 (v).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8888 (v).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 999 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9244 (v).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 8960 (v).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Newspapers (remarks) 10343 (v).
Post Office Promotions and Salaries (remarks) 10469 (v).
Railway Act (express companies) Amt. B. 8 (Mr. S. Sharpe) on M. for 2°, 1299 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9395 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Reciprocity Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10023, 10033 (v).
Rules of the House, Amendment of (remarks) 10470 (v).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Divorce Bills, Ques. of Priv., *re* Remarks of Senator Kirchhoffer, 4201 (iii).
United Shoe Machinery Co., Investigation *re* Combines Act, Govt. Action *re* (remarks) 4300 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S., (*Minister of Finance*) *Shelburne & Queen's (N. S.).*
Accounts outstanding, (Ans.) 5403 (iii).
See "Government Loans."
Adjournment for Coronation, (M.) 9580 (v).
——— Extension of Time (remarks) 9090, 9566 (v).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5568 (iii).
Alberta Ry and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3392 (ii).
American Bank Note Co.'s Contract, Expiry of &c. (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
American Silver Coin, Quantity exported from Canada into United States (Ans.), 6270 (iv).
See 'Gold'.

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6758, 6907 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Copy (remarks) 7256 (iv).
—— Signing of (remarks) 6673 (iv).
See 'Japanese'.
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Banking Act Amt. (B. 50) 1° m., 1340 (i)
Bank Act Amt. (B. 213) 1° m., 8887 (v); 2° m. and in Com., 9221; 3° m., 9334 (v).
See 'Penny Banks,' 'Quebec Savings Banks.'
Bank Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 6675, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).
—— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6443 (iv).
Bankers' Associations, &c., on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 4116 (iii).
—— Agreement *re* Competition (Ans) 3466 (ii).
Bank Failures, Reps. of Curators by Govt. (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
—— Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govtl. Action *re*, (Ans.) 5632 (iii).
—— Curators Reports, on Inquiry for Ret., 4569 (iii).
—— Statement by Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses (Ans.) 2671 (ii).
See 'Farmers' Bank.'
Bahama Islands, Annexation to Canada, Rumours *re* (remarks) 8956, 9373 (v).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3601 (ii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7475 (iv).
Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c. (Ans.) 4825 (iii).
British Preference (remarks) 5620 (iii).
Budget, The (financial statement) 6577 (iv).
—— (remarks) 6439 (iv).
Business of the House, (remarks) 4117 (iii).
Business of the House, Adjournment of House for Coronation (statmt.) 9309 (v).
See 'Coronation,' 'Adjournment.'
—— Morning Sittings (M.) 8887 (v).
Canadian Currency refused on Pullman Cars, Letter from Vice-President of Co. (read) 8191 (v).
Canada Cement Co., Charges by Sir Sandford Fleming (remarks) 9372 (v).
Canada Medical Act, Order called for Com. on B. 15, 6067 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8836; in Com., 9260 (v).
Cattle exports to the U. S., Bonded to G. B. (remarks) 7427 (iv).
—— Re-shipped to G. B. (remarks) 7558 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Cement Merger: *See* 'Can. Cement.'
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9059 (v).
Census, Hochelaga Division, Names of officers, &c. (Ans.) 9372 (v).
—— Jacques Cartier Division, Names of officers, &c. (Ans.) 9372 (v).
Commercial Agent for Canada at Washington (remarks) 9512 (v).
Continental Fire Insurance Co.'s of Canada incorp. B. 196 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 8968 (v).
Customs Duties, 1906-1910: Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Hon. Mr. Foster , 7021 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 6438 (iv).
Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff (Ans.) 10196 (v).
Elections Deferred (remarks) 10381 (v).
Estimates (1911) Suppl. (presented) 3068 (ii), 5525 (iii), 8355 (v).
—— (1912) Suppl. (presented) 8534, 8675, 9312 (v).
Estimates, Special Items, reported as passed, &c. (remarks) 9076 (v).
Estimates *to* be voted re Interim Supply Bill (remarks) 9223 (v).
See 'Supply Bills.'
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5306 (iii).
—— Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation re Double Liability, &c., (Ans.) 4111 (iii).
—— Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8209 (v).
—— Proceedings *re* Commission, on Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 10472 (v).
—— Stmnt. of Warning by Mr. Osler, M.P. (remarks) 5389 (iii); 10473 (v).
—— Treasury Board Minutes (remarks) 4741 (iii).
—— Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificates (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
—— Warning to Govt. (remarks) on Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2679 (ii).
See 'Bank Curators.'
Financial Statement—Budget, The, 6577 (iv).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4357 (iii).
Foreign Consuls, Official Status (remarks) 9511 (v).
Germany, Trade Relations with, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 8535 (v).
Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U. S. and British, Authority *re* (Ans.) 9985 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
See 'American Silver.'
Govt. Loans and Sinking Funds, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3775 (ii).
Govt. Loans, Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c., (Ans.) 3281 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) Ques. of Order, 9524 (v).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9308; in Com. 9510 (v).
Hydro-Electric Co., Water Power Lease, Tenders *re* (remarks) *re* Question, 9352 (v).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Renewal of (remarks) 3275 (ii).
——— Total Amount paid since 1896 (Ans.) 3607 (ii).
See 'Steel.'
Imperial Conference, Military Arviser to, &c., 9182 (v).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9182 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations (B. 224) in Com. on Res., 9432, 9445; in Com., 9494; 3° m., 9533 (v).
Japanese Treaty, Action *re* (remarks) 9076 (v).
See 'Anglo.'
——— Canada-Japan Treaty, Expiration of (Ans.) 5638 (iii).
La Banque International du Canada B. 123 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com., 5631 (iii); in Com., 6120 (iv).
Loans: *See* 'Govt. Loans.'
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2765 (ii).
Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with (Ans.) 3066 (ii).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecremont) in Com., 7722 (iv).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on Regularity of Proceedings 9500 (v).
N.T.Ry., Total Cost to Dec. 31st, 1910, inclusive of Quebec Bridge (Ans.) 5130 (iii).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10509 (v).
Niobe and Rainbow, Names of Officers ((remarks) 9090 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, on Inquiry for, 3672 (ii).
Penny Bank Act Amt. (B. 221) M. for Com. on Res., 8104; in Com. on Res., 9220 (v).
Pensions to Veterans (remarks) 6915 (iv).
Porcupine Disaster by Fire, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 9636, 9696 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Govt. Advances (Ans.) 7246 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Financial Loan, Interest *re* (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Advances to, Rate of Interest (Ans.) 2851 (ii).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. (B. 219) 1° m., 9089; 2° m., 9343 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9228 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., Statement, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 2440; Schedules laid on Table, 2465 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4845 (iii).
——— in Com. on Res., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 3289 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4073
——— Free Trade Offer by U.S., Speech of Mr. Taft (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5294 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper (Ans.) 4468 (iii).
——— British Ambassador's Warning to Mins. (remarks) 6200 (iv).
——— Britain's Demand from U.S. *re* Tariff Concessions (remarks) 6574 (iv).
——— British Preference, Increase of (remarks) 5620 (iii), 7214 (iv).
——— British Tariff Commission, Rep *re* (Ans.) 6269 (iv).
——— Champ Clark, Speech of, *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609; on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 3954 (iii).
——— Conference at Washington, Length of Session, &c. (Ans.) 7037 (iv).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 3068 (ii).
——— Cor. marked 'Private,' 2987 (ii).
——— Cor. Giving Names of Writers of Letters, &c. (remarks) 7265 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10007 (v); (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 9885 (v).
——— Debate, Talking of Ministers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 7292 (iv).
——— Denial *re* Annexationist, 4054 (iii).
——— Farm products imported from other Countries (Ans.) 3668 (ii).
——— Fishing Bounties, Payments *re* (remarks) 6671 (iv).
——— Fruit and Vegetable Growers Representations, French Edition, on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9075 (v)
——— Importations from Favoured Nation countries (Ans.) 4111 (iii).
——— Importations from Favoured Nations (remarks) *re* Answer, 4114 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Importations from Favoured Nations Countries into Canada, Answer to Questions, 4134 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Pets, &c. (Mr. Bradbury) 3057 (ii).
—— Lord Strathcona's Telegram, Mess. from Associated Press (read) 5292 (iii); on Explanation (Mr. Goodeve) *re* Lord Strathcona's Telegram, 5211 (iii); Tel. from Min. of Fin. to High Commissioner, on Inquiry for, 3274 (ii).
—— Names of Favoured Nation Countries (Ans.) 4665 (iii).
See 'Importations.'
—— North York, Challenge *re* Contest (remarks) 7222 (iv).
—— Perley, Mr., Cor. *re* Connection with Riordan Paper Co. (remarks) 10198 (v).
—— Protests *re* (remarks) 3951 (iii).
—— Pulp and Paper Duties, Further Information *re* (remarks) 2646 (ii).
—— Resolutions against (remarks) 4121 (iii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5948 (iv).
—— Statistics from U. S. (remarks) 4931 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Can., 6780 (iv).
—— Statistics, Accepting as Read and Printing in Hansard (remarks) 6858 (iv).
—— Statistics, Mess. to Pres'dt Taft *re* (remarks) 4472 (iii).
—— Statistical Tables, on Inquiry for, 2985, 3059 (ii).
—— Statistics, Purpose of Negotiations (Ans.) 7037 (iv).
—— Statistics from U. S. (remarks) 2737 (ii).
—— Statistics, U. S. Govt. Publication *re* (remarks) 6674 (iv).
—— Stmnt. in White Book, &c. (Ans.) 10194 (v).
—— Suppl. Ret. Laid on Table, 4383 (iii).
—— Tel. of Senator Cummins *re* Manufactured Products (remarks) 4115 (iii).
—— Trade with other Countries affected (Ans.) 3667 (ii).
—— Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2644 (ii).
—— Wool in the Fleece, omitted from Free List (Ans.) 6264 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8093 (v).
Revenue and Expenditure Total for 1890-1911 (Ans.) 9992 (v).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Limited incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).; in Com., 8966, 9165 (v); (M.) to ref. to Banking Com. 7590 (iv).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2596, 2649, 3021, 3454, 3845 (ii).
Selkirk Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9078 (v).
Sessional Employees, House of Commons, on M. (Mr. S. Sharpe) for Ret., 3471 (ii).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry (Mr. Blain) for Ret., 3347 (ii).
Speeches by Prime Minister, distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9072 (v).
Stamp Contract: *See* "American Bank Note."
Statutes, French Translation, Corrections, &c. (remarks) 8090 (v).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3107 (ii).
Steel Bounties, Govt. Inspectors, Salaries, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 5937 (iv).
Steel Wire Bounties *re* (remarks) 6613 (iv).
See "Iron," "Budget, The"
Sterling Trust Co.: *See* "Security."
Supply Bill (No. 128) in Com. 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 4210 (iii).
—— (B. 160), 1°, 6439-40 (iv).
—— B. 225, 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 9580 (v).
SUPPLY—
Schedules of proportion of Votes (presented) 9566 (v).
Charges of Management—(foreign and uncurrent coins) 6060 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3834 (ii).
Indians—Man. &c. (annuities) 8884 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6497 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Newfoundland) 8784 (v).
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8685 (v); (coronation decorations) 9566 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3202 (ii); (pavements) 8884 (v); (Rideau Hall) 8875 (v).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 6059 (iv).
Unprovided items (generally) 6160 (iv).
Testimonials to Ministers. *See* "Ministers."
Treasury Board Minutes, *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting (remarks) 5136 (iii).
U.S.—Japanese Treaty, on Inquiry for Copy, (Mr. Foster) 7256 (iv).
U. S.—Warships on Great Lakes, Information *re* (remarks) 6613 (iv).
Vancouver, Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with (Ans.) 3066 (ii).
Victoria Museum, Cracking of Walls (remarks) 9152 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
West Indies Trade with Canada, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6382 (iv).

FISHER, Hon. S. A., (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*
Address, The, 626 (i).
Agriculture and Experimental Farms Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Agriculture, Expenditure from Confederation (Ans.) 4302 (iii).
——— Expenditure in Ontario for 1910 (Ans.) 6668 (iv).
——— Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
Agricultural Imports into Canada, Value &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 5402 (iii).
Agriculture and Militia Expenditures from 1867 to 1910 (Ans.) 9432 (v).
Agricultural Products of Canada, Total Quantity (Ans.) 6757 (iv).
"Alva" Str., Price paid to Philip & Son. (Ans.) 2438 (ii).
Animal Industry in Can., Reps. Data, &c., on M. (Mr. Magrath) for Copies, 4677 (iii).
Animals transported between Can. and U. S., Disregard of Rules (remarks) 311 (i).
Archives Dept., Commission of Historical Work, Care of Documents, &c., (Ans.) 2156 (ii).
Archives Historical Work, Names of Staff (Ans.) 2155 (ii).
Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re* (remarks) 10350 (v).
Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 655 (i).
Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co's. Patent Relief B. 187 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8970 (v).
Cement Production, Total annually since 1900 (Ans.) 10196 (v).
Census Commissioner, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2155 (ii).
Census Commissioner for York County, N. B. (Ans.) 8704 (v).
Census Enumerators, Apptmt. of by Liberal Associations (remarks) 7021 (iv).
Census Enumerators for Hochelaga, Names, &c. (Ans.) 9432 (v).
Census Enumerators for Man., Recommendations *re* Apptmts. (remarks) 8889 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9016 (v).
Census Enumerators Names, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4465 (iii).
Census Enumerators in Peel County, Names, Apptmt. &c. (Ans.) 10335 (v).
Census Officials, Policy of Appointments (remarks) 2887 (ii), 4933 (iii).

FISHER. Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Census of North and South Ontario, Expenditure &c. (Ans.) 9432 (v).
Census, Omissions by Enumerators, (Stmt.) 9898 (v).
——— Inaccuracies in Quebec (remarks) 7217 (iv).
——— Omissions in Enumerations, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9714 (v).
——— Omissions in Enumerations in Toronto (remarks) 10099 (v).
Census, Progress *re* (remarks) 9594 (v)
Census Questions, Preparation of Lists, &c. (Ans.) 659 (i).
Census Returns, Method of, on Inquiry for Ret., 6669 (iv), 8193 (v).
Census, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 9694 (v).
Census, System of Collecting, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4338 (iii).
Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6204 (iv).
Cheese Curing Cool Room, Brockville, Sale of (Ans.) 8096 (v).
Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5407 (iii).
Cholera Precautions, &c. (remarks) 10197 (v).
Civil Servants, Appointments from South Grey, on Inquiry for Ret., 2555 (ii).
Cold Storage, Aid to by Govt. (Ans.) 1455 (i).
Cold Storage Depots, Total Amount paid from 1907-10 (Ans.) 2437 (ii).
See 'Live Stock.'
Coloured Persons appointed to Experimental Farm (remarks) 5039 (iii).
Conservation Commissioners' Report, Printed Copies, &c. (Ans.) 660 (i).
——— (presented) 698 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. (B. 184), in Com. on Res., 7807 (iv); 2°* and in Com., 8895 (v).
Copyright Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 7557 (iv), 9594 (v).
Copyright Law and Imperial Copyright Conference, Canada's Action *re* (Ans.) 5134 (iii).
Crop Statistics, Method of Collecting, &c. (Ans.) 5937 (iv).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7018 (iv).
Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re* (Ans.) 663 (i).
Embargo on British Cattle, (remarks) 10344 (v).
Exhibition Grants, Subsidies paid *re* (Ans.) 2437 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Fruit and Vegetable Farms (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9001 (v).

FISHER. Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Experimental Farms, Number established for past year (Ans.) 656 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number operated in Dominion, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1102 (i).
——— Ottawa, Milk Average, Eggs, &c. (Ans.) 662 (i).
——— Sale of Eggs, &c. (Ans.) 1286 (i).
Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets for 1910-1911 (Ans.) 8096 (v).
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8107 (v).
Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale, on prop. Res. (Mr. Stanfield) 3226 (ii).
Fruit Growers, Duty *re* (remarks) 3284 (ii).
Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Appointmt, Qualification, &c. (Ans.) 8701 (v).
Horses diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada (remarks) 7428 (iv).
Immigration—Farmers sent to G. B. from Man. (Ans.) 1489 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (bushel and bags) Amt. (B. 153) 1°*, 6035 (iv); in Com., 8078 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9476 (v).
Jacques Cartier, Census Enumerators &c. (Ans.) 9431 (v).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1197 (i).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2809 (ii).
Munderloh and Co.'s Patent Relief B. 203 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 8970 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5946 (iv).
Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ans.) 8992 (v).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 701 (i).
Rabies, Outbreak, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4409 (iii).
——— Papers Laid on Table, 10590 (v).
——— Speech of Min. of Agr. in Montreal, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) 6199 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6811 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7669 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5736 (iii).
——— Delays in Preparing (remarks) 7554 (iv).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation *re* (remarks) 10095 (v).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. (B. 157) in Com. on Res., 6189 (iv); in Com., 8077 (v).

FISHER. Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Seed Grain Distribution, Complaints *re* Quality and Price (remarks) 8042 (v).
Selkirk Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9077 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture (archives) 6184 (iv); (dairy and fruit inspection) 6234 (iv); (exhibitions) 3775 (ii), 9077 (v); (farm bulletins) 6185 (iv); (Patent Record) 6184 (iv); (seeds) 6213 (iv); (tobacco production) 6262 (iv); (year book) 6184 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 5954 (iv); (salaries) 1474 (i); Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1486 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 1485 (i).
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6170 (iv); (stationery) 6177 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3157 (ii); N.B. (Tracadie) 1625 (i); Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 8879 (v); Que. (Grosse Isle) 1675 (i).
Quarantine (animals' health) 5955 (iv); (public health) 5979 (iv); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 6187 (iv).
Senate (address to His Ex.) 6167 (iv); (salaries) 6166 (iv).
Trussed Concrete Steel Co.'s Patent Relief B. 188 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8970 (v).
Wheat Prices in West and Canada and Liverpool Market (Ans.) 6267 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *Toronto North.*
Address, The, 60, 531 (i).
——— Correction of Figures by Mr. Guthrie (remarks) 229 (i).
See "Customs Duties" "Govt. Sinking Funds."
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1361 (i).
American Silver Coin, Amount exported from Canada (Ques.) 6270 (iv).
Anglo-Japanese Commercial Treaty, Signing of (remarks) 6673 (iv).
——— Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6907 (iv).
——— (remarks) 2271 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Quebec Oriental Ry. Co. and New Canadian Co., Date of Incorporation, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2161 (ii).
Bahamas and Canada, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 8955 (v).
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8887 (v).
Bank Act Bill, Delay in Discussing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6444 (iv).
Bank Act, Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govtl. Action *re* (Ques.) 5632 (iii).
Bank Failures, Rep. of Curators by Govt. (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
——— (M. for copies*) 3142 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Bank Failures, Inquiry for Ret., 4569 5038 (iii), 7556 (iv).
See 'Farmers Bank.'
Bankers' Association, Bylaws, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 4116 (iii).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2364, 2429 (ii).
Bark Lake Post Office, Cleaning and Opening, &c. (Ques.) 6270 (iv).
Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co.'s Patent Relief B 187 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8969 (v).
British Preference (remarks) 5620 (iii).
Budget, The, Reply to Financial Statement, 6588 (iv).
——— Delay, &c. (remarks) 6441 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7575 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8836 (v).
Can. Shipping Act (registration) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6115 (iv).
Canada and West Indies SS. Subsidy, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 5936 (iv).
Canadian West Loan Corporation Incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8568 (v).
Census Appointments for East Elgin (Ans.) 4302 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Commencement and Completion of (remarks) 7218 (iv).
Census Taking, System, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4339 (iii).
China-Japan, SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2509 (ii). in Com., 8677 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8719 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8906 (v).
Continental Fire Insurance Co. of Canada Incorp. B. 196 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 8968 (v.)
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1322 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7819 (iv); in Com., 8898 (v).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8714 (v). *See* "Supply—Miscellaneous."
Customs Duties, Average Value for 1896 and 1910 of Units (M. for ret.) 2162 (ii).
Customs Duties 1906-1910, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 7022 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Customs Duties, (correction) 7104 (iv).
See 'Address' &c.
Dog Fish Industry (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 8045 (v).
Dom. Lands Act, Orders in Council, Amendments to, in Com. on Res., 1985 (ii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Cartoons, Telegram, &c. (remarks) 147-156 (i).
———, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations, &c. from "Le Devoir" 472 (i).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur and Fort William, Investigation *re* Management; on prop. Res. (Mr. W M. Martin) 2379 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8115 (v).
Farmer's Bank Failure, Application *re* Charter, Date and Names (Ques.) 1970 (ii).
———, Incorporation, and Dom. Govt. (M. for cor.°) 1726 (i); 2230 (ii).
———, Inquiry for, 4468 (iii).
———, Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8214 (v).
———, Question *re* Incorp. (remarks) 1904 (i).
———, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5329 (iii).
———, Treasury Board Minutes (remarks) 4741 (iii), *see* "Treasury Board".
——— Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificate (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 2679 (ii).
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8108 (v).
Fisheries Act, (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8045, 8420 (v).
Fisheries Arbitration at Washington, Sir John Thompson's Memorandum, (M. for copy*) 980 (i).
———, Inquiry for Sir John Thompson' Memorandum, 2004 (ii).
———, Regulations, Changes at Washington (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8495 (v).
———, Printing of Documents (remarks) 4207 (iii).
———, Trap Nets (remarks) 2070 (ii).
Fish Transhipments from Mar. Provs., Ret. (remarks) 7106, 7259 (iv).
Fish Transportation, Amounts paid out of Aiding Fund. Further Information *re* (remarks) 6506 (iv).
——— Expenditure annually, Value, &c., (Ques.) 6271 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8607 (v).
Govt Sinking Fund, Legal Amount required Bounties paid, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).
——— ref. to by Mr. Guthrie for 1895-6, Ques. of Priv. 3772 (ii).
See 'Address.'
Germany, Trade Relations with Negotiations *re* (remarks) 8403, 8534 (v).
Grain Grower's Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8536 (v).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of Men (remarks) 1507 (i).
Hague Arbitration, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Bay of Fundy) on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup. 4683 (iii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations v. U. S. Conference *re*, on Stmnt. (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 1998 (ii).
——— Distribution of Copies (remarks) 8094 (v).
——— Printing of Papers (remarks) 23[illegible] (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3. (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1529, 1747 (i).
House of Commons, Translation Staff, Promotions, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 527 (i).
House of Commons and Senate, Inquiry for Ret., 2556 (ii).
Hudson Bay, Position *re* Hague Award (remarks) 673 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Lands, Number of Acres sold, re Construction Fund (Ques.) 796 (l).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 2005 (ii).
Imperial Conference, Secretariat Formation, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7352 (iv).
See 'Secretariat.'
Imperial Defence Conference, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 2217 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7837 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8104, 8403 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amts., 3460 (ii).
I.C.R. Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6388 (iv).
I.C.R. and G. T. Ry. Arbitration Commission, Points to be determined, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3665 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 4205 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9092 (v).
FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Bounties, Renewal of (remarks) 3275 (ii).
Justice, Deputy Minister acting as Counsel for outside Cases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3061 (ii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1159 (i).
Manitoba and Southeastern Ry. Co.'s Land Grant, Inquiry for O.C. of May 6th, 1907, 6915 (iv).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
——— Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 7447 (iv).
Milk and St. Mary's River Water Rights (remarks) in Com. on Waterways Bill, 9109 (v).
Mint Operations Implementing Information (M. for ret.*) 980 (i).
Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation, &c., Conditions complied with (Ques.) 3065 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8887 (v).
Munderloh and Co.'s Patent Relief B. 203 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 8970 (v).
Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 546 (i).
Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of into N.W. (remarks) 5912 (iii).
——— Restrictions re (remarks) 6525 (iv).
Niagara River Water Powers Regulations *re* (remarks) 8892 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police, Loss of Men on Macpherson-Yukon Patrol (remarks) 7254 (iv).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8317 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6123 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2830 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, Apology for using word 'liar' insisted on, 463 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2274 (ii).
Parliament, Opening and Closing, Date of from 1896 to 1910 (M. for ret.*) 786 (i).
———Inquiry for Ret., 1805 (i).
Pelagic Sealing, Treaty between G. B. and U. S., Protection (remarks) 3671 (ii).
Post Office Act (stamp box) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 2736 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7697 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Blocking in Public Accounts Com., 998 (i).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4337 (iii).
Questions, Incomplete Answers (remarks) 1013 (i).
Racial and Religious Prejudices, Liberal Pamphlets, &c., Quotations &c. (remarks) on Address, 531 (i).
Railways and Canals Deptl. B. 156 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8410 (v).
Ry. Commission &c., Agreement *re* Traffic between U.S. and Can. (remarks) 3056 (ii).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
'Rainbow' and 'Niobe' Cost to Date, Price, Repairs, and Maintenance &c. (Ques.) 791 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3327, 3530 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4852 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com, on Ways and Means, 2446 (ii).
——— (remarks) on Address, 72 (i).
Reciprocity, Assurances *re* Farmer's Interests (remarks)) 5543 (iii).
——— Letter of 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7678 (iv).
——— Negotiations at Washington, Mr. J. A. Macdonald's Connection *re* (remarks) 4299 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., Pets. Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 980 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1652 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2439 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Commercial Statistics, 2070, 2555, 2646, 2737, (ii).
——— Mess. to President Taft *re* Request for Statistics (remarks) 4471 (iii).
Reciprocity on Inquiry for Pets., &c., (Mr. Bradbury) 3057 (ii).
——— Trade and Commerce Dept., Reply *re* Ret. for Statistics (remarks) 6510 (iv).
Reciprocity Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5949; Rule (read) 5953 (iv).
——— Procedure in the House, *re* Resolutions, &c. (remarks) 5752 (iii).
Reciprocity, Tabulated Statements, &c. (remarks) 2986 (ii).
——— Tel. from Min. of Fin. to High Commissioner, Inquiry for, 3274 (ii).
——— Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2644 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8093 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Revillon Freres Trading Co., incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8577, 8966 (v).
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 8969 (v).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service at Public Function (remarks) 940 (i).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5643, (iii); in Com., 8411 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5871, 5900 (iii).
St. Lawrence River, Damming the Long Sault, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3230 (ii).
Secretariat in London, Inquiry for Papers, 1506 (i); 5836 (iii).
See Imp. Conference.
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2649, 3845 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2722 (ii).
Senate, Cost for each year from 1896 to 1911 (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1805 (i).
Senate, Reform of, on prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4316 (iii).
Senate Vacancy in P. E. I. (remarks) 2074 (ii).
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7248 (iv).
Sussex Street Deptl. Buildings, Alterations in Plan (remarks) 2077 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture &c. (exhibitions) 3776 (ii), (seeds) 6213 (iv); Quarantine (animals health) 5962 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6396; Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6391; (machinery) 6389; (protection works) 6390 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1474; Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1486; Depts. Generally (cleaning, &c.) 1486; High Commissioner (salaries) 1486; Justice (salaries) 1017; (contingencies) 1020, Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1464; Militia (salaries) 1025; Mines (salaries) 1476; Privy Council (salaries) 1013; Railways and Canals (salaries) 1473; Secretary of State—External Affairs (salaries) 1472; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 1485 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6625 (iv).
Militia (allowance) 8517 (v).
Miscellaneous (Coronation Members and Senators) 8685; Imperial Conference (Ministers expenses) 8679; (pelagic sealing conference) 8679 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax Citadel) 1581 (i); Ont. (Athens) 2089; Que. (Montreal barracks) 2572 (ii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov.-Gen's cars) 6447 (iv).
Tariff Negotiations, &c. (remarks) on Address, 65 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Tatamagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishway, &c. (Ques.) 7806 (iv).
Treasury Board Minutes *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting (remarks) 5136 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 4659 (iii).
See 'Bank,' Farmers Bank.'
Treaty of 1871 *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters (remarks) 7022 (iv).
U.S. Consuls, Names, Fees, &c. (M. for ret.) 1727 (i).
U.S. Immigration Agents, and Canadian Travellers (remarks) 6119 (iv).
U.S., Japanese Treaty, Inquiry for Copy, 7256 (iv).
U.S. Warships on Great Lakes, passing through Canadian Canals (remarks) 6118, 7253 (iv).
U.S. Warships passing through canals, Inquiry for Ret., 1571, 1805 (i), 2556 (ii), 5629 (iii).
Vancouver Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with (Ques.) 3066 (ii).
West Indies Trade with Canada, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iv).
—— Notice of Discussion, 6274 (iv).
Yukon Beer Import Tax Repeal B. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 1978 (ii).

FOWKE Mr. F. L., *South Ontario.*
Address, The, 254, 271, (i).
Baptist Convention of Ont. and Quebec (B. 152) 1°*, 6439; in Com., 7470 (iv).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. (B. 161) 1°*, 6756 ; in Com., 7560, 7568 (iv).
G.B. and U.S. Arbitration Treaty, Information *re* (Ques.) 5834 (iii).
Naval Policy *re* Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 271 (i).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 126) 1°*, 4384 (iii).
Reciprocity, Manufactured Articles, (remarks) 5746 (iii).
—— Oshawa Fruit Growers Ass'n, Res. (read) 5747 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6824 (iv).
Scugog River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Supply., 6425 (iv).
Whitby Postoffice Site, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1868 (i).

FRASER, Mr. A. L., *King's (P.E.I.)*
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building, &c. (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8932 (v).

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*
Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractor, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 7593 (iv).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8047 (v).
Fishing Bounty in King's Co., P.E.I., Names of Persons receiving (Ques.) 7246 (iv).
Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Appotmt., Qualification, &c. (Ques.) 8701 (v.)
Georgetown Public Building Drainage, &c. (Ques.) 3469 (ii).
Govt. Railways Constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4829 (iii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U. S. (remarks) 2003 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Material purchased, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7593 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. (B. 153) in Com., 8743 (v).
Judicial Vacancy in P.E.I., Apptmt. *re* (remarks) 2072 (ii), 7553 (iv).
Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7805 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Committee, Meeting of (remarks) 4048 (iii).
New Harmony Postoffice (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6084 (iv).
Oyster Industry, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor., 757 (i).
P. E. I. Coast Fisheries, Fines, Penalties *re* Breach of Regulations (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).
—— Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments (remarks), 6923 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3883 (ii).
P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorial, &c., *re* Surveys, on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2178 (ii).
—— Winter Service, Contracts *re* Coal, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
Red Point Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3469 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
St. Peter's Breakwater, Repair, &c. (Ques.) 7344 (iv).
Senate Vacancy from P.E.I., Complaints *re* (remarks) 2072 (ii).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3105 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service—Marine (ice breakers) 6489; Postoffice—Outside Service (mail clerks) 6084 (iv); (postmas-

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
ters) 4295 (iii); Public Works—Buildings — P.E.I. (Summerside Armoury) 1602 (i), (Tignish) 1603 (i), Railways—P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira branch) 6352 (iv).
Supreme Court Judgeship in P.E.I. Vacancy, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2072 (ii), 7553 (iv).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election (remarks) 5777 (iii).
I. C. R. Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1166 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers, from Quebec to Gulf of St. Lawrence, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret. 774 (i).
Order, Ques. of, Apologies for using word "liar", 467 (i).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents) 5184 (iii); Railways—I.C.R. (highways protection) 5918 (iii).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 1069 (i); in Com., 2594-5, 3021 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 60) 1°*, 1453 (i); in Com., 3060, 3182 (ii).
La Sauvegarde Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 193) 1°*, 8308 (v).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7938 (v).
Restigouche Riparian Association incorp., (B. 176) 1°*, 7019; in Com., 7589 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Buildings—Que (Montreal barracks) 3147 (ii); (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (St. Lambert) 1895 (i).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M. *Welland.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Par. in 'Globe' *re* commencement (remarks) 2261 (ii).
International Ry. Co. and International Traction Co, &c., (B. 74) 1°*, 1488 (i).
Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 377 (i).
Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Ry Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 2254 (ii).
Privileges and Election Com., 3rd Rep. of Com. *re* Lanctot Charges, (presented) 6756 (iv); (M.) to conc, 7873, Agreed to (Y. 98, N. 56) 8030 (v).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4482 (iii).
——— Vote re Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden). Personal Explanation, 4929 (iii).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8739 (v).
Debates, Official Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 6438 (iv).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8236 (v).
Montreal, Govt. Appointments since 1st Jan., 1904 (M. for ret.*) 3225 (ii).
Postal Conventions with Spain, Changes *re* (Ques.) 1104 (i).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Ltd., incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 1°, 6439; on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).

GILBERT, Mr. ARTHUR, *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Address, The, 624 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
——— (notice of motion) 5938 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure from Confederation (Ques.) 4302 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid (Ques.) 6158 (iv).
Militia Expenditures, Total Amount since Confederation (Ques.) 3467 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, re Telegram delayed, &c., 1456 (i).
Railway Subsidies, Total Amount since Confederation (Ques.) 3467 (ii).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
Lake St. John Repatriation Society, Cor., &c. (M. for cor.*) 9994 (v).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3117 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6239; (seeds) 6232 (iv).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S., *Kootenay.*
Arrow Lake Postal Clerk (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
B. C. Militia, Complaints *re* Treatment, Par. in B.C. Newspapers, 9248 (v).
Canadian Inter-Mountain Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 4740 (iii).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9063 (v).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8943 (v).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S.—*Con.*
Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 6912 (iv).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8712 (v).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8459 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5399 (iii).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8054 (v).
Flag Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4366 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 8618, 8650 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1427, 1732, 1756 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6946 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9204 (iv).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9472 (v).
Nelson Postal Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blair) to Com. of Sup., 2322 (ii).
Postmasters Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10192 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4969 (iii).
——— Hamilton Cotton Co., Statement of Employees (read) 5747 (iii).
——— Lord Strathcona's Telegram (explanation) 5210 (iii).
——— Obstruction *re* Debate (remarks) 10043 (v).
——— Res. from Creston Fruit and Produce Association (read) 4119 (iii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7628 (iv).
Seybold Building Elevator, Reimbursement for Installation of, &c. (Ques.) 1359 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (clerical assistance) 6065 (iv).
Fisheries (inspectors) 6637; (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6108 (iv).
Labour Dept. ('Labour Gazette') 4226 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C., (Cranbrook) 3013; (Revelstoke) 3017; Dominion (rents) 3212; Ottawa (lighting contracts) 3186; Yukon (Dawson) 3215 (ii).
Western Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board, Settlement, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9696 (v).
Woods Building, Lighting Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *Kent East.*
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s (B. 206) in Com., 8970 (v).
Coal imported from U.S. into Ont., Value of Duties, &c. (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Supply—Fisheries (overseers) 3821 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. G., *Nipissing.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8824 (v).
Cobalt Mail Service, Delays and inefficient Service (remarks) 1649, 1663, 1804 (i).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8615 (v).
French River Dam (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7841; in Com., 7861 (iv).
Loughrin, Police Commissioner at Cochrane, Number of Convictions before (Ques.) 1568 (i).
Monetville Cut, Lake Nipissing Public Works, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 1495 (i).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 170) 1°*, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8233, 8519, 8535, 8642, 8916, 8956 (v).
North Bay Wharfs, Information *re*, 2556 (ii).
Northern Ontario, Settlement of, Govt. Assistance *re* (remarks) 6766 (iv).
Porcupine Disasters by Fire, Aid to (remarks) 9694 (v).
Reciprocity Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10062 (v).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (survey) 9564 (v); Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6632 (iv); Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3406; Public Works — Buildings—Ont. (Sudbury) 2627 (ii); (Tillsonburg) 2628 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P. (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Brockville.*
Accidents, &c. on Canadian Railways, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3927 (ii). *See* "Ry. Accidents".
Advertising Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv). *See* "I.C.R.".
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Cash) on Senate Amts., 6469 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. 5079, 5253, 5630 (iii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3027 (ii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3459 (ii).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4240 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co. &c. (Ans.) 3853 (ii).
———, (explanation) 4048 (iii).
Baggage Smashing Prevention B. 124 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 4199 (iii)
Beauharnois Canal, Alienation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1713 (i).
———,Privileges, Advertisement *re* Tenders (Ans.) 1712 (i).
———, Grantees, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 1712 (i).
———, Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
———, Total Cost, Revenues from Grantees. Arrears, &c. (Ans.) 1713 (i).
Bradford Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).
British Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 5127 (iii).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1683 (i).
Canadian General Development Co., Total Amounts paid by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 656 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. (B. 211) Guarantee Bonds (M.) for Com. on Res., 8704 (v); in Com. on Res. 8801; in Com., 9222, 9255 (v).
Canadian Northern Branch Lines Co.'s (B. 81) on Senate Amts., 6468 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com. 3454, 3456 (ii).
C.P.Ry., Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction of, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Cor., 769 (i).
———, Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1828 (i).
Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3062 (ii).
Canal Reciprocity for American Boats (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
Canal Statistics (presented) 7019 (iv).
Cardinal Canal Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Carillon Water Power Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c. (Ans.) 2669 (ii), 8700 (v).
Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Clarry, L. F., Expenditure *re* Trent Canal Floods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of (Ans.) 2852 (ii).
Electric Railway Charters since 1896, Extensions *re* Constructions, &c. (Ans.) 4043 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractor, Completion &c. (Ans.) 7593 (iv).
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Depts (remarks) 2996 (ii).
Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 10196 (v).
See 'Parcel Post'.
Fish Ladders on Trent Canal (remarks) 4825 (iii).
Fish Preservation in Trent River, (remarks) 1504 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Commencement *re* (remarks) 2261 (ii).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii)
Govt. Railways, constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4829 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s inc. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8237, 8922 (v).
Grand Falls Ry.: *See* "St. John".
G.T.Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1079 (i).
G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 73 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3022 (ii).
G.T.P.Ry. Classification, Arbitrators' Report (Ans.) 696 (i).
———, Eastern Division, Overbreak, Agreement *re* (Ans.) 1571 (i).
——— Labourers working at Lafond, Amounts due, &c. (Ans.) 3670 (ii).
——— Lake Superior Division, Construction Limit, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 1493 (i).
——— Lumsden Investigation, Total Cost *re* (Ans.) 1493 (i).
———Pension Fund, Rules and Regulations (Ans.) 2153 (ii).
See 'Nat. Transcl. Ry.'
Halifax and St. John, Wharfage, &c. (Ans.) 7807 (iv).
Hillsborough Bridge, Material furnished, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7593 (iv).
Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1425, 1794 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 661 (i).
Hydro-Electric Co.'s Water Power Lease on Ottawa River (Ans.) 9430 (v).
I.C.R., Accidents, Causes of (remarks) 6678 (iv).
——— Accidents, Passes, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
——— Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
See "Advertising."

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Bell, Mr. G. W., Pass Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 6666 (iv).
——— Branch Lines Leasing (prop. res.) 9244; in Com. on Res., 9581, 9588 (v).
——— Branch Lines, Acquisition of (remarks) 6769 (iv).
——— Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5833 (iii).
——— Dismissals, from Nov., 1908, Number reinstated (Ans.) 3666 (ii).
——— Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1174 (i).
——— Excursion Rates *re* Monument Nationale Demonstration in Montreal, &c. (Ans.) 1347 (i); (remarks) 2997 (ii).
See 'Rates.'
——— Freight Rates on Coal, Iron, &c., Classification, &c. (Ans.) 6157 (iv).
——— Freight Transfer, Letter to Agent at Moncton (Ans.) 654 (i).
——— Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* Appropriating Scrap Brass, &c. (Ans.) 6664, 7601 (iv).
——— Gross Earnings, Cost per Ton, &c. (Ans.) 5130 (iii).
——— Halifax Terminals (stmnt.) 2647 (ii). 9561 (v).
——— Hawke, Mr. J. T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds (Ans.) 6665 (iv).
——— Hay transported free from Quebec to Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 5134 (iii).
——— Ice Contract at Riviere du Loup (Ans.) 2438, 3853 (ii).
——— I.C.R. and G. T. Ry. Arbitration, Points to be determined, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3665 (ii); (remarks) *re* Answer, 4206 (iii).
——— Locomotives purchased since 1896, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 7033 (iv).
——— Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept. (Ans.) 6666 (iv).
——— Mileage, Value of Rolling Stock (Ans.) 3668 (ii).
——— Moncton Extension, Acquisition of Land from Builders' Woodworking Co. (Ans.) 6157 (iv).
——— Moncton Station, Site purchased (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Payments to Dr. C. A. Murray *re* Tickets (Ans.) 7032 (iv).
——— Petit Rocher Spur, Cost, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 6156 (iv).
——— Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
——— Porters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6340 (iv).
——— and P.E.I. Ry. Pension Fund, Delegation *re* Amendments (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Printing, Amounts paid to 'Globe' (corrected statement) 2886 (ii).
See "Advertising."
——— Rates, for Political Picnics at Truro (explanation) 3343 (ii).
See "Excursion."
———Ste. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 2436 (ii).
International Ry Traffic, Points of Crossing, &c. (Ans.) 4466 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9190 (v).
See 'Long Sault.'
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2596 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).
See 'International Waterways,' 'St. Lawrence.'
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024 (ii).
Milk and Cream shipped in Western Ont., Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).
N.T.Ry., Classification Arbitration, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1490 (i).
——— Completion of Eastern Division (Ans.) 1099; Correction in Figures, 1293 (i).
——— Contracts for Eastern Division (Ans.) 1095 (i).
——— Contracts Estimated Quantities, &c. (Ans.) 1491 (i).
——— Defaulting Contractors, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 1281 (i).
——— Eastern Div., Total Cost (Ans.) 2434 (ii).
——— Eastern Division, Total Cost up to Dec. 1910 (Ans.) 3064 (i); Corrected Answer (read) 3144 (ii).
——— Eastern Div., Question, Overbreak *re* (remarks) 2434 (ii).
——— Estimated Cost and Mileage of Fencing, &c. (Ans.) 1094 (i).
——— Execution of Work under Contract, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 6668 (iv).
——— Expenditure, Difference in Amount in Ret., (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
——— N.B. Section, Pusher Grade (remarks) 4051 (iii).
——— N.B. Section, Standard, Total Estimated Cost (Ans.) 4047 (iii).
——— Over Classification, Reduction *re* (remarks) 6273 (iv), 9899 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
N.T.Ry., Over Classification, on Inquiry for Information *re*, 9995 (v).
——— Payments, on Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
——— Provisions in Contract *re* taking over completed sections (Ans.) 1093 (i).
——— Rails and Fastenings, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 1099 (i).
——— Ry. Commission Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
——— St. Lawrence and Moncton Div., Dat of Completion (Ans.) 1711 (i).
——— Section Houses (Ans.) 1099 (i).
——— Shops, Specifications *re* Machinery &c. (Ans.) 1569 (i).
——— Shops, Specifications *re* Emplymt. of Mr. W. J. Press (Ans.) 2157 (ii).
——— Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry Co., Agreement *re* Running Rights, &c (Ans.) 2435 (ii).
——— Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 5135 (iii), 7591 (iv).
——— Total Cost up to 31st Dec. 1910, Estimated Cost of Winnipeg and Moncton Section (Ans.) 1497 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 1727 (i). *See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
Newmarket Canal, Expenditure for 1910, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5831 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv)
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) on M. for Com., 8094 in Com., 8234, 8525, 8916 (v).
Parcel Posts System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9923 (v). *See* 'Express.'
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for copies, 713; 1497 (i), 3069 (ii).
——— American Engineers consulted by Min. of Rys. (Ans.) 697 (i).
——— British Empire Bridge Co.'s Deposit, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 9981 (iv).
——— Caisson, Damage to (Ans.) 4045 (iii).
——— Commission of Expert Engineers, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 1714 (i).
——— Construction, Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 4324 (iii).
——— Contract, Advertisement *re*, on M (Mr. Lennox) for Copy, 713, 1497 (i).
——— Contract *re* Construction, Resignation of Chairman (remarks) 4205 (iii).
——— Contract, Plans, &c. (remarks) 7103 (ii).
——— Contract for Reconstruction (remarks) 4740 (iii).
——— Date of Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2667 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Quebec Bridge, Estimated Cost, Tunnelling, &c. (Ans.) 3279 (ii), 6268 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Investigations, &c (Ans.) 8102 (v).
——— Investigations *re* River Bed, Tests &c. (Ans.) 658 (i).
——— Members of Board of Construction (Ans.) 9981 (v).
——— Plans, Contract, &c. (remarks) 6273 (iv).
——— Plans and Specifications, Approval by Chief Engineer of G.T.Ry. Co. (Ans.) 4826 (iii).
——— Superstructure, Contract let (announcement) 6669 (iv).
——— Supervision, Amount expended (remarks) 6671 (iv).
——— Supervision, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6450 (iv).
——— Tenders *re*, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for copies of Advertisements, &c., 3069 (ii).
——— Tenders *re* Carriage Way &c. (Ans.) 9980 (v).
Railway Act (accidents) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 959, 1798 (i).
Ry. Act. (commutation tickets) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Macdonnell) on M. for 1°, 1551 (i).
Ry. Act (express co.'s) Amt. B. 8, (Mr. S. Sharpe) on M. for 2°, 1299 (i).
Railways and Canals Dept. Act (equipment renewal) Amt. (B. 156) 1° m., 6188 (iv). 2° m., 8409; in Com., 8409 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Ant. (B. 197) 1° m., 8399 (v); in Com., 9312, 9377 (v).
Railway Accidents on running Trains, Construction Work, &c., on M. (Mr. R. Smith) for Ret. 714 (i). *See* "Accidents.'
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5246 (iii).
Railway Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Ry. Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission, Agreement *re* Traffic between Can. and U. S. (remarks) 3055 (ii).
Railway Commission Vacancy, Apptmt. of Farmer (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Apptmt. of French Canadian (Ans.) 1103 (i).
Railway Crossings, Action of Ry. Commissioners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Railway Express Rates: *See* "Express," "Parcel," &c.
Ry. Rates, Comparison with U.S. Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Railway Rates to Clergymen, Reduction of (Ans.) 2434 (ii).
Railway Sectionmen, Complaints *re* Overwork (Ans.) 9987 (v).
Railway Subsidies, Total Amount paid since Confederation (Ans.) 3467 (ii).
—— Corrected Stmnt., 6196 (iv).
Railway Telegraph, &c., Rates, Treaty *re* Control (remarks) 8357 (v).
Railway Traffic Connections, Arrangements between Provincial and Ry. Commissioners (Ans.) 697 (i).
Railways, Transportation Problem in Canada, Stmnt. on M. for Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) *re* handing in Statements, 6955 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co., Limited incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).
Rideau Canal Lockmen, Increased Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).
Rideau River, Removal of Stumps (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt. or N. T. Ry. (Ans.) 2852 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. Branch Line Lease (B. 150) M. for Com. on Res., 4200 ; in Com. on Res., 5641 (iii); 2° m., 8410; in Com., 8411 (v).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Annual Payments *re* Light, Power, &c. (Ans.) 3468 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Damming, Protest *re* Bill now before U. S. Senate (remarks) 4217 (iii).
See "Long Sault."
St. Peter's Canal, N.B., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 8103 (v).
—— Answer to Question (remarks) 8356 (v).
Scugog River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).
Selkirk Route *re* Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Claims for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
—— Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* Administration (remarks) 6273 (iv).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3348 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay Dyke) 6411 (iv).
Canals—Cardinal (dock) 6410 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (Iberville bridge); 6356; (macadamizing) 6408; (machinery) 6357 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (enlarging office); 6409; (lock 17) 6409; (lock 19) 6409; (removing high spots) 6409; (Robertson's Culvert) 6409 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Canals—Farran's Point (lower entrance) 6409 (iv).
Canals—Galops (upper lock) 6410 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358, 6410 tugs) 6359, 6388; (wharf's and basins) 6359 (iv).
Canals—Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6412 (iv).
Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 6427; (surveys, &c.) 6452; (working expenses) 6452 (iv).
Canals—Murray (dredging) 6410; (scow) 6411 (iv).
Canals—Que. (dredging) 6411 (iv).
Canals—Rapide Plat (dredging) 6413 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (bridges) 6413 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste Marie (concrete walls) 6358; (lock gates, &c.) 6417; (mooring pier) 6397; (upper entrance) 6416 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6395 (iv).
Canals—St. Peter's (improvements) 6418 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6390; (machinery) 6389; (mooring posts) 6389; (protection works) 6390 (iv).
Canals—Trent (flood damages) 6453; (improvements) 6419; (lift lock) 6398 (iv).
Canals—Welland (enlargement) 6404; (Jane St. bridge) 6425; (Port Colborne) 6397; (stone protection) 6425 (iv); (survey) 9563 (v); (widening) 6408 (iv).
Canals—Williamsburg (electric power) 6396 (entrance pier) 6426; (iron mooring posts) 6426; (lockmaster's house) 6408; (machinery) 6426 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (salaries) 1473 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6655 (iv).
Railways—G. T. P. (govt. director) 6449 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (air brakes) 5913, 5915; (bridge strengthening) 5914; (Campbellton) 5914, 5983; (Chatham) 5915; (draw bars) 5915; (facilities and acommodation) 5929; (fire extinguishers) 5927 ; (Fredericton) 5916; (Halifax) 5918 (iii); (Halifax docks) 9561 (v); (highways protection) 5917 (iii); 9560 (v); (Moncton car shops) 5926 (iii); (operation) 5983; (Pullman berths) 5991 (iv); (rolling stock) 5927 (iii), 8913 (v); (Str. 'Scotia') 5928; (surveys, &c.) 5928; (Sydney Mines) 5929 (iii); (Windsor branch) 6352; (working expenses) 6338 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's cars) 6446; (inspections, &c.) 6452 (iv); (level crossings) 9509 (v); (McGill University) 6445; (official cars) 6447; (Ry. Commissioners) 6427 (iv), 9508 (v).
Ry's. P.E.I., (Harmany-Elmira branch) 6352 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. Eastern Div. Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 9431 (v).
See 'G. T. P.' &c.
Truro Freight Shed Fire (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Waddington Power Development, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7210 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Water Carried Freight, Value, &c. (remarks) 6671 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. Douglas) in Com., 6951 (iv).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*
Address, The, 77 (i).
——— Correction of figures in Hansard, 228 (i).
See 'Govt. Loans.'
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3181 (ii).
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 220), (M.) to place on Govt. Bills, 9350 (v).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3459 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3456 (ii).
Govt. Loans and Sinking Funds, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3774 (ii).
See 'Address.'
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com. 3182 (ii).
Railway Sel. Com. (M.) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3629 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4868 (iii).

HAGGART, Mr. A., *Winnipeg.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5080 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8840 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8572 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8925 (v).
Coronation Holiday and Bank Holiday, (remarks) 5836 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8608, 8666 (v).
Fort Osborne, Purchase of Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4469 (iii), 6054 (iv).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10251, 10290 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9515 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8549 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 9 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1792 (i).
Immigrants, Money Qualification, *re* Operation of Act (remarks) 150 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7853 (iv).

HAGGART, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Man. Legislative Building, Purchase of Fort Osborne Barracks, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 4469 (ii), 6054 (iv).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 6762 (iv).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6122 (iv).
Parliament Site, Winnipeg, Reservation in Crown Grants, &c. (M. for papers, &c*.) 7039 (iv).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8072 (v).
Post Office Supplies for Western Provs., Distribution of (Ques.) 1282 (i).
Priv. and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot) Charges *re*, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7888 (iv).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9332 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8389 (v).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers, on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10140 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2597, 3021, 3180, 3454, 3842 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3793 (ii); Quarantine (public health) 5981 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5173 (iii).
Indians—Man, &c. (annuities) 8885 (v).
Militia (Winnipeg drill hall) 6054 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3004; Man. (Winnipeg armoury) 3052 (ii); Ottawa (pavements) 8884 (v).
Winnipeg River Water Power Rights, Grants, Leases, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2162 (ii).
Winnipeg World's Fair, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *North Lanark.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5086 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal Grantees, Rentals from, Sums expended by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2196 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8804, 8818; in Com., 9222, 9259 (v).
C.P.Ry. Reducton of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).
Copyright Act, B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8899 (v).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1319 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4662 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Drummond &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 479 (i).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2388 (ii).
Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2190 (ii).
——— Cancellation of (remarks) 2264 (ii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8559 (v).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1075 (i).
Imperial Conference, Rep. presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10120 (v).
I.C.R. Special Trains *re* Monument Nationale, Montreal, Demonstration (remarks) 2999 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9099; in Com., 9156, 9216 (v).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Long Sault Dam, on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3238 (ii).
Niagara River Water Powers, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8893 (v).
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration (remarks) 672 (i).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 954 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Genl.'s Report, 834 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies, 3069 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4334 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 961 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. B. 156 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8409 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9379 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to meet during sittings of the House, 9228 (v).
Railways, Transportation Problem , on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup. (reply) 5103 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8411 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1378 (i).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 6216; Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1467(i); Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2093 (ii).
Sussex Street, Deptl. Buildings, Alteration in Plans (remarks) 2079 (ii), 4824 (iii).
Yukon, Beer Import Tax Repeal, in Com. on Res., (Mr. Oliver) 1977 (ii).

HARRIS, Mr. Llyod, *Brantford.*
Globe Printing Co.'s (B. 121) 1°*, 4040 (iii).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 106) 1°*, 2828 (ii).
Morrison, Nellie Bridgland Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 7666 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 4877 (iii).
Reciprocity, Berlin Board of Trade Res., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) 5730 (iii).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2138 (ii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9222; on M. for 3°, 9334 (v).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2431 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Miller) to sit during Sessions of the House, 8355 (v).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7470 (iv).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1683 (i).
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3859 (ii).
Bronte Harbour Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3183-3454 (ii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2227 (ii).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8953 (v).
Dom. Lands Act (O. Cs.) in Com., 8086 (v).
Elora Postoffice, Site, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 6505 (iv).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8128 (v).
Express Rates, *See* 'Parcel.'
Sheldon, C. D. Illegal Use of Mails (re-
M. (Mr. Foster) for copy, 2242 (ii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Farmers' Bank, Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation *re* Double Liability, &c. (Ques.) 4111 (iii).
—— Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8224 (v).
—— Royal Commission of Investigation (amt.) to Com. on M. for Ways and Means, 5295, Neg. (Y. 62, N. 97) 5523 (iii).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
Forest Reserves B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 8084 (v).
Govt. Bills, Withdrawal of (remarks) 2080 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1419 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6946 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amts., 3460 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8079 (v).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2596 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3182 (ii).
Milton Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1871 (i).
Ministerial Association, Attack *re* by h. m. (remarks) 3372 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3184 (ii).
Parcel Post, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9936 (v).
Postoffice Act, (stamp vending machine) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2° 8069; in Com., 8070 (v).
Public Buildings in former Estimates, given Precedence over new Ones (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2114 (ii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8401; in Com., 9321 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5063 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7633 (iv).
—— Res. from Fruit Growers' Association, Burlington, (read) 4122 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6517, 6816 (iv).
—— Statistics, &c., Ques. *re* Vote of member for Labelle, 6839 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7625 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8579, 9166 (v).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2598 (ii).
Seed Control Act (seeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6189 (iv); in Com., 8078 (v).
Supply Bill, Interim (B. 160) on M. for 1°, 6440 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6235; (Patent Record) 6184; (seeds) 6217 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (macadamizing) 6408 (iv)
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1049; Mines (salaries) 1477; Public Works (salaries) 1033 (i).
Dom. Lands—Parks (buffalo) 6051 (iv).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6629; (modus vivendi licenses) 6160 (iv); (overseers) 3809; (protection service) 3807 (ii).
House of Commons (committees) 6170; (messengers) 6172; (pages) 6174; (servants) 6175; (sessional clerks) 6170; (stationery) 6178; (telephones) 6171 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5195 (iii).
Indians—N. W. T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6043; Que. (medical attendance) 6035 (iv).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6161 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4233 (iii); (technical education commission) 3804 (ii).
Miscellaneous (coronation decorations) 9566 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Campbellton) 1609; (Hampton) 1615 (i); Ont. (Dresden) 2108; (Fergus) 2111; (Essex) 2110 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 5996 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (freight cars) 5987 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6558; (meteorological service) 6566 (iv).
Senate (stationery) 6337 (iv).
Unprovided Items (generally) 6160 (iv).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Macleod.*
Adjournment for Coronation, Definite Date (remarks) 9090 (v).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1966 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3181, 3392; (amt.) 3024 (ii).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5087 (iii).
Bellevue Mining Disaster, Information *re* (remarks) 1079 (i).
Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3062 (ii).
Census Omissions in Enumeration (remarks) 9719 (v).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Coal Strike in Alberta and B. C., Conciliation by Labour Dept. (remarks) 6197, 6363, (iv) 9070 (v).
Coal Strikes in West, Information *re* (remarks) 6908 (iv).
——— Present condition (remarks) 7105 (iv).
Dom. Lands in Alberta, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2271 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3508 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8607, 8674 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8083 (v).
Land, Timber, Natural Resources, &c., of Alberta, Provl. Control of (M. for cor. *) 1500 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1240 (i).
McLeod Postoffice, Progress *re* (remarks) 9588 (v).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9315, 9416 (v).
Seed Grain, Distribution of, Complaints *re* Quality and Price (remarks) 8041 (v).
Seed Inspection and Sale Act B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8078 (v).
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management—(foreign and uncurrent coin) 6062; Dom. Lands—Parks—(buffalo) 6050; Indians—N. W. T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046 (iv); Postoffice (postmasters' salaries) 4292 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3004 (ii).

HODGINS, Mr. G. F., *Pontiac.*
Emo, Matilda Relief (B. 130) 1° *, 4298 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 3529 (ii).
Quebec and Great Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 198) 1° *, 8476 (v).
Welland Canal Enlargement, Memorials, Pets, &c. (M. for copies *) 1500 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Naval Policy, 281 (i).
Advertising Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6394 (iv).
Alberta Rangers, Macleod Squadron, Organization of, Capt. D. J. Campbell's Connection therewith (Ques.) 7340 (iv).
Ancona Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3601 (ii).
Bermuda, Information *re* Annexation to Canada (remarks) 5216 (iii).
Boot and Shoe Lasts, Names of Manufacturers, &c. (M. for ret. *) 1340 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Bradford Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
British Patriotic Songs in Western Schools and American Pupils (Ques.) 656 (i).
——— Remarks of Mr. Armstrong *re* (remarks) 4931 (iii).
Canal Reciprocity for American Boats (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
Clifford W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of (remarks) 9997 (v).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8712 (v).
Coronation Ceremonies, and Cadets from Canada (Ques.) 706 (i).
——— Indian Contingent, Par. *re* (remarks) 6506 (iv).
——— Names of Officers, &c., Cadets, &c. (remarks) 7105 (iv).
Debates Committee, Status of (remarks) 7015 (iv).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, *re* Speeches (remarks) 153 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Attendance of Militia, Authority for (Ques.) 3219 (ii).
——— Govt. Authority *re* Decoration of Govt. Buildings (Ques). 925 (i); (remarks) 3369 (ii).
——— Guards of Honour, &c. (remarks) on Address, 289 (i).
——— Mess of Homage from Administrator of Can. Govt. (Ques.) 706 (i).
——— Militia Officers attending Reception, in Uniform (Ques.) 707 (i).
——— Public Procession, Authority of Govt. *re* State Officials (Ques.) 925 (i).
See 'Precedence.'
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5496 (iii).
Fenelon Falls Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Flags flying on Govt. Buildings on St. David's Day (remarks) 3671 (ii).
——— Neglect on St. George's Day (remarks) 7553 (iv).
——— Orders *re* (remarks) 2648 (ii).
See 'St. George's.'
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 1641 (i).
G. T. R. Trainmens' Strike, Reinstatement of Dismissed Employees (remarks) 1073 (i).
Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
Homage: *See* Eucharistic..
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1411 (i).
House of Commons Ventilation, (remarks) 4209 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Indian Act Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 7020 (iv).
'Iroquois,' Str., Report *re* Wrecking (remarks) 7104 (iv).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10349 (v).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3241 (ii).
See '*St.* Lawrence.'
Marriage Laws in Quebec, Action of Roman Catholic Church (Ques.) 7207 (iv).
Masonic Property stolen, Verdict of Montreal Jury *re* (Ques.) 7207 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Counsel's Action, 7552 (iv).
——— Apology to Counsel, Ques. of Priv. 7873 (v).
Militia Officers: *See* 'Eucharistic.'
Militia Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1008 (i).
Ministerial Association, Ottawa, Res. *re* (remarks) 3059 (ii).
Order Ques of *re* Member asked to withdraw word 'Liar', 5562 (iii).
Oshawa Customs Collector, Mr. G. F. Blamey, Retirement of (Ques.) 3225 (ii).
Parliament Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 6768, 7023 (iv).
——— Water Supply, &c. (remarks) 7345 (iv).
Peat Gas Producer, Progress *re* Electric Power (Ques.) 708, 985 (i).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty between U.S. and G. B., Protection *re* (Ans.) 3671 (ii).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Newspapers (remarks) 10342 (v).
Postmaster General's Mission to Rome, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 3606 (ii).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 955 (i).
Printing Bureau Employees, Religious Status (Ques.) 3606 (ii).
Questions and Answers written, Copies given to Press (remarks) 990 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7126 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10009, 10059 (v).
——— Debate, Ques. of Order *re* Talking' between Ministers, 7292 (iv).
——— Farmers's Interests, &c. (remarks) 5543 (iii).
Reciprocity, Negotiations by Mr. J. A. Macdonald of 'Globe', at Washington (remarks) *re* Speech at St. Catharines, 2560 (ii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Reciprocity ,Editorial in 'Globe' (remarks) 2743 (ii).
——— Attack of Ministerial Association, Ottawa (personal explanation) 3352 (ii).
Reciprocity, Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3608 (ii).
Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices, &c. (remarks) 6782 (iv).
——— Accepting as read and printing in Hansard (remarks) 6840 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, Addressing the Chair, 6890 (iv).
Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7670 (iv).
——— Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7676 (iv).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service, Approval of Govt. (Ques.) 1288 (i).
——— Meaning of Word 'faction', Preparation of Answer (remarks) 1351 (i).
——— (remarks) 942 (i).
Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own Rifles while in England (Ques.) 1087 (i).
Ross Rifles loaned by Can. to G.B., Use at Bisley, &c. (Ques.) 1085 (i).
——— (remarks) 7552 (iv).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly the Flag (remarks) 7687 (iv).
See 'Flags.'
St. Lawrence River Damming, Diversion of the Channel (remarks) 3058 (ii).
——— Information *re* Bill before U. S. Senate (remarks) 4210 (iii).
See 'Long Sault.'
Scugog River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Small Pox Epidemic, Sanitary Condition of House of Commons (remarks) 7252 (iv).
See 'House.'
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7249 (iv).
Speaker's Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola (Ques.) 926 (i).
Speaker's Gallery, Discourtesy to Clergymen, &c. (remarks) 269 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 6184; (year book) 6184 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (Iberville bridge) 6357; (machinery) 6357 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358, (wharfs and basins) 6359 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6396 (iv).
Canals—Trent (machinery) 6357 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 1021 (i).
House of Commons (Dep. Clerk Crown in Chancery) 6167; (electric light attendant) 6175; (messengers) 6173; (sessional clerks) 6167; (stationery) 6175; (telephones) 6172 (iv).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5557 (iii).
Justice—Dom (gratuities) 6161 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6455 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8079 (v).
Post Office—Outside Service (mail service) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lavatories) 2583; (water supply) 2583; Que. (Montreal barracks) 2569, 3148 (ii)
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6558 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (working expenses) 6[illegible]
P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira branch) 6353 (iv).
U.S. Army Deserters at Niagara Falls, &c., Subjects of Extradition, &c. (Ques.) 707 (i).
Victoria Museum, Defects in Building (remarks) 7350 (iv).
—— Cor. *re* Foundation, Inquiry for, 7666 (iv).

HUNT, Mr. A. B., *Compton.*
Orford Mountain Ry. (B. 100) 1°*, 2254 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7006 (iv).

JAMESON, Mr. C., *Digby.*
Accidents on Canadian Railways, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3943 (ii).
'Arctic,' Rep. of Capt. Bernier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Bait Freezer at Barrington Passage, Assistance *re* Construction (M. for papers*) 3947 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5039, 5293 (ii), 8791 (v).
Bay of Fundy Fishing Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries: *See* 'Hague Arbitration.'
Bear Indian Reserve, Medical Officer, Payments to (Ques.) 3223 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 3606 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5293 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers, in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Brier Island Light, Application *re* New House (Ques.) 4929 (iii).
—— Lightkeeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4929 (iii).
Canadian Naval Service, Applications from Canadians and British Navy (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction &c. (Ques.) 8983 (v).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 28 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8723 (v).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 28) 1° m., 699 (i).
Deep Brook, N.S., Wharf, Expenditure *re* (M. for cor.*) 4383 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5293 (iii).
Digby Public Works, Expenditures *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8440 (v).
Fisheries Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6093 (iv).
Fish landed by Canadian Atlantic Fisheries since 1870, Quantities, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).
Fisheries Protection Service, Seizures by 'Rainbow' (remarks) 4116, 4208 (iii).
Fishery Regulations, Complaint *re* C. K. Golden, for Violation of (Ques.) 2367 (ii).
Fisheries Regulations agreed to at Washington (remarks) 2088* (ii).
—— Changes at Washington (remarks) on motion for Sup., 8502 (v).
Fish Tariff, Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty (Ques.) 2886 (ii).
Fishing Vessel Licenses (B. 27) 1° m., 698 (i).
Fishing Vessels and Customs Regulations, Request to place on Govt. Orders, 3373 (ii).
Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock (Ques.) 1976 (ii).
Grand Manan Fisheries, Prices charged per Hogshead, Weir Licenses, &c., (Ques.) 2367 (ii).
Hague Arbitration, Bay of Fundy, 4683 (iii).
Hague Arbitration, North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, Production of Papers, on M. for Sup., 4588 (iii).
Haskett, Havelock and New Tusket Post Offices, Distance between, &c., (Ques.) 8991 (v).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2018 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9218 (v).
'John B. Young', Str., Stranding of, Govt. Assistance *re* (Ques.) 2368 (ii).
Lunenburg, N.S., Dredging, Plans *re* (Ques.) 2157 (ii).
Meteghan Landing Place, Report *re* Defective Condition Ques.) 4043 (iii).
Meteghan Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 4929 (iii).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*
Montreal and Maritime Provs., Forwarding of Mails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Payments, Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
New Edinboro, N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1283 (i).
N. S. Breakwaters, Contracts *re* Construction in Digby County (Ques.) 657 (i).
Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 9782 (v).
Postmasters Association, Pets *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3947 (ii).
Ry. Rates to Clergymen, Reduction *re* (Ques.) 2434 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6966 (iv).
——— Fishing Bounties, Payments *re* (remarks) 6670 (iv).
Rockliffe Rifle Ranges, Additional Land Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 8994 (v).
——— (M. for cor.*) 8994 (v).
Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c. (Ques.) 2853 (ii).
Seed Inspection and Sale Act B. 167 (Mr. Fsher) in Com., 8078 (v).
Sick Mariners Dues, Amount of Money in Trust, Investment, &c. (Ques.) 9993 (v).
Smelt Fishing in N. S., Pet. *re* Change for Open Season (Ques.) 9984 (v).
Statutes, French Translation, Corrections (remarks) 8090 (v).
Steam Trawlers, Application *re* Fishing Bounty (Ques.) 4046 (iii).
——— Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3129 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9088 (v); (tobacco production) 6264; (Year Book) 6184 (v)
Charges of Management—(foreign and uncurrent coin) 6061 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1054 (i); Postoffice (clerical assistance) 6063; (contingencies) 6070 (iv).
Fisheries (fish transportation) 6093; (fishways) 6659; (inspectors) 6658; (oyster culture) 6661 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (maritime road) 6543; (shipbuilding) 6488, 6498; (telephones, life stations) 6539 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers maintenance, &c.) 5815; (life saving awards) 5822; (patrol boats) 5829; (P. E.I. winter mail service) 5828; (schools of navigation) 5824 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Chatham) 1610 (i).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax, Dom.) 1592; (Halifax post office) 1587; (Weymouth) 1601 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2616; Ottawa (lighting) 3173; (Rideau Hall) 8882 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Summerside armoury) 1602; (Tignish) 1603 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1863; (Napierville) 1865 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Argyle Sound) 9504 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Pullman berths) 5990; (surveys) 5929 (iii).
Scientific Institutions (meteorological service) 6565 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection (life belts &c.) 6572; (magnetic observatry) 6563 (iv).
Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling.'
Typhoid Epidemic in Ottawa (remarks) 4723 (iii).
Wesport Signal Stations, When erected, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 1091 (i).

KIDD, Mr. E., *Carleton, O.*
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6209 (iv).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8953 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com,. 8746 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 10572 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6234; (seeds) 6224 (iv).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G., (Minister of Labour) *Waterloo North.*
Accidents on Canadian Railways, Investigation *re* , on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3933 (ii).
Alcoholism International Congress, Delegates to (Ans.) 5632 (iii).
Alien Labour Law on Public Contracts, in B.C. (remarks) 10369 (v).
——— Administration at Sault Ste. Marie, on M. for Sup., 5530 (iii).
B.C. Coal Strikes, (remarks) 6363 (iv).
——— Agreement of Two Years past (remarks) 6366 (iv).
See 'Coal Strike.'
British Patriotic Songs and American Scholars in Western Schools (Ans.) 657 (i).
Cement Merger: *See* "Industrial Mergers."
Coal Strike in B. C. and Alberta, Conciliation *re* (remarks) 6197 (iv).
——— Further Information (read) 6908 (iv).
——— Present Condition (remarks) 7105 (iv).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G.—*Con.*
Coal Strike in B. C. &c., Remarks of Mr. Taylor, M.P., 9721 (v).
See 'Labour.'
Cocaine, Prohibition of Sale (prop. res.) 1803 (i); in Com. on Res., 2063 (ii).
See 'Opium.'
Combines Investigation Act, Changes *re* (Ans.) 663 (i).
—— Report *re* (remarks) 1987 (ii).
See 'Cement.'
Conciliation Boards, Principle *re* Actior (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4242 (iii).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 1302; in Com., 1318 (i).
Echo Lake Post Office, Application *re* Establishment of (Ans.) 8993 (v).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c. (remarks) 9001 (v).
Govt. Bills, Withdrawal of (remarks) 2080 (ii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, Apptmt. of Judge Barron (Ans.) 2158 (ii).
—— Arrangement re Reinstatement (Ans.) 654, 809, 811 (i).
—— (remarks) 1072, 1507 (i).
—— Conciliation Board (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
—— Inaction of Labour Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5776 (iii).
—— Investigation by Judge Barron, Remuneration to (remarks) 1805 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4261 (iii).
—— Minister's Efforts a Success (Ans.) 811 (i).
—— Resolution from Order of Conductors (Ans.) 9988 (v).
—— Settlement of (remarks) 9692 (v).
—— Statements by Leaders of Ry. Organization (read) in Com. of Sup., 4246-7 (iii).
—— Status of Men reinstated (remarks) 3375 (ii).
—— Tel. from Minister of Labour to Messrs. Berry and Murdock (Ans.) 1105 (i).
Great Northwestern Telegraphers Co., Request *re* Board of Conciliation (Ans.) 5639 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1408, 1534, 1737 (i); on M. for 3°, 2870, (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works *re* Com., Printing of Proceedings (Ans.) 3280 (ii).
—— Representations re I.C.R. Workingmen (correction) 4116 (iii).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Amts. re (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G.—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Demand for Repeal (Mr. Rhodes) (remarks) 6931 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2940 (ii).
See 'U. S. Trusts.'
Industrial Training, Royal Commission, Incompetent Reporting (Ans.) 3463 (ii).
I. C. R. Telegraphers Board of Conciliation, Statute re Granting (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9176 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9463 (v).
Labour Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Labour Strike, Remarks of Mr. Geo. Taylor, on Ques. of Priv., 9721, 9786 (v).
—— Letter from Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P., re Militia (read) 10344 (v).
Match Factories using Phosphorus, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 1717, 1977 (i).
Matches, Manufacture, Prohibition of Phosphorus B. 10 (prop. res.) 1802; 1° m., 104; 2° m., 1576 (i).
—— (B. 96) in Com. on Res., 2021 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Contractors and Labour Conditions (remarks) 8597 (v).
North Atlantic Collieries, Protest re Nomination on Conciliation Board (remarks) 4209 (iii).
Opium Prohibition (B. 97) Prop. Res., 1803 (i); in Com. on Res., 1°*, 2062; 2° m., 2518, in Com., 2532; 3° m., 2740 (ii); on Senate Amts, 8090 (v);
—— (B .22) 1° m., 468 (1).
See 'Cocaine.'
Petawawa Military Camp, Damages by Fire (remarks) 9250 (v).
Quebec Bridge, Fair Wage Clause for Bridge Workers (Ans.) 5835 (iii), 6757 (iv).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3946 (ii).
Reciprocity, Res. of Berlin Board of Trade, Ques. of Priv., 5726 (iii).
—— Speech of Member for N. Oxford (remarks) 5545 (iii).
—— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6817 (iv).
—— Special Rep. of Comparative Prices, laid on Table, 10468 (v).
—— (M.) to print, 10590 (v).
—— (remarks) 10469 (v).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Additional Land Purchase (Ans.) 8994 (v).
Springhill Mines Strike, Conciliation Board *re* Labour Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 4237 (iii).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G.—*Con.*
Springhill Mines Strike, Information *re* Condition (remarks) 2641, 2740 (ii), 6363 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (combines investigation Act) 4280 (iii); (conciliation board) 3384, 3393 (ii); (Labour Gazette) 4230 (iii), 6057 (iv); (salaries) 1484 (i): technical education commission) 3801 (ii).
Technical Education Commission, Progress *re*, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1721 (i).
——— Completion of Work (remarks) 1661 (i).
Trade Commissioner to Mexico, Date of Mr. Bouley's Apptmt. (Ans.) 8993 (v).
United Shoe Machinery Co., Application *re* Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 2672 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Combines Act (remarks) 4300 (iii).
——— Board of Investigation (remarks) 5954 (iv).
U.S. Trusts and Combines, Regulations, &c, U.S. Courts, on M. (Mr. Meighen) for Ret., 4345 (iii).
Western Coal Miners' Strike, Settlement of, Rep. of Conciliation Board, on M. (Mr. Goodeve) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9699 (v).
——— Conciliation Board (remarks) 9070 (v).
Workingmen's Wages, Increased Cost of living (Ans.) 3065 (ii).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Moosejaw.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1934 (i).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9014 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9034 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9523 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co., incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8918 (v).
Healey, Fanny Mary Relief (B. 199) 1°*, 8476 (v).
Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation Co.'s incorp. (B. 56) 1°*, 1277 (i); in Com. 3994 (iii); on Senate Amts, 6952 (iv).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6151 (iv).
Postmasters Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6064 (iv).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. 8071 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) on Res., 6921 (iv).
——— Res. from Swift Current Board of Trade (read) 4119 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (clerical assistance) 6064 (iv).
Tariff Resolution, Par. in Moosejaw 'News,' Ques. of Priv., 2639 (ii).

KYTE, Mr. G. W., *Richmond (N.S.)*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 369 (i).
I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1140 (i).
Lymburner Contracts with Public Works Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3205 (ii).
Privileges and Elections (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7958 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S. in Com. on Res., 3956 (iii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7632 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and SS.Subventions (Baddeck and Iona) 8764 (v).

LACHANCE, Mr. A., *Quebec Centre.*
Canadian Fisheries, Extent in Marine Miles, Amount realized, &c. (Ques.), 1289 (i).
Militia, Total Annual Cost from 1867 to 1910, &c. (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Quebec Civil Servants, Names of Permanent and Temporary Employees, since 1st Jan. 1905, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2376 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Depth at Low Tide below thirty feet (Ques.) 1718 (i).

LAFORTUNE, Mr. D. A., *Montcalm.*
Address, The, 615 (i).
Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 1710 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 8007 (v).
Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6833 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1892 (i).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1958 (i).
Agricultural Products imported into B. C. from U. S., Australia, &c. (Ques.) 7344 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work remarks) 7219 (iv).
Census Enumerators in Man., Apptmt. of, on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9024 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8726 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4661 (iii).
Dom. Lands. Sask., Gross Receipts, Cost of Administration, &c. (Ques.) 3221 (ii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Dom. Lands, S. W. ¼ Section 10, Twp. 38, Range 15, 2nd Meridian, Application *re* Entry, &c. (M. for copy*) 1501 (i).
Drummond, &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 472 (i).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3491 (ii).
Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets, 1910-11 (Ques.) 8096 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P. M. G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2268 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9532 (v).
Homestead Irregularities, Cancellation of Mr. John Bradley's Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5584 (iii).
Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908, Total Amount in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23 (Ques.) 4112 (iii).
See 'Pre-emptions.'
Immigrants entering Canada, Cognizance of Destination (Ques.) 814 (i).
Immigration into Western Can., Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions (M.) to adjn., 1551 (i).
——— Notice of Discussion, 1503 (i).
James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians &c. (Ques.) 1082 (i).
Lajord Post Office, Change as Accounting Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iii).
Natural Resources, &c. in Sask. and Alberta, Provincial Control, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 3462 (ii).
N. W. M. Police, Coronation Contingent, Number, &c. (remarks) 5836 (iii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission's Report, Inquiry for, 2004, 3672 (ii).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8586 (v).
Post Office Estimates, on objections to passing (remarks) 4298 (iii).
Pre-emptions and Purchased Homesteads, Total Acreage, Amounts received, Annual Interest, &c. (Ques.) 812 (i).
Reciprocity—Opposition to, Ques. of Priv., 5739 (iii).
——— Speech of Min. of Agr. in Montreal, Ques. of Priv., 6199 (iv).
——— Statistics asked from Trade and Commerce Dept.; Reply of Dep. Min. (remarks) 6510 (iv).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Saskatchewan Post Offices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 6505 (iv).
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re* (Ques.) 3462 (ii).
——— Total Acreage, Amounts realized, &c. (Ques.) 1908, (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (postal guide) 4280 (iii).
Immigration (seed grain) 3837 (ii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5583 (iii).
Labour (Labour Gazette) 6057 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8691 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3003; Sask. (Battleford) 2971 (ii).
R. N. W. M. Police—(pay of force) 8598; (subsistence) 8600 (v).
Sussex Street Deptl. Buildings, Ottawa, Alterations in Plans (remarks) 2075 (ii).
University of Sask., Land Endowment, Res. *re* (Ques.) 4111 (iii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827; in Com. 9265 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8719 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8913 (v).
Dunnville Postal Collections, Customs, &c. (Ques.) 3470 (ii).
Dunnville Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5314, 5459 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1434, 1531 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8745 (v).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1206 (i).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9916 (v).
Public Buildings, Erection and Construction (prop. res.) 4319 (iii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9390 (v).
Railway Mail Service, Names and Dates of Apptmts. of Persons not passing Qualifying Examinations (Ques.) 3855 (ii).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Statement (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5058 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., Res. from Winnipeg Board of Trade (read) 4121 (iii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Correction *re* Stmnt. (Mr. Paterson) *re* Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario, 4223 (iii).
Speeches of Ministers distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3786 (ii); (seeds) 6229; (Quarantine, animals) 5963 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1666; (Napierville) 1866 (i).
Tilbury Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
Wilhelm Telephone Factory, Seizure at, Compromise (Ques.) 7601 (iv).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c. (Ques.) 4825 (iii).
Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 80) 1°*, 1640 (i).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7567 (iv).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 201) on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8982 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9257 (v).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U.S. Officials (Ques.) 4672
Census, Omissions in Enumeration (remarks) 9714 (v).
Coroners' Inquests: *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
Elevators Terminal at Port Arthur, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2425 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5399 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8216 (v).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9613 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Croket) 10261 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8237, 8542, 8918 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 223) in Com., 9510 (v).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8977 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1434, 1527, 1738, 1750 (i); on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 2874 (ii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Imperial Conference Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 10112 (v).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7810 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B., 9 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 1527 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 977, 1511 (i).
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3268 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10523 (v).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com., 8234, 8519, 8535, 8642, 8916; (amt.) 8956; 3° m., 8962 (v).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8340 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2849 (ii).
Public Works Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1604 (i).
Public Works—Generally, Objection to Votes in full, 9552 (v).
Public Works Promised during Western Tour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1630 (i).
Quebec Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 1639 (i).
Ry. Act (accidents, coroners, &c.) Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 8; 2° m., 956; on M. for 2°, 1407; Debate rsmd. on M. for 2°, 1797 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9377, (amt.) 9378 (v).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7281 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10016, 10036 (v).
——— Letter of 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7678 (iv).
——— North York, Challenge *re* Contest (remarks) 7224 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6781 (iv).
St. Catharines Drill Hall, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1680 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1726 (i).
Senate, Abolition of (prop. res.) 2680 (ii).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2600 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1374 (i).
Supply—Schedule of Proportion of Votes (remarks) 9567 (v).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (survey) 9563 (v).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3440 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Fairville) 1611; (Grand Falls) 1614; (Hampton) 1615; (Hartland) 1617; (Hillsborough) 1621; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (Tracadie) 1624 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax citadel) 1582; (Parrsboro) 1630 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2604; (Seaforth) 2626; (Tilbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2627; (Wiarton) 2636 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 2590; (pavements) 2593; (water supply) 2589 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Tignish) 1602 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1665; (Aylmer) 1672; (Grosse Isle) 1677; (Lévis armoury) 1678; (Maisonneuve) 1685; (Marieville) 1697; (Megantic) 1710, 1860; (Montreal barracks) 1864; (Napierville) 1865; (Rigaud) 1887; (Roberval) 1887; (Rock Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (St. Lambert) 1895; (Shawinigan) 1890 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9501; Ont. (repairs, &c.) 9552 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 9562; (highway protection) 9561; (level crossings) 9509 (v).

LANCTOT, Mr. A., *Richelieu.*
Independence of Parlt., Charges *re* Govt. Employees, painting Private Dwelling, &c., on M. (Mr. Blondin) for Special Com., 4655 (iii).
——— Charges *re* obtaining lumber, &c., from Govt. Store (Ques. of Priv.), 8695 (v).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*
Agriculture. Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup.. 6285 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Napierville) 1879 (i).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Address. The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 16 (i).
Quebec Members, Absence of *re* Extra Session (remarks) 10098 (v).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W., P.C., G.C.M.G., (Prime Minister), *Quebec East.*
Address, The, 44; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 441 (i).
——— Precedence *re* (M.) 5 (i).
——— (M.) to present. 694 (i).
——— Reply from His Ex., (read) 1487 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Address to His Majesty King George, Intention of Govt. *re* (remarks) 7824 (iv).
Adjournment of House (M.) 866 (i).
See 'Coronation,' &c.
Administrator of the Govt. during His Ex.'s Absence in Eng., Emoluments *re* (Ans.) 1089 (i).
Agricultural Implements, resuming adjnd. debate (remarks) 2253 (ii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission's Report (presented) 3952 (iii).
Aliens, Naturalization of, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6907 (iv).
——— Termination of (remarks) 2004 (iv).
——— (remarks) 2271 (ii).
Arbitration Treaty between G.B. and U.S., Information *re* (Ans.) 5834 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5619 (iii).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 4115 (iii).
Atlantic, Que. and Western Ry.: *See* 'Charing Cross.'
Aylmer Post Office, Revenues for 1908-9, &c. (Ans.) 984 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1340 (i).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2131 (ii).
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., Ref. for Decision (Ans.) 1091 (i).
Bellevue Mining Disaster (remarks) 1080 (i).
Births and Deaths in Canada, Number, &c., on M. (Mr. McCarthy) for Ret., 2680 (ii).
Birthday of Prime Minister, Congratulations from Leader of the Opposition (remarks) 9 (i).
Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiations with U.S. (remarks) 1575 (i).
British National Songs in N.W. Schools, Remarks of Mr. Armstrong (remarks) 4932 (iii).
British Preference Trade Policy (remarks) 5619 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity,' &c.
Business of the House (remarks) 4117 (iii).
Business of the House for Thursdays (remarks) 1550 (i), 2065 (ii).
Canadian Commisioner to France, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1971 (ii), 8103 (v).
Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency of, Charge *re* Frauds (Ans.) 1716 (i).
Canadian Light and Power Company, Plans *re* Improvements (remarks) 7261 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3455 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*, on Personal Explanation (Mr Oliver) 8189 (v).
——— Proposed Motion, 8191 (v).
See 'Oliver, Hon. Mr.'
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 661 (i).
Canada and South America SS Service, Subsidies to (Ans.) 5290 (iii).
Canada and W. Indies SS Subsidy, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 5936 (iv).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr W. M. Martin) in Com., 8570 (v).
Cement Merger, Charges of Sir Sanford Fleming (remarks) 10468 (v).
Census Enumerators, Circulating Pets. *re* Reciprocity (remarks) 6508 (iv).
Charing Cross Bank, Cor. with Dom. Govt. on M. for Copy, 1726 (i).
China-Japan SS Subsidy (B. 103) prop. Res. 1802 (i); M. for Com. on Res., 2503 (ii); in Com., 8675 (v).
Chinese Immigration, Stmnt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion &c. (remarks) 2738 (ii).
——— Total Number, Capita Tax, &c. (Ans.) 788 (i).
Chinese Investigation, Rep. of Judge Murphy, Laid on Table, 9897 (v).
——— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9836 (v).
——— Discussion *re* Judge Murphy's Report, 9928 (v).
Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909 (Ans.) 1103 (i).
Christmas Adjournment: (M.) 1453 (i).
Civil Servants and Municipal Officers (remarks) on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor. 2220 (ii).
——— on Notice of M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1912 (i).
Cobalt Mail Service, Inefficient Service (remarks) 1663 (i).
Collingwood Corner Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ans.) 656 (i).
Colonial Conference, 1911, Canada's Proposals, &c. (Ans.) 1280 (i).
See 'Imperial.'
Commercial Relations, &c., Translation of Papers (Ans.) 3462 (ii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 5 (i).
——— Lists (presented) 262 (i).
——— (M.) to add Name, 377 (i).
Companies Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Miller) on M. to place on Govt. Orders, 8789 (v).
Consuls General, Status at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 952 (i).
LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1304 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8709 (v).
See 'Imperial Conference.'
——— Invitation to Members of Parlt (remarks) 1580 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Indian Contingent, (remarks) 6507 (iv).
Coronation Holiday and Bank Holiday (remarks) 5836 (iii).
Courtice, Howard, Emplmt. by Liberal Bureau (remarks) 9784 (v).
Customs Official, Halifax, Dismissal of *re* Municipal Office, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2220 (ii).
Dairy Industry, Nature of Memorials *re*, &c. (Ans.) 2672 (ii).
Debates Committee, Status *re* Duties (remarks) 7015 (iv).
Declaration of London, Consideration by Govt. (Ans.) 5935 (iv).
Deputy Governor, Tel. of Mr. Justice Girouard to Cardinal Vannutelli (Ans.) 702 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election (remarks) on Address, 54 (i).
——— Quotations from Notary Begin, Ques. of Order, 57 (i).
——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* quotations from 'Le Devoir', Ques. of Order, 472 (i).
Easter Adjournement (M.) 6758 (iv).
Electricity Exportation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 2260 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8120 (v).
Estimates, 1912 (presented) 695 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Authority of Govt. *re* State Officials in Procession (Ans.) 925 (i).
——— Mess. of Homage by Administrator (Ans.) 702, 707 (i).
——— Reception by Federal Govt., &c. (Ans.) 5935 (iv).
——— Reception to Cardinal Vanutelli, (remarks), 6522 (iv).
See 'Speaker'.
Fabre, Mr. Hector, Date of Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 5933 (iv).
See 'Can. Commissioner.'
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5395 (iii).
——— (remarks) 1510 (i), 7560 (iv).
——— Application *re* Charter, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1970 (ii).
——— Assets, Keeley Mine, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2152 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Farmers' Bank, Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2247 (ii).
——— Endorsation of Premier, Letters read, 2264 (ii).
——— Question *re* Incorp. (remarks) 1904 (i).
——— Representations to Fin. Dept. *re* Stability, &c. (Ans.) 2151 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation, Article in Grain Growers' Guide *re* Hudson Bay Ry., Denial of Stmt., 1574 (i).
——— Speeches, &c. (M.) to print, 3054 (ii).
——— Distribution of Copies of Report (remarks) 6908 (iv).
See 'Western'.
Favoured Nation Treaties, Par. in Toronto 'Globe' *re* Abrogation (remarks) 5292 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity, &c.'
Fenian Raid Veterans' Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9605 (v).
See 'Veterans.'
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8108 (v).
Fish Hatchery at Snake Island, Winnipegosis Lake, Apptmt. of Keeper (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations between Can. and U.S., Proclamation *re* (stmt.) 1725 (i).
——— Modification of (remarks) 1804 (i).
——— Changes at Washington (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8512 (v).
See 'Hague.'
Fraser Mills Postmaster, Defalcation of Funds, Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 1567 (i).
Fruit and Vegetable Growers, Report of Proceedings (M.) to print, 3952 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk), Objection to motion, 5161 (iii).
——— Estimates *re* (remarks) 2095 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Globe' *re* Commencement (remarks) 2261 (ii).
Govt. Business, Morning Sittings (M.) 10095 (v).
——— Precedence on Mondays (M.) 4114 (iii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 3143 (ii).
See 'Business.'
Gov. General, Apptmt. of Duke of Connaught (remarks) 1726 (i).
Grain in Fort William and Port Arthur Elevators, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3605 (ii).
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8095, 8536 (v).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S. (remarks) 1725 (i).
——— Fisheries Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1805 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
——— *See* 'Fisheries,' 'North Atlantic'.
Halifax Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 653 (i).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10102 (v).
Hay Claims, Delay in repayment to Canadian Exporters (Ans.) 5103 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1436, 1532, 1743, 1754 (i).
House of Commons, Appointments (M.) 5288; (M.) to conc., 5400 (iii).
——— Galleries of H. of C., Applause in (remarks) 4469 (iii).
——— Number of Persons residing in (Ans.) 3848 (ii).
——— Restaurant, Joint Com. (M.) 469 (i).
——— Restaurant and Speaker's Rooms, Number of Employees (Ans.) 1085 (i).
——— Sessional Clerks, Application *re* Increase of Salary (Ans.) 5404 (iii).
——— Translation Staff Promotions (M.) 527 (i); (M.) *re* Apptmt., 7015 (iv).
——— Water Supply for Parlt. Biuldings *re* Typhoid Epidemic (remarks) 2004 (ii).
Hydro-Electric Commission, Toronto, Mr. McGann's Application *re* (remarks) 1574 (i).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' Conditions *re*, (remarks) on M. (Mr. Lake) 1566 (i).
Imperial Conference, Attendance *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8034-7 (v).
See 'Coronation.'
——— Questions to be submitted by Canada (remarks) 4299 (iii).
——— Secretariat Formation, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7372 (iv).
See 'Secretariat.'
Imperial Conference, Precis Rep. and Verbatim Rep. (remarks) 9693, 9783 (v).
——— Complete Report presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10111 (v).
——— Cor. with Mr. Harcourt (read) 10338 (v); (M.) to print, 10340 (v).
——— Defence Papers laid on Table, 10467 (v).
Imperial Defence Conference, on M. (Mr. Monk) for copies, 2217 (ii).
Imperial Defence Committee Report, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 948 (i).
Indian Act, (Treaty) Amt. (B. 177) 1° m., 7019; on M. for 2°, 7830 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8105 (v).
I.C.R. Terminals at Halifax, Accommodation *re* (remarks) 2376 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1524 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex., 377 (i).
International Waterways Commission (prop. res.) 695 (i).
——— Names of Members, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 3861 (ii).
——— Apptmt. of Chairman (remarks) 4741 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 3 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 874 (i).
See 'Long Sault.'
Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid (Ans.) 6158 (iv).
Jackson, Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ans.) 656 (i).
Japanese Treaty: *See* 'Anglo-Japanese.'
Jardine, John, Claims *re* Govt., Par. in 'Daily Times,' (Ans.) 3847 (ii).
Judicial Vacancy in P.E.I., Apptmt. *re* (remarks) 7553 (iv).
See 'P. E. I.'
Juvenile Delinquents Act. Discussion *re* (remarks) 4383 (iii).
Kelly, Robt., Employmt. by Govt. at Vancouver, B. C., (Ans.) 2665 (ii).
Langdon Subdivisions of C. P. Ry., Mail Service in Northwest (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Lemieux, Hon. Mr., Mission to Rome, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 3607 (ii).
Letter Carriers, Free Transportation *re* Tramways (Ans.) 1104 (i).
——— Superannuation, Amt. to the Act (Ans.) 1488 (i).
Library of Parlt., Joint Com., (M.) 309 (i).
——— Apptmt. of Mr. O. Souliere (M.) 8789 (v).
Lt.-Governor, N. S., Cor. *re* Continuance as Director of N. S. Steel & Coal Co. (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
Long Sault Dam, on St. Lawrence River, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).
——— Cor. between Govt. and British Ambassador (remarks) 3530 (ii).
——— Rep. of American Commissioners, &c., (remarks) 1652 (i).
See 'International Waterways,' 'St. Lawrence.'
Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions *re* (Ans.) 1285 (i).
See 'Rural.'
Mails, Illegal Use of for Fraudulent Schemes (Ans.) 802 (i).
——— Illegal Use of by C. D. Sheldon, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 1358 (i).
See 'Sheldon.'
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals, on M. for Sup., 6201 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Man. Boundaries, Speech of Prime Min. at Winnipeg *re*, Cor. &c. (Ans.) 710 (i).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c., (remarks) 6764, 6915 (iv).
Matches, White Phosphorus, Manufacture Prohibition B. 10 (Mr. King) on M. for 2°, 1577 (i).
———B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2052 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates (1912) Presented, 695 (i).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2791 (ii).
——— on Explanation (Mr. Boyce) 2439 (ii).
——— Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7444 (iv).
Minister of Militia. Absence from Hse., *re* N.S. Elections (remarks) 2265 (ii).
Minority Representation, Intention *re* Redistribution Bill (Ans.) 9998 (v).
Mormon Propaganda, Prevention by Govt. (Ans.) 5136 (iii).
Mounted Police, Coronation Contingent (remarks) 5836 (iii).
——— Death of Inspectors, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iv); 8598 (v).
——— Pay and Allowance, &c., (Ans.) 8101 (v).
N. T. Ry., Contracts, Security Deposit, Amount of (Ans.) 1972 (ii).
Natural Resources in Alberta and Sas., Prov. Control, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 3462 (ii).
Naval Conference, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Protocol. 3074 (ii).
Naval Construction, Tenders *re* (remarks) 8355 (v).
Naval Defence, Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 54 (i).
——— Direct Contribution in Resolution (remarks) 548 (i).
Naval Service, 'Rainbow', Type of Guns, (Ans.) 1490 (i).
Netherlands Land Mortgage Co., Investments in Canada, Cor. with W. T. R. Preston (Ans.) 789 (i).
——— Further Cor., Reps., &c. (Ans.) 5639 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Cor., 7349 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co.'s Investments in Canada, on M. for Rep. of W. T. R. Preston, 778; Letter of Chief Justice Sir Charles Fitzpatrick (read) 779 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) for Com., 781 (i).
——— Statement by Mr. Preston *re* Chief Justice Fitzpatrick, Official Notification (Ans.) 2669 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, Hague Award, Distribution of (remarks) 8094 (v).
See 'Hague.'
North Shore Taxpayers and Voting at Federal Election (Ans.) 1082 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, 1 (i).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy (M.) for Com. of Investigation, 8309 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8315 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv., 8032 (v).
——— (M.) for Com., *re* Investigation, 8791 (v).
——— Information *re* Committee (remarks) 9900 (v).
See 'Can. Northern.'
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6134 (iv).
——— on M. to introduce, 2829 (ii).
Orders Discharged (M.) 4464 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, on using word 'liar', apology insisted on (remarks) 463 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission's Rep., on Inquiry for, 2004 (ii).
Parcel Post Service, Loss *re* (Ans.) 806 (i).
Pelagic Sealing, Treaty between G.B. and U.S., re Protection (remarks) 3670, 3769 (ii).
See 'Seal.'
Pork Packing Industry, Inquiry for Rep. of (remarks) 3530 (ii).
Postal Conventions with Spain, Changes *re* (Ans.) 1104 (i).
Post Office Revenue for Tilbury, &c., for 1904-10 (Ans.) 807 (i).
Post Office Savings Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1568 (i).
Post Office Service in N.S., Weekly and Bi-Weekly (Ans.) 982 (i).
Post Office Supplies for Western Provs., Distribution of (Ans.) 1282 (i).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 952 (i).
See 'Eucharistic.'
P.E.I., Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments (remarks) 6927, 7430, 7803 (iv), 8355 (v).
See 'Judicial,' 'Senate,' &c.
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7688, 7798 (iv).
Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 309 (i).
Private Bills (M.) to extend time, 1454 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com. (A. Lanctôt) 3rd Rep. (remarks) 6756 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Warburton) and Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 823 (amt. to amt.) 827; Agreed to (Y. 98; N. 74) 864 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, and Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (remarks) 310 (i).
Questions answered Orally (remarks) 700, 990, 1080 (i).
Questions, Incomplete Answers, &c. (remarks) 1013 (i).
Race Track Gambling, on M. (Mr. Miller) to print evidence, 10467 (v).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 967 (i).
——— B. 4 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 2°, 3946; in Com., 3946 (ii).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5235 (iii).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10193 (v).
Railways, Telegraph Rates, Treaty *re* Control (remarks) 8357 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4741 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4873 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4057 (iii).
——— Assurance *re* Farmers' Interest (remarks) 5542 (iii).
——— Butter and Eggs, Prices in London, Information from Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (remarks) 6509 (iv).
——— Debate (remarks) 3143 (ii).
——— Debates, Articles in Press *re* Obstruction (remarks) 10001 (v).
——— Debate, Resuming of (remarks) 5939 (iv).
——— Farmers and Manufacturers Interests, Speech of Mr. Nesbitt (remarks) 4663 (iii).
——— Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Rep. *re* Delegation (remarks) 3529 (ii).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1654 (i).
——— On Inquiry for Protocols, 2555 (ii).
——— On Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2439 (ii).
——— Lord Strathcona's Telegram *re* Reported Interview (read) 5126 (iii).
——— Negotiations between Can. and U.S. (remarks) on Address, 48 (i).
——— Negotiations with U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 1506 (i).
——— Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 2070, 2271 (ii).
——— Negotiations, Mr. J. A. Macdonald's Connection *re* (remarks) 4299 (iii).
——— Negotiations at Washington, Submission to Hse. before Signed (remarks) 1805.
——— Procedure *re* Resolutions, &c., (remarks) 5753 (iii).
——— Protests *re* (remarks) 3952 (iii).
——— Pulp and Paper Duties *re* (remarks) 2639 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., on Ques. of Order, *re* referring to previous debate (remarks) 8255 (v).
——— *re* Question (Mr. Monk) 4114 (iii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5950 (iv).
——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609 (ii).
——— Statistics, Accepting as Read and printing in Hansard (remarks) 6857 (iv).
——— Trade Statistics with U.S. (remarks) 6675 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7671 (iv).
——— letter from 'Globe' reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7678 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5736 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Campbell), 5954 (iv).
Returns, Notice to Members of bringing down (remarks) 5939 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8579 (v).
Rivière des Prairies Dredging Rep., on M. (Mr. Wilson) for Copy, 2163 (ii).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Defense at Public Functions (remarks) 941 (i).
Rosendale Mail Service on C.N.R., Pets. *re* (Ans.) 1291 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Manufacture of Stamps and Postcards &c. (Ans.) 983 (i).
——— Number &c. (Ans.) 983 (i).
Rural Mail Routes operating in Man. (Ans.) 1105 (i).
Rural Mail Service in East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 983 (i).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service (remarks) 9995 (v).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., on Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) *re* Amendments, 5723 (iii).
St. Johns, P.Q., Postmaster, Refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir' (Ans.) 1090 (i).
St. Lawrence River, Damming Long Sault Rapids, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3229 (ii).
——— Information *re* Bill before U.S. Senate (remarks) 4210 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 3058 (ii).
——— Legislation *re* at Washington (remarks) 3283 (ii).
——— Letter from Gov. Dix (remarks) 3840 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Mr. Allison's letter, 3769 (ii).
See "Long Sault".

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re* (Ans.) 3462 (ii).
See 'Natural Resources.'
Seal Fisheries Negotiations (remarks) 9594 (v).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 10197 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table, 10337 (v).
See 'Pelagic.'
Secretariat at London, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Papers, 5836 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 1507 (i).
See 'Imperial Conference,' &c.
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2663 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2709 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1726 (i).
Senate, Reform of, on Prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4314 (iii).
Senate Vacancy in P. E. I. (remarks) 2074 (ii).
See "Judicial."
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1373 (i).
See "Mails."
Small Pox Epidemic, Condition of House of Commons (remarks) 7252 (iv).
See 'Typhoid.'
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7248 (iv).
South African Parlt., Report of P. M. G. (remarks) 1580 (i).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3346 (ii).
Speaker of the House, Wearing of Official Robes, &c. (Ans.) 706 (i).
Speakers' Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola (Ans.) 926 (i).
——— Purchase of Birds (Ans.) 928 (i).
——— Purchase of Glassware (Ans.) 929 (i).
——— Purchase of Gramophone Records (Ans.) 927 (i).
——— Rental of Piano, &c. (Ans.) 927 (i).
Stamp Cancelling Machine, Cost, Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 806 (i).
Supply, (M.) for Com., 695 (i).
Supply, for Public Works (remarks) 10354 (v).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (public health) 5981 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1485; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 1013; High Commissioner (salaries) 1486 (i); Privy Council (clerkships) 8750 (v); (salaries) 1013 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8752; (Baddock and Iona) 8763 (iv); (Bonaventure River

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

and N. B.) 8764 (iv); (Canada and Australia) 8764 (v); (Canada and Cuba) 6058 (iv), 8775; Canada and G. B.) 8773; (Canada and Mexico) 8781; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8783; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 8785; (Port Mulgrave, &c.,) 8786; (P. E. I. and G. B.) 8788; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Islands, B.C.) 8787; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 8788 (v).

Miscellaneous—(Coronation, members and senators) 8680 (Imperial Conference ministers expenses) 8679; (Paris agency) 8694; (Pelagic sealing conference) 8678 (v).

Mounted Police (Coronation contingent) 8752 (pay of force) 8598); (subsistence) 8599 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax citadel) 1581 (i).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 6058; (commercial agents) 6059; (inspectors) 6059 (iv).

Taylor, Mr. Geo., Retirement as Chief Whip (remarks) 5 (i).

Trade Commissioners, Names of Countries, &c. (Ans.) 2156 (ii).

Trade Relations with Germany (remarks) 8403 (v).

Typhoid Epidemic, Prorogation of House (Ans.) 4676 (iii).

See 'Smallpox.'

U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadian Travellers (remarks) 6119 (iv).

—— Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations *re* (Ans.) 984 (i).

—— Trusts and Combines, Regulations in U. S. Courts, &c., on M. (Mr. Meighen) for Ret., 4346 (iii).

U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Armament of (Ans.) 7026; (remarks) 6362 (iv).

—— Passing through Canadian Canals, Permission from Govt. (Ans.) 10335 (v); (remarks) 6118, 7254 (iv).

University of Sask., Land Endowment *re*, (Ans.) 4111 (iii) .

Unorganized Districts, Deferred Elections (remarks) 10100 (v).

See 'Voters.'

Veterans, Grants to (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5217 (iii).

See 'Fenians.'

Voters Lists in Unorganized Territories, Delay, &c. (remarks) 9909 (v).

'Wanda' Yacht, Valuation by Customs (remarks) 5628 (iii).

Water Powers, Conservation of (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Water Powers owned by Dom., Legislation *re* Regulating (Ans.) 7804 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

See 'Long Sault,' &c.

Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 695 (i).

Wentworth, Number of Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret., 2557 (ii).

Westbrook Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1103 (i).

Western Farmers' Delegation, Control of Rates, &c. (remarks) 1508 (i).

See 'Farmers.'

Western Tour, and Tariff Promises (remarks) on Address, 45 (i).

W. Indies SS. Service, Specification *re* Contract (Ans.) 4466, 4674, 4925 (iii).

Whips, &c.: *See* 'Taylor.'

Winnipeg International Exposition, Govt. Assistance to (Ans.) 708 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).

Yukon Beer Import Tax Repeal B. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 1979 (ii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

Reciprocity with U. S., Res. from Yarmouth Farmers' Association (read) 4122 (iii).

—— Yarmouth Board of Trade, Res. *re* (read) 5550 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General), *Gaspé.*

Arrow Lake Postal Clerk (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of (remarks) *re* Question, 2373 (ii).

Bark Lake Post Office, Closing and Opening (Ans.) 6279 (iv).

Barrington Passage Bait Freezers Ret. (stmnt) 8889 (v).

Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Grantees, Rentals paid, Sums expended by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2197 (ii).

Birch Grove Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).

Cable, G.B. and Canada State-owned, Proposal *re* by G.B. and Can. (Ans.) 1905 (i).

See 'Telegraphs.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8815 (v).

Canso and Guyborough Mail Service, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 8994 (v).

Chemin Gouin Postmastership. Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 7038 (iv).

—— Postmaster A. C. Miquelon, Pension, &c. (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2506 (ii).

Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. (B. 217) in Com. on Res., 8906, 8924 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Cobalt Mail Service to Cochrane (remarks) 1804 (i).
Coronation Celebration at Ottawa, Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10353 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Apptmt. of Col. Landry (remarks) 8093 (v).
Dixon Post Office, Pets. *re* Change of Location (Ans.) 4670 (iii).
Don. Post Office, Mail Service to Toronto, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 9987 (v).
Dunnville Postal and Customs Collections (Ans.) 3470 (ii).
Elora Post Office, Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 6505 (iv).
English Mails to Mar. Provs.: *See* 'Mail Service.'
Escott Postmastership, Apptmt of, Charges against late Postmaster (Ans.) 4926 (iii).
—— Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6181 (iv).
—— Postmaster's Salary, Date of Increase (Ans.) 7602 (iv).
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Decoration of Govt. Buildings (remarks) 3369 (ii).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, Speech of P. M. G. at Montreal (remarks) 2080, 2268 (ii).
Franking for Fraudulent Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv). *See* 'Mails.'
Fraser River Mail Service, Application *re* (Ans.) 3463 (ii).
Gaspe Mail Service, Revenue *re* (Ans.) 3854 (ii).
Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders (Ans.) 7038 (iv).
Hall's Prairie Post Office, Pet. *re* Location, &c. (Ans.) 3468 (ii).
Haskett, Havelock, and New Tuskett Post offices, Distances between &c. (Ans.) 8991 (v).
Herron Post Office, Progress *re* (remarks) 9588 (v).
I. C. R. Mail Clerks allowing friends to ride in Mail Cars (Ans.) 8584 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9457 (v).
Leamington Post Office, Cost in Detail (Ans.) 9782 (v).
Letter Carriers, New Westminster, Free Transportation *re* Tramways, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2194 (ii).
Mails Delayed and mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c. (Ans.) 2372 (ii), 4668 (iii).
Mail Delivery, Free, Conditions *re* (Ans.) 4925 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 9538-9 (v).
Mail Service Estimates, Objections *re* passing (remarks) 4297 (iii).
Mail Service in Mar. Provs., Delivery of English Mails (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9544 (v).
—— (remarks) 8794 (v).
Maritime Mail Service, Delay *re*, Representations by Board of Trade, Halifax (remarks) 2376 (ii).
Montreal and Maritime Provs. Mail, Forwarding of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
Meteghan Centre Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4296 (iii).
Ministers Speeches, distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
Ministers Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7441 (iv).
Mississippi Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9252 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Brodeur) on Senate Amts., 9534 (v).
Montreal Letter Carriers, Addition to (remarks) 2647 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec (B. 222) 1° m., 9228; in Com., 9495 (v).
Naval Coronation Contingent, Names of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 9375 (v).
Naval Service, Medical Examiners for Recruits (Ans.) 8991 (v).
Nelson Postal Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Newspapers, Postal Regulations *re* Distribution of (remarks) 10341 (v).
Newspaper Trains, Special, Cost of Operation (Ans.) 9983 (v).
Parcel Post Rates, Reduction *re* (Ans.) 5934 (iv).
Parcel Post, Express Rates (remarks) 9915, 9937 (v).
Peel County Mail Service (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
—— Rural Mail Delivery, Generally (remarks) 10361 (v).
Postage Stamps, Canadian Design (remarks) 7108 (iv).
—— Refusal of Imperial Design (remarks) 6908 (iv).
Postage Stamps, New Issue, Condemnation *re* (Ans.) 9990 (v).
—— Prizes, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 5402 (iii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increases to, Classification *re* Offices, &c. (Ans.) 5934 (iv).
—— Pets. *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Post Office Act (stamp box) Amt. (B. 104) 1° m., 2736 (ii); 2° m., 8065 (v).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. (B. 216) M. for Com. on Res., 8585; in Com. on Res., 8906; in Com., 9567-8, 9577 (v).
Post Office Collections, Revenue in Cities (Ans.) 3862 (ii).
Post Office Dept., Overcrowding in Basement (Ans.) 6667 (iv).
Post Office Matters, Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).
Post Office Revenue and Expenditure, Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 10335 (v).
Post Office and Customs, Revenues for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw (Ans.) 4673 (iii).
Pratt's Siding Post Office, Request *re* Establishment (Ans.) 3067 (ii).
Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Sale of (remarks) 7109 (iv).
Railway Mail Clerks, Injuries, &c., Grants *re* (Ans.) 3860 (ii), 9537 (v)
——— Minimum and Maximum Salary, Claims *re* Increase (Ans.) 2160 (ii).
——— Names of Persons not passing Qualifying Examination, Date of Apptmts., &c. (Ans.) 3855 (ii).
See 'Post Office, B. 216, 'Supply.'
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 4005 (iii).
——— Mr. Bryce's Instructions *re* (remarks) 4141 (iii).
——— Denial *re* Annexationist (remarks) 4054 (iii).
'Review of Reviews' Collection of Extra Postage (Ans.) 2371 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery in Renfrew County (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).
See 'Mail Routes,' 'Peel,' &c.
Saskatchewan Post Offices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 6505 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Sheldon, C. D., Return to Canada (remarks) 6201 (iv).
Sorel Shipyard, Inquiry for Official Rep., 10203 (v).
Stamp Vending Machine: *See* 'P. O. B., 104.'

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (clerical assistance) 6063 (iv); (salaries) 4280 (iii).
Immigration (agents) 5185 (iii).
Post Office (Curren, R.C., gratuity) 4283; (letter carriers' boots) 4283 (iii); (mails) 6076; (mail service) 6179; (miscellaneous) 6182 (iv); (postmasters' salaries) 4290; (ry. mail clerks) 4281, 4286 (iii), 6082, 6179; (ry. mail clerks, compensation) 6088 (iv); (rural postmasters) 4281 (iii); (salaries) 6178 (iv); (stamps) 4280; (superannuation) 4285 (iii).
Public Works—Building—Ont. (Athens) 2092 (ii).

Tadousac Postmaster, Charges *re*, Apptmt. of Successor (Ans.) 5133 (iii).
Telegraph and Cable Services Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9641 (v).
——— *See* 'Cable.'
Thibodeau, Mr. Frank, Salary as Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 8100 (v).
Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause (Ans.) 3466 (ii).
Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance *re* (Ans.) 3861 (ii).
U.S. Tax on Canadian Shipping (remarks) 9248 (v).
Water Carriage of Goods Act Amt. (B. 212) 1°*, 8887; in Com., 9348 (v).
Windsor Letter Carrier, Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *Simcoe South.*
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 9225, (i).
Aliens outside of Canada, Inquiry for Ret., 7554 (iv).
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9221 (v).
Bank Act, Legislation this Session (remarks) 6441, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3602 (ii).
Barlow, John R., Emplymt. by Geological Dept. (Ques.) 8583 (v).
Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits *re* cutting Timber, Agent's Name, &c. (Ques.) 4304-5 (iii).
——— Place of Residence (Ques.) 5238 (iii).
See 'Christian.'
Big Bay Point Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 6005 (iv).
Bookkeeping of Depts., Names of Employees in Departments, &c. (Ques.) 1718 (i).
——— *See* 'Falconer.'
Bradford Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8822; in Com., 9258 (v).
C.P.Ry.. Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1834 (i).
Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3063 (ii).
Canada West Loan Corporation incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8564 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8569 (v).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9722 (v).
Christian Island Indian Reserve, Answer to Question (remarks) 4567 (iii).
——— *See* 'Beauscleil.'
Chrysler, Mr. F. H., Amounts paid by Govt. *re* Legal Service from 1896 to the present (M. for ret.*) 1727 (i).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy re, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2224 (ii).
Clarry, Mr. L. F., Payments to by Govt. for Professional Services (Ques.) 813 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7811 (iv).
Copyright Act Amt., Legislation *re* (remarks) 7557 (iv), 9594 (v).
Declaration of London. Consideration by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 5935 (iv).
Elevators, Terminals, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3499 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on Prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2381 (ii).
Falconer System of Book-keeping, Adoption of (Ques.) 1904 (i).
——— *See* 'Book-keeping.'
Farmers' Bank, Negligence of Govt., Protection (amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 8193, 8209, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 97) 8232 (v).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compention, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9617 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6639 (iv).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8655 (v).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) Ques. of Order, 9523 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238 (v).
G.T.Ry. Pension Fund, Rules, Regulations, &c. (Ques) 2153 (ii).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, Agreement *re* reinstatement, &c. (Ques.) 811 (i).
——— Minister's efforts a Success, &c. (Ques.) 810 (i).
——— Conciliation Board (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— Status of Men Reinstated (remarks) 3375 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Development Co. (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 2666 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry., Eastern Division Overbreak, Agreement *re* (Ques.) 1570 (i).
——— Lumsden Investigation, Total Cost *re* (Ques.) 1493 (i).
——— *See* 'Natl. Transcl. Ry.'
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9305 (v).
Holland Peat Investigations, &c. (Ques.) 4303 (iii).
Imperial Conference, Questions to be submitted by Canada, Par. from 'Morning Post' quoted, 4298 (iii).
——— Secretariat, &c., on M for Com. on Ways and Means, 7378 (iv).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 905 (i).
Judges appointed since 1896, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 8095 (v).
Legal Agents, appointed by Govt., Precautions *re* acting for Private Parties (Ques.) 813 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3249 (ii).
Mineral Deposits, Circular *re* Information by F. H. Forchet (Ques.) 4305 (iii).
Ministers, Speeches of, distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9254 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2777 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9241; in Com., 9496 (v).
N.T.Ry., Classification, &c., Arbitration Rep., *re* Investigation (Ques.) 1490 (i).
——— Completion of Eastern Division (Ques.) 1099 (i).
——— Construction Work, Estimated, Quantity, Cost, Bridges, &c. (M. for ret.*) 785 (i).
——— Contracts for Eastern Division, &c., (Ques.) 1095 (i).
——— Contracts Security Deposit, Amount of (Ques.) 1971 (ii).
——— Customs Duties on Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 8583 (v).
——— Defaulting Contractors, Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 1281 (i).
——— Eastern Division, Expenditure *re* 21 Contracts (M. for ret.) 5136 (iii).
——— Eastern Division Overbreak, Agreement *re* Progress Estimates (Ques.) 2434 (ii).
——— Eastern Division, Section Houses &c (Ques.) 1099 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

N.T.Ry., Eastern Division, Total Cost, to 31st Dec., 1910 inclusive of Quebec Bridge (Ques.) 5130 (iii).

——— Eastern Div., Total Expenditure *re* Construction &c. (Ques.) 9430 (v).

——— Estimated Cost and Mileage of Fencing, &c. (Ques.) 1094 (i).

——— Execution of Work under Contract, Delay *re* (Ques.) 6668 (iv).

——— Expenditure, Difference in Amount in Ret. &c. (Ques.) 4827 (iii).

——— Haney, Quinlan & Robertson, Contract *re* Construction of Locomotive Shops east of Winnipeg (M. for copy*) 785 (i).

——— Labour Conditions, Charges *re* Supplies (remarks) 8596 (v).

——— Over-Classification, Investigation, Reps. (M. for copy*) 4677 (iii).

——— Over-Classifications, Reduction *re* (remarks) 6272 (iv); 9899, 9995 (v).

——— Provision in Contract *re* G.T.P. taking over completed Sections (Ques.) 1093 (i).

——— Total Cost to complete Construction (Ques.) 5135 (iii).

——— Western Div., Total Cost *re* Construction (Ques.) 7591 (iv).

See "G.T.P. Ry."

Newmarket Canal &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10515 (v).

New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co's B. 170, on M. for Com., 8094 (v).

Niagara Falls Water Power, Quantity developed, &c. (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8348, (amt.) 8350; Neg. (Y. 65; N. 99) 8353 (v).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8594 (v).

P.E.I. Judicial Vacancy, Delay in Apptmt. (remarks) 7431 (iv).

P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2182 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Blocking Public Accounts Com., 990 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 527, 818 (amt.) 823 (i).

——— Proposed Amendment (notice) 696 (i).

Public Buildings for Post Offices, &c., Number, Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.°) 786 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3954 (iii), 7347 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders *re* Contract (M. for copies) 713, 1497 (i), 2068 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, American Engineers consulted by Min. of Rys. (Ques.) 697 (i).

——— Amount expended *re* Supervision (remarks) 6671 (iv).

——— Construction, Information *re* (prop. res.) 4319 (iii).

——— Contract with M. P. Davis, dated July 27th, 1903, Transfer of Same to Govt. &c. (M. for ret.*) 785 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4567 (iii).

——— Employment of Mr. Cooper *re* Inspection (Ques.) 6663 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Investigations, &c. (Ques.) 8102 (v).

——— Financial Loan, Interest, &c. (Ques.) 4665 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Tunnel Construction (Ques.) 6268 (iv).

——— Plans, Contract, &c. (remarks) 6273 (iv).

——— Plans and Specifications, Approval by Chief Engineer of G.T.Ry. Co. (Ques.) 4826 (iii).

——— Plans and Specifications, Instructions *re* (M. for papers*) 4677 (iii).

——— Remuneration, Supervision, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6449 (iv). 6670 (iv).

——— Superstructure Contract (remarks) 6670 (iv).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8400; in Com., 9314, 9379 (v).

Ry. Act Amt. (1903) c. 31, Proclamation *re* (M. for copy*) 786 (i).

Railway Crossings, Action of Ry. Comission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).

Ry. Shelter for Sectionmen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).

Railway Traffic Connections, Arrangements between Provinces and Ry. Commissioners (Ques.) 696 (i).

Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5053 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3681 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) Ques. of Order, 7550 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) Globe's Report *re* (remarks) 7602, 7671 (iv).

——— British Tariff Commission, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 6268 (iv).

——— Correction *re* Figures in Speech in Hansard, 3770 (ii).

——— Cor. *re*, Inquiry for, 2988 (ii).

——— Denial of Stmnt. *re* Member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) 5029 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Reciprocity with U.S., Farmers' and Manufacturers' Interests, Speech of Mr. Nesbitt, 4663 (iii).

—— French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty &c. (Ques.) 8097 (v).

—— Obstruction by Opposition (remarks) 9887 (v).

—— Ques. of Order, 5030 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order *re* Interruptions, 4451 (iii).

—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5953 (iv).

—— Statistics, Accepting as Read, and Printing in Hansard (remarks) 6858 (iv).

—— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Ques. of Order, 6892 (iv).

—— Statistics, Question *re* Vote of Member for Labelle, 6839 (iv).

—— U. S., Govt. Publication *re* Bureau of Statistics (remarks) 6673 (iv).

Returns, Delays in Preparation (remarks) 7555 (iv).

—— Inquiry for, 7256 (iv).

—— Notice to Members (remarks) 5939 (iv).

'Rexall', Registration by United Drug Co. ing, &c., (Ques.) 4672 (iii).

Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9171 (v).

Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2650 (ii).

Senate Chamber, Expenditure for Decoratting, &c. (Ques.) 1100 (i).

Senate, Reform of, on prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4312 (iii).

South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3347 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (seeds) 6223; Quarantine (animals' health) 5976 (iv).

Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6411 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing) 6408 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (enlarging office) 6409 (iv).

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 6410 (iv).

Canals — Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6412 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358; (tugs) 6359 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 6427; (surveys, inspections, &c.) 6452 (iv).

Canals—Murray (dredging) 6410 (iv).

Canals—Que. (dredging) 6411 (iv).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (lock gates, &c.) 6417; (upper entrance) 6416 (iv).

Canals—Trent (flood damages) 6454; (improvements) 6420 (iv).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6399; (stone protection) 6425 (iv).

Canals—Williamsburg (entrance pier) 6426; (machinery) 6427 (iv).

Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6639; (legal expenses) 6661; (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6197 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3383, 3410; Ques. of Order, 3450 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8752 (v).

Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8681 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Lunenburg) 1595 (i); Ottawa (McGillivray's contract) 5994 (iv).

Public Works — Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Amaguadees Pond) 9500; (Argyle Sound) 9501 (v).

Railways—G.T.P. (govt. director) 6448 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Fredericton) 5916 (iii); (freight cars) 5985 (iv); (Halifax) 5919; (highways protection) 5917; (Str. Scotia) 5928 (iii); (working expenses) 6341 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (inspections) 6452; (McGill University) 6445; (official cars) 6447; (ry. commissioners) 6427; (remunerations) 6449 (iv).

Victoria Museum, Defects in Building (remarks) 7351 (iv).

Water Carried Freight, Value, &c. (remarks) 6671 (iv).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *Huron, West.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 417 (i).

Baggage Smashing Prevention (B. 129) 1° m., 4198 (iii).

Bank Act Amts. (B. 297) 1° m., 8695 (v).

Business of the House, Public Bills for Thursdays (remarks) 2064 (ii).

Canada Shipping Act (registration) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6116 (iv).

Commercial Agent at Washington (remarks) 9511 (v).

Criminal Code (homicide by hunters) Amt. (B. 40) 1° m., 987 (i).

Daylight Saving (B. 26) 1°*, 663 (i).

Food Supplies in Cold Storage (B. 112) 1° m., 2983 (ii).

Foreign Consuls, Official Status (remarks) 9511 (v).

Gov. General, Duke of Connaught, Rumours *re* Apptmt. (remarks) 1725 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (marking) Amt. (B. 154) 1° m., 6034 (iv).

Load Lines on Ships (B. 98) 1° m., 2063 (ii).

Militia Regulations governing Admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1001 (i).

Offensive Weapons (B. 86) 1° m., 1642 (i).

—— Pets. *re* Legislation (Ques.) 3064 (ii).

—— Sale of, Par. in Montreal Papers *re* (remarks) 2557 (ii).

Ottawa City Health Conditions (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6367 (iv).

Pickford and Black SS. Service between Can. and W. Indies, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4465 (iii).

Poisons (Cocaine) Sales (B. 13) 1° m., 259 (i).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*
Secret Commissions (B. 87) 1° m., 1646 (i).
Sewage Disposal (B. 122) 1° m., 4039 (iii).
Water for Drinking Purposes (B. 131) 1° m., 4564 (iii).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships (B. 41) 1° m., 988 (i).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*
Fisheries Act (B.C. licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8447 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10239 (v).
Herring Traps, Close Season *re* (remarks) 2086 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1160 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 863 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) 10084 (v).

LORTIE, Mr. J. A., *Soulanges.*
Canadian Light and Power Co., Lease between Govt. &c. (M. for copy*) 1501 (i).
Reciprocity, Vote *re*, Par. in "Le Canada", Ques. of Priv., 3953 (iii).
Sevigny Island, Change of Name, &c. (Ques.) 1491 (i).
Water Powers on St. Lawrence, Concessions granted (Ques.) 9780 (v).

LOW, Mr. T. A., *Renfrew, South.*
Bankers' Association, Agreement *re* Competition (Ques.) 3466 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5297 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7186 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*
Address, The, 567 (i).
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2172 (ii).
British National Songs in N. W. Schools, Remarks of Mr. Armstrong (remarks) 4932 (iii).
C.P.Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1856 (i).
Dom. Steel Company of Canada, Date of Incorporation, Capital, &c. (Ques.) 9690 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Ques. of Order, 144 (i).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8464 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P. M. G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2270 (ii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr Beattie) 4361; (M.) to adjn., Debate, 4364; Agreed to (Y. 89; N. 49) 4380 (iii).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8975 (v).
Imperial Conference, Secretariat Formation, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7390 (iv).
I. C. R., Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1159 (i).
—— Telegraphers Board of Conciliation, Statute *re* Granted (Ques.) 2853 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9177 (v).
Negro Immigration, Restrictions *re* (remarks) 6527 (iv).
Newfoundland Export Trade, Total Value, Imports, &c. (Ques.) 2854 (ii).
Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8594 (v).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3890 (ii).
Public Works promised during Western Tours (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1632 (i).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5114 (iii).
Reciprocity, Agricultural Implements (remarks) 5745 (iii).
Supply.
Lighthouse and Coast Service ('Earl Grey') 6485 (iv); Postoffice (ry. mail clerks) 4285 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Parrsboro) 1632 (i).
West Indies Trade, Exports and Imports, Total Value (Ans.) 2854 (ii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *Toronto, South.*
American War Vessels, passing through Canadian Canals, Request from Washington *re* (Ques.) 10334 (v).
Baby Farm, Toronto, Sale of, Competition *re* (Ques.) 2155 (ii).
See 'Toronto Barracks.'
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7573 (iv).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8566 (v).
Census, Omissions in Enumerations, in Toronto (remarks) 10099 (v).
Coal Miners' Strike in West, Rep. of Conciliation Board, &c., on M. (Mr. Goodeve) 9704 (v).
Copyright Law and Imperial Copyright Conference, Canada's Action *re* (Ques.) 5134 (iii).
—— Legislation *re* (remarks) 9595 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Coronation, Naval Cadets, Method of Selection, &c. (Ques.) 9986 (v).

Curran, R. E., Compensation for Injuries *re* Ry. Mail Service (M. for cor.*) 3948 (ii).

Customs Collections in Cities, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 4042 (iii).
See 'Postoffice.'

Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 37) 1° m., 924 (i).

Don Post Office, Mail Service to Toronto, &c., Name of Contractor (Ques.) 9987 (v).

Donlands Postoffice, Removal of Site (M. for cor.*) 9994 (v).

Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff (Ques.) 10196 (v).

Empire Life Insurance Co., of Canada, incorp., (B. 71) 1°*. 1488 (i).

Farm Labourers, O.C., *re* Immigration Regulations from U.S., (remarks) 10099 (v).

Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr Beattie) 4355 (iii).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8664 (v).

Garden Seeds purchased for Indians in N. W., Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1717 (i).

Gas Meters in Toronto, Complaints *re* Excessive Measurements (Ques.) 3280 (ii).

Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U. S. and British, Authority *re* (Ques.) 9985 (v).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8550 (v).

G. T. Trainmen's Strike, Apptmt. of Judge Barron as Investigator (Ques.) 2158 (ii).

——— Resolution from Order of Ry. Conductors, (Ques.) 9988 (v).

——— Tel. sent by Minister of Labour to Messrs. Berry and Murdock (Ques.) 1105 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1421, 1548. 1729, 1761 (i).

Humber River Bridge, G. T. Ry. Plans *re* (Ques.) 2885 (ii).

Hydo-Electric Power Commission, Toronto, Mr. McGann's Application *re* (remarks) 1574 (i).

Immigrants, Efficient Medical Inspection, &c., (Ques.) 1716 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1520 (i).

International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 878 (i); in Com., 9193 (v).

International Waterways Commission, Names of Members, Amounts paid to, &c.. (Ques.) 3861 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* (remarks) 7259 (iv).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

International Waterways Commission, Inquiry for Ret., 4569 (iii).

Letter Carriers Superannuation, Amt. to the Act (Ques.) 1488 (i).

Levis Dry Dock, Plans Filed by Sir Robt. Perks, Subsidy, &c., (Ques.) 712 (i).

Minority Representation, Redistribution Bill, Intention *re* (Ques.) 9988 (v).

——— Speech of Sir Richard Cartwright (remarks) 9693 (v).

Munderloh and Company Limited Patent Relief (B. 203) 1°*, 8582 (v).

N. T. Ry. and Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry., Agreement *re* running Rights, &c., (Ques.) 2435 (ii).

Naval Cruisers ordered for Canada, Stmnt. in 'Navy,' (Ques.) 793 (i).

Navigation Licenses on Great Lakes, Regulations by U. S. Govt. (Ques.) 2375 (ii).

Orders Discharged (M.) 4464 (iii).

Postoffice Collections. Revenue in Cities, &c., (Ques.) 3862 (ii).

Postoffice and Customs Revenue for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw from 1906 to 1910 (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
See Customs.

Printing Bureau, Paper purchased, Inspection of (Ques.) 2373 (ii).

Ry. Act (commutation tickets) Amt. (B. 78) 1° m., 1551 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8402 (v).

Ry. Employees Protection B. 114 (Mr. R. Smith) on M. for 1°, 3219 (ii).

Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10191 (v).

Railway Mail Clerks, Accidents to, Grants *re* Injuries, &c. (Ques.) 3859 (ii).

——— Maximum and Minimum Salary, Claims *re* Increase. &c., (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

Railway Sectionmen, Complaints *re* Overwork, &c. (Ques.) 9987 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 9938 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4078 (iii).

———Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10016 (v).

——— North York, Challenge to Contest Riding (remarks) 7220 (iv).

——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, &c., (remarks) 6791, 6895 (iv).

Roman Catholic Church, Attack *re* by Member, Protest *re*, 3371 (ii).

Steel Bounties. Total Amount paid, &c., (Ques.) 3470 (ii).

Toronto Barracks Site, (Baby Farm) Re Valuations, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 981 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Toronto Barracks Site, (Ques.) 2153 (ii).
——— (remarks) 7557 (iv).
See 'Baby,'
Toronto Federal Buildings, Plan of Erection (remarks) 8479 (v).
Toronto Harbour Consolidation Act Amt. (B. 175) 1°*, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8235, 8535 (v).
Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal of (Ques.) 2367 (ii).
Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re* and Fair Wage Clause (Ques.) 3466 (ii).
Toronto Post Office, Addition to, Change *re* Specifications (Ques.) 805 (i).
Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance to Widow (Ques.) 3861 (ii).
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Members, Reps., O. Cs., &c., (M. for copies*) 1339 (i).
See 'International.'

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *York, South.*
Address, The, 98 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1341 (i).
B.C. Ry. Belt and Peace River Water B. 124 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4110 (iii).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c. (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 1806 (i).
——— (remarks) 1573 (i).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2509 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, &c., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9620 (v).
——— (remarks) 9999 (v).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of (remarks) 1507 (i).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10103 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1425 (i).
Imperial Conference Rep. presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 10117 (v).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1518 (i).
Mail Service with Allan SS. Co. (remarks) 4428 (iii).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9909 (v).
Questions and Motions proposed to be Introduced, Notice of, 1502 (i).
Ry. Act (commutation tickets) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 1°, 1551 (i).
Railways, Capitalization of, 5233, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5246 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Railway Rates in the West (remarks) on Address, 104 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2459 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4856 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4062 (iii).
——— Amendments *re*, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4125 (iii).
——— Announcement *re*, Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2643 (ii).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10020 (v).
——— Notice of Motion, 4049 (iii).
——— Pulp and Paper Duties, Information *re* (remarks) 2646 (ii).
——— Pulp and Paper Duties, Par. in New York 'Herald' (read) 2638 (ii).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2654 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2719 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1372 (i).
Telegraph and Cable Service Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9636 (v).

MacNUTT, Mr. T., *Saltcoats.*
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2398 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7262 (iv).

McCALL, Mr. A., *Norfolk.*
Canadian Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnstone before Com. on Ag. (remarks) 2993 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8854 (v).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2700 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (enlargement) 6401 (iv).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp, (B. 93) 1°, 1969 (ii); in Com., 5079, 5568, 5630; 3° m., 5252 (iii).
Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 162) 1°*, 6756 (iv).
Births and Deaths in Canada, Number, &c. (M. for ret.) 2679 (ii)
Dakin, Violet Jane Relief (B. 190) 1°*, 8187 (v).
Elbow and Bow River Water Powers, Applications *re* (Ques.) 1345 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*
Elbow River, Conserving of Water Flow (M. for cor.*) 1912 (i).
——— Water Power License, Agreements, &c. (M. for copies) 1501 (i).
Grazing Leases in the Foothills, Applications *re* (Ques.) 1492 (i).
Langdon Subdivision of C.P.Ry., Mail Service in Northwest (Ques) 1346 (i).
Manitoba and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s Charter, Transfer, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6505 (iv).
N.W. Ter. School Lands, Complete Procedure *re* Disposal, &c. (Ques.) 800 (i).
School Lands in Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, Revenues from Sales (M. for ret.*) 1911 (i).
——— Revenues from, &c. (Ques.) 1488 (i).
School Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal (Ques.) 1345 (i).

McCOIG, Mr. A. B., *Kent West.*
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5944 (iv).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *Northumberland West.*
British Crown Assurance Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8839 (v).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatoon.*
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) 1°*, 1969 (ii).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5572 (iii).
British Columbia and Central Canada Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 5127, 5253 (iii).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 201 (Mr. W. M. Martin) on M. for 2°, 8581; in Com., (amt.) 8981 (v).
C. P. Ry. (B. 108) 1°*, 2983 (ii).
Canadian Surety Co.'s incorp. (B. 151) 1°*, 5933 (iv).
Canada West Loan Corporation Co.'s incorp. (B. 169) 1°* 6906 (iv); in Com., 8563 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3501 (ii).
Hornell, Ethel May, Relief (B. 144) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 3994 (iii).
La Banque du Canada B. 123 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 5776 (iii).
Reciprocity—Saskatchewan Boards of Trade Res. (read) 5751 (iii).
——— Stmnt, of Mr. Shepherd (remarks) 5752 (iii).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*
Regina and Moose Jaw Town Sites, C.P.R.'s Interest *re* (Ques.) 2281 (ii).
Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amount still owing by Farmers (Ques.) 3848 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2706 (ii).

McGIVERIN, Mr. H. B., *Ottawa City.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His. Ex.'s Speech (moved) 10 (i).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2222 (ii).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 1069 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (water supply) 2588 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D., *Cape Breton North.*
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change (M. for cor.) 2166 (ii).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5081 (iii).
All Red Steamship Route incorp. (B. 105) 1°*, 2827 (ii); in Com., 4239 (iii)
See 'Imperial.'
Bait Freezers, Construction in Louisburg, &c., (M. for cor.*) 6505 (iv).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2226 (ii).
——— and Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2015 (ii).
Imperial Steamship's Co.'s incorp. (B. 105) on Senate Amts., 6610 (iv).
I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, (prop. res.) 1106 (i).
See 'All Red.'
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 970 (i).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2547 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2331 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 5014, 5260 (iii).
Reciprocity Debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Northrup) *re* Quotation, 5410 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1061 (i); Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3434 (ii).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 875 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H., *Sunbury & Queen's (N.B.)*

Canada Shipping Act (coal barges) Amt. (B. 118) 1° m., 3664 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Militia (allowance) 8532 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *Huron South.*

Combines Investigation Act, Restraint *re* United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Investigation (remarks) 5953 (iv).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5438 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7110 (iv).

Reciprocity—Agricultural and Farmers Associations, Res. approving Tariff (read) 5546 (iii).

Senate of Canada, Reform of (prop. res.) 4306 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 6219 (iv); Railways—I.C.R. (freight service) 5988 (iv).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W., *Cape Breton South.*

Alien Labour Law, Emplymt. of Foreign Labour on Public Contracts (remarks) 10374 (v).

Birch Grove, Pet. *re* Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6073 (iv).

Bonded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4464 (iii).

Bricks, Tiles, &c., Amount imported from G. B. and U. S., 1909-10 (Ques.) 2369 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act, Report *re* (remarks) 1987 (ii).

Customs Preventive Officers, Duties &c. (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

Fire Brick, imported into N. S., Number, Ports, &c. (Ques.) 3471 (ii).

Fish Wardens in Victoria, N. B., (inquiry for ret.) 5629 (iii), 6672 (iv).

——— (remarks) on Ret., 5733 (iii).

Glace Bay Bait Association, Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c. (Ques.) 4044 (iii).

——— Payments to from 1906-10, Dates &c. (Ques.) 3670 (ii).

——— (M. for copy*) 3948 (ii).

G. T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 5803 (iii).

Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Hague Arbitration, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Fundy Bay)on M.(Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup., 4618, 4687 (iii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com.. 1441 (i).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1127 (i).

McGillivray, Judge, and Conciliation Boards (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4274 (iii).

Naval Service, Medical Examiners *re* Recruits (Ques.) 8991 (v).

North Atlantic Collieries, Application *re* Conciliation Board (M. for cor.*) 3947 (ii).

——— Protest *re* Nomination on Conciliation Board (remarks) 4209 (iii).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 10550 (v).

Springhill Mines Strike, Conciliation Board Settlements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1058 (i).
Labour Dept. (conciliation board) 3401 (ii) 4262 (iii).
Militia (allowance) 8533 (v)
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8693 (v).

Post Office—Outside Service (mails) 6073 (iv); (superanuation *re* clerks) 4284 (iii).

'Wanda' Yacht, Valuation of (remarks) 5627 (iii).

Westville Post Office, Number of Bricks used (Ques.) 3471 (ii).

Wharfs, N. S., Contracts *re* Construction (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A., *Medicine Hat.*

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 1277 (i).

Animal Industry in Canada, Reps. Data &c. (M. for copies) 4677 (iii).

Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8123 (v).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8607 (v).

Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7850 (iv).

International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 874 (i); on M. for 2°, 9101; in Com., 9212 (v).

Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).

Milk River and St. Mary's Boundary: *See* "Long Sault" International Waterways (B. 36).

Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9321 (v).

Railway Charters, Granting by Parlt., Conditions *re* (remarks) on Railway Estimates, 5122 (iii).

Railway Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5122 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 8373 (v).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 5196 (iii); Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9548 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Alta (Lethbridge) 3009 (ii); Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (repairs) 9553 (v).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Application *re* Irrigated Lands Reserve (Ques.) 803 (i).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

Reciprocity—Statistics &c. Hearing of Motion read. Vote *re* 6839 (iv).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *Elgin East.*

Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

——— Post Office Revenue for 1908-1909 &c. (Ques.) 984 (i).

Canned Peas, Number of Cans imported and Amount of Revenue *re* &c. (Ques.) 3221 (ii).

Census Appointments for East Elgin, Names &c. (Ques.) 4302 (iii).

Fish Hatchery in East Elgin, Construction *re* (remarks) 5137 (iii).

Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6620 (iv).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 3276 (ii).

Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections &c. (Ques.) 985 (i).

Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9327 (v).

Railways—Transportation Problem. on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5101 (iii)..

Rural Mail Service in East Elgin, Number &c. (Ques.) 983 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6242; (seeds) 6222; Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6620 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Printing Bureau) 2363 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8874 (v).

MARTIN, Mr. A. M., *Wellington North.*

Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6829 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2614 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Marys.*

Beauharnois Canal, Alienation Reps. *re*, on M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2215 (ii).

——— Grantees, Rentals, &c., Sums expended, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2200 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4114 (iii).

Montreal Letter Carriers, Additional Numbers (remarks) 2647 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Railway Act Amt., (B. 4), 1°*, 148 (i); 2° m., 3943 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 2570 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M., *Regina.*

Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s. (B. 201) 1°*, 8476 (v); 2°m., 8581 (v).

Casualty Co., of Canada, incorp. (B 174) 1°, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8566 (v).

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William Terminals, Investigations *re* Mixing of Grain (prop. res.) 2377 (ii).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5456 (iii).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8543 (v).

Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief (B. 200) 1°*, 8477 (v); in Com., 8971 (v).

Grant, Maud Gertrude, Relief (B. 138) 1°*., 5619 (iii).

Half-Breed Scrip issued to J. W. Malboeuf, (M. for cor.*) 2161 (ii).

High River, Saskatchewan & Hudson Bay Ry. Co''s incorp., (B. 202) 1°* 8582 (v); 2°m., 8642 (v).

Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7844 (iv).

Kirkland, Walter Harvey Relief (B. 164) 1°*, 6756 (iv).

N. W. Mounted Police, Pay and Allowance &c., (Ques.) 8101 (v).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8589 (v).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Advances, &c., (Ques.) 7245 (iv).

Reciprocity,Fleming Grain Growers Ass'on. Res. (remarks) 5551 (iii).

———Tels. from Saskatchewan Municipalities (read) 5534 (iii).

St. Peter Indian Reserve Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5883 (iii).

Sterling Trusts Corporation incorp., (B. 32) 1°*, 817 (i); in Com., 2596, 2648, 3021, 3180, 3453, 3841 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6609 (iv).

SUPPLY—

R. N. W. M. Police (subsistence) 8603 (v).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A., *Portage la Prairie.*

Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties (prop. res.) 1915 (i).

——— Resuming Adjnd. Debate (remarks) 2253 (ii), 4383 (iii).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii), 6006 (iv).
Austin Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
Battleford Public Buildings, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3031 (ii).
Casualty Co., of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8571 (v).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4585 (iii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res., (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2401 (ii).
Ennis. D. N., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses (Ques.) 3847 (ii).
Estimates *re* Man., Discussion *re* (remarks) 2970 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation from the West, Control of Ry. Rates, &c. (remarks) 1508 (i).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res., (Mr. Beattie) 4353 (iii).
Floods on the Assiniboine, Pets. to Govt., Political Interference *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10255; 10293 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8540, 8541 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1429, 1756 (i).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6000 (iv).
Markey Fishing Leases, Inquiry for Ret. 6119 (iv).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to. on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2811 (ii).
Minnedosa Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3049 (ii).
Neepawa Post Office, Mail Route, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8351 (v).
Public Buildings in former Estimates, given precedence over new ones (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).
Public Works Building Plans, approved by Depts, previous to Aug. 5th, &c. (Ques.) 698 (i).
Railway Act (animals killed) Amt. (B. 23) 1° m., 529 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9401 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res. (remarks) 4498 (iii).
Reciprocity Papers, Comparative Prices, Printing of (remarks) 10469 (v).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A.—*Con.*
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of (remarks) 10524 (v).
Scrip to Northwest Settlers, Claims of Pioneers (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10121 (v).
——— Refusal of Claims (remarks) 1293 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 4730 (iii); Militia (salaries) 1029; Public Works (salaries) 1034 (i).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8683 (v).
Post Office—Outside Service (ry. mail clerks compensation) 6088 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Dresden) 2105; (Gananoque) 2112 (ii); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2130; (Listowel) 2141; (Midland) 2142; (Mitchell) 2148; (Peterborough) 2608; (Seaforth) 2626; (Sudbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2628; (Waterloo) 2634 (ii);
Public Works — Buildings — Que. (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1892 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2972 (ii).
U.S. Trusts and Combines, Regulations in U.S. Courts, &c. (M. for ret.) 4342 (iii).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7856 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 1301 (i).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S., *Grey, North.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 423 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop, Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1939 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3026 (ii).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Termination of, Cor. *re* (remarks) 2003, 2271 (ii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7480 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7560 (iv).
Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities dredged, Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 1905 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9260 (v).
Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c. (Ques.) 3608 (ii).
Civil Servants and Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9708 (v).
Cold Storage in Can., Govt. Aid to, &c. (Ques.) 1455 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Capital Cost, Dimensions, &c. (Ques.) 10337 (v).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

Combines Investigation at, Charges *re* (Ques.) 663 (i).

Coronation Contingent from Canada, Regulations *re* Apptmts (Ques.) 3220, 3277 (ii).

Dissolution of Parlt., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Opposition (remarks) 5737 (iii).

Drill Halls Generally, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2129 (ii).

Explosives, Number of Factories, Employees, &c. (Ques.) 2374 (ii).

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of, M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2191 (ii).

Farmers Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5324 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8217 (v).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9595; Amt. Neg. (Y. 45; N. 61) 9633 (v).

——— Estimated Number surviving, Pensions, &c. (Ques.) 1715 (i).

——— Grants to (Ques.) 1089 (i).

Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).

Fishery Regulations at Washington, *re* Newfoundland (remarks) 2071 (ii).

See "International".

Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup., 8487 (v).

Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4364 (iii).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8622, 8652, 9346 (v).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8240, 8920 (v).

G.T.R., Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1078 (i).

Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage available, &c. (Ques.) 1907 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1436, 1530, 1741 (i).

Indian Act Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8407 (v).

Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8078 (v)

I.C.R. Special Trains *re* Monument National Demonstration, Montreal (remarks) 2997 (ii).

International Fisheries Regulations, Ratification of (remarks) 1654 (i).

International Waterways Treaty (boundary water) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9097 (v).

International Railway Traffic, Points of Crossing, &c. (Ques.) 4466 (iii).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3062 (ii).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c. (Ques.) 9538 (v).

Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8338 (v).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6122 (i).

Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2532 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8091 (v).

Owen Sound Dock, Work *re* Construction (Ques.) 10337 (v).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9316, 9380 (v).

Ry. Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission, Agreement *re* Traffic between U.S., and Can. (remarks) 3054 (ii).

Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9228 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10192 (v).

Ry. Telegraph, &c., Rates, Treaty *re* Control (remarks) 8356 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2465 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4535 (iii).

——— Absence of Ministers during discussion (remarks) 8372 (v).

——— Articles in Press *re* Obstruction (remarks) 9999 (v).

——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 2989 (ii).

——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5950 (iv).

——— Res. by Associated Boards of Trade, Ont. (read) 4121 (iii).

——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609 (ii).

——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, 6797 (iv).

Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2601 (ii).

Steel Bounties, Renewal of (remarks) 3275 (ii).

Stone, Cut, Duty Between U.S. and Can., Value, &c. (Ques.) 1287 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9087 (v).

Civil Govt., Customs (salaries) 1067; Public Works (salaries) 1041 (i).

Fisheries (fish transportation) 6105 (iv); Ont. (inspectors) 6620 (iv); (overseers) 3819 (ii); (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6106 (iv).

Indians—N. W. T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6036 (iv).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Fergus) 2111; (Kingston, R. M. C.) 2136; (Peterborough) 2605 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1688 (i).

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings, &c., for 1910 (Ques.) 2159 (ii).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *Grey, South.*

Address, The, 229 (i).

Adjournment, Extension of Time (remarks) 9566 (v).

Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum (M.) 2365, 2429, 3599 (ii).

——— (M.) to sit during Sessions of the House, 8355 (v).

Canadian Railways, Accidents *re*, Investigation, &c. (prop. res.) 3922 (ii).

Canada West Loan Corporation incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8564 (v).

Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8576 (v).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 7) M. to place on Govt. Orders, 8789 (v).

Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1309 (i).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5354 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8227 (v).

——— Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2241 (ii).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9346 (v).

Interest Act Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 149; 2° m., 968; agreed to (Y. 87; N. 24) 975; in Com., 976, 1294, 1510-11; on Order for Com., 1406 (ii).

Ministerial Association, Ottawa, Res. *re* (remarks) 3059 (ii).

——— Attacks *re* by h. m. (remarks) 3372 (ii).

Minister of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2768 (ii).

Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 229 (i).

Quebec Bank Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9345 (v).

Race Track Gambling, (M.) to print Evidence, 10467 (v).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Com. on Res., 4906, 4937 (iii).

Révillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8580 (v).

Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2652 (ii).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2721 (ii).

MILLER, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*

South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3348 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (animals health) 5978; Ques. of Order, 5934 (iv).

House of Commons (telephones) 6337 (iv).

Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8690 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Lambert) 1900 (i).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Ry. Commission) 6434 (iv).

MOLLOY, Mr. J. P., *Provencher.*

Absence from H. of C., Ques. of Priv., 1353 (i).

Continental Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 196) 1°*, 8403; in Com., 8968 (v).

Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4373 (iii).

Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 148) 1°*, 5726 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com., on Res., 4183 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5908 (iii).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Acton Vale, Upton and St. Pie, Post Office Revenues (M. for ret.*) 980 (i).

Address, The, 111 (amt.) 133; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 595 (i).

Address to His Majesty King George, Intention of Govt. *re* (remarks) 7824 (iv).

Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220, on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. orders, 9350 (v).

Arthabaska and Drummond Elections, Cor. laid on Table, 194 (i).

See 'Drummond.'

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6304, 6324 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Alienation of, Reps. *re* (M. for cor.) 2214 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1713 (i).

Beauharnois Canal Grantees, Improvements, Value of Franchise, &c. (Ques.) 1711 (i).

——— Rentals, Sums expended by Govt., &c. (M. for ret.) 2194 (ii).

——— Privileges, Advertisement for Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1712 (i).

——— Total Cost, Revenue from Grantees, Arrears, &c. (Ques.) 1713 (i).

Canadian Commissioner for France, Vacancy, Apptmts. *re* (Ques.) 1971 (ii), 8103 (v).

Canadian General Development Co., Total Amounts paid to, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 655 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Canadian Light and Power Co.'s Plans *re* Improvements (remarks) 7261 (iv).
—— Plans, &c., Date of Approval (Ques.) 7591, 7805 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9265 (v).
C.P.R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction, &c. (M. for cor.) 766 (i).
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid *re*, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 661 (i).
Carillon Water Power Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c. (Ques.) 8700 (v).
See 'Ottawa River.'
Carrier-Laine Works, Purchase of by Govt. Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 8992 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9049 (v).
Census Enumerators, Names, Number, &c. (Ques.) 4465 (iii).
Census, Hochelaga Division, Names of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 9372 (v).
Census for Jacques Cartier, Names of Enumerators, &c. (Ques.) 9431 (v).
—— Names of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 9372 (v).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2504 (ii).
Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to *re* Immigration (Ques.) 8308 (v).
Co-operation Credit (B. 11) 1° m., 194; 2° m., 1302; in Com., 1302 (i).
Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity (Ques.) 7025 (iv).
Declaration of London, Adoption of, Inquiry for Papers, 3530 (ii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, 'pounding England' Speech of Notary Begin (remarks) 57 (i).
—— on Ques. of Order, *re* Mr. Gauvreau's insulting language (remarks) 77 (i).
—— quotations from Speeches, &c., on Address, 125 (i).
Fabre, Mr. Hector, Date of Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 5933 (iv).
Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Delegation, Rep. *re* (remarks) 3529 (ii).
—— French Edition, Inquiry for, 9075 (v).
Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re* (Ques.) 1489 (i).
Gaspé Mail Service, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 3854 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Use of by Americans (Ques.) 7804 (iv).
Govt. Printing, Amounts paid to Newspaper Offices (M. for stmnt.) 944 (i).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, Basis of Settlement by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 809 (i).
MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Great Northwestern Telegraph Co., Request for Board of Conciliation, &c. (Ques.) 5639 (iii).
Hay Claims, Delay in repayment to Canadian Exporters (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Hochelaga Census Enumerators, Names, &c. (Ques.) 9432 (v).
Hydro-Electric Co., Limited Water Power Lease on Ottawa River (Ques.) 9430 (v).
—— Tenders called, &c. (Ques.) 9352 (v).
Imperial Conference, Report *re*, Complete, presented to Parlt. (amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10103 (v).
—— Information *re* Precis Rep. and Further Rep. (remarks) 9783 (v).
—— Inquiry for Rep., 9690 (v).
—— Precis *re* (remarks) 9694 (v).
—— Premier's Return from, Amount expended (Ques.) 9780 (v).
Imperial Defence Committee Report (M. for copy) 944 (i).
—— Additional Copies (prop. res.) 2215 (ii).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re* (prop. res.) 2927, 2967 (ii).
I. C. R., Ice Contracts at Riviere du Loup Terms, &c. (Ques.) 2437, 3853 (ii).
International Naval Conference, Final Protocol, (M. for copy) 3073 (ii).
International Prison Congress, Canadian Representative, &c. (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
International Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Crairman, Mr. George Gibbons (remarks) 4741 (iii).
Lafleur, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt., Interference in Elections (Ques.) 1907 (i).
Lanctot, Mr. A.: *See* Priv. and Elections.
'Le Devoir,' Quotations from, *re* Drummond Elections, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) 471 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Dates of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.) 771 (i).
Mail Delivery Free in Towns, &c., Conditions *re* (Ques.) 4925 (iii).
Maple Sugar Adulteration, Pet. *re*, Amt. to Foods Act (Ques.) 5131 (iii).
Marieville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 4636 (iii).
Mergers, Competing Industries, Notice of Discussion, 2736 (ii).
See 'Industrial.'
Military School, Montreal, Selection of Site, Price, &c. (Ques.) 1713 (i).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) on M. for 3°, (amt.) 7717, 7560; in Com., 7718 (iv).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Montreal Post Office, Electrical Fixtures, Drawings *re* (Ques.) 1714 (i).
—— Mailing and Registering Facilities (Ques.) 1715 (i).
Naval Defence, Govt. Proposals, on Address, 112, (amt.) 133 (i).
Naval Policy of Govt., Conscription *re* (remarks) on Address, 241 (i).
Naval Policy, Amt. to Address, Neg. (Y. 67; N. 120) 651; on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Address, 595 (i).
Naval Service of Can., 'Bristol' Type, Specifications &c. (Ques.) 1279 (i).
—— Coal Consumption by Govt. Cruisers, Quantity, &c., per day (Ques.) 7209 (iv).
—— Construction, Tenders *re* (remarks) 8355 (v).
—— (Ques.) 8700 (v).
—— Expenditure *re* (M. for stmt.*) 786 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 4471, 4659 (iii).
—— Names of Employees, Domicile, Duties Assigned, Salaries, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 932 (i).
—— Navy Act, Rules and Regulations (M. for ret.) 1499 (i).
—— (Ques.) 7804 (iv).
—— Navy Regulations, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 4665 (iii).
—— 'Niobe', Contracts *re* Provisions, &c. (Ques.) 793 (i).
—— 'Niobe', Date of laying of the Keel, Repairs in England, &c. (Ques.) 793 (i).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Gun Practice, Approximate Cost., &c. (Ques.) 7209 (iv).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Loan by Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 983 (i).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Speed, Result of Official Trials (Ques.) 7209 (iv).
—— Par. in 'Naval Annual' *re* Scrapping of Cruisers (remarks) 931 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' Guns, Type of (Ques.) 1490 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' listed as ineffective (remarks) 1070 (i).
—— 'Rainbow,' Struck off Effective List (Ques.) 1081 (i).
—— Recruiting by Postmasters (remarks) 7261 (iv).
—— Ships building for Govt., Par. in 'Ottawa Free Press' (remarks) 866 (i).
—— Total Expenditure since 31st Oct., 1910 (Ques.) 5638 (iii).
Netherland Loan Co., Rep. by Mr. W. T. R. Preston *re* Establishment in Canada (M. for copy) 766 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Netherland Loan Co., (prop. res.) for Com., 781 (i).
—— Cor. between Mr. Preston and Govt. (M. for copies*) 3142 (ii).
—— Further Cor., Reps., &c. (Ques.) 5639 (iii).
—— Inquiry for, 7349 (iv).
—— Statement by W. T. R. Preston *re* Chief Justice Fitzpatrick, Official Notification (Ques.) 2669 (ii).
Ottawa River and Carillon Water Powers, Lease, &c. (M. for cor.*) 9994 (v).
Pecuniary Claims Convention, *re* Hay Claims, Objections, &c. (Ques.) 802 (i).
Post Office Act B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 9567, (amt.) in Com., 9568, 9577 (v).
Preston, W. T. R., and Sir Chas. Fitzpatrick: *See* 'Netherland.'
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot), on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com. 7889; (amt.) 7899, Neg. (Y. 56; N. 98) 8030 (v).
—— (remarks) 6756 (iv).
Proportional Representation, (M.) for Sel. Com., 3228 (ii).
Quebec Bridge. British Empire Bridge Co.'s. Deposit, Amount, &c., (Ques.) 9981 (v).
—— Agreement *re* Commission (remarks) 3073 (ii).
—— Commission of Expert Engineers, Amounts paid to, &c., (Ques.) 1714 (i).
—— Contract for Reconstruction (remarks) 4740 (iii).
—— Members of Construction Board, (Ques.) 9981 (v).
—— Tenders *re* Carriage Way, &c., (Ques.) 9979 (v).
Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ques.) 8992 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2456 (ii).
—— in Com. on Res., 3284; (amt.) 3289; Neg. (Y. 72; N. 97) 3292 (ii).
—— (amt.) *re* Loyalty to G. B., 4051 (iii).
—— Answer to Question on Paper (remarks) 4114 (iii).
—— Cor. with American Govt. *re* Champ Clark's Speech, Inquiry for, 3954 (iii).
—— Debate, Resuming of, (remarks) 5939 (iv).
Restigouche Riparian Association B. 176 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 7589 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2150 (ii).
Riviere des Prairies, Completion of Deepening, &c., (Ques.) 1714 (i).
—— Dredging, Rep. of *re*, on M. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) for Copy. 2163 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Riviere des Prairies, Survey, Rep. of Engineer, &c., (M. for ret.) 2161 (ii).
Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 799 (i).
——— Speech *re* Naval Service at public function (remarks) 932 (i).
Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt., or N. T. Ry., &c., (Ques.) 2851 (ii).
St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 1489 (i); 4666 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Buoys at Sorel Shipyard, Charges *re* (Ques.) 7025 (iv).
Ste. Marie Division Postoffice, Defective Site. &c., (Ques.) 10336 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com. 9170 (v).
Scrip to Northwest Settlers, Claims of Pioneers (remarks) 10132 (v).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2731 (ii).
Sessional Clerks, Application *re* Increase of Salary (Ques.) 5404 (iii).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue, &c., (Ques.) 4825 (iii).
Sorel Marine Shops, Complaints *re* Theft, &c., (Ques.) 1088 (i).
Sorel Shipyards, Investigation, Instructions to Commissioners, &c.. (Ques.) 7039 (iv).
——— Investigation into Irregularities (remarks) 6758 (iv).
——— Rep. of Commissioner *re* Investigation, Inquiry for, 9994, 10096, 10203 (v).
Soulanges Canal, Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* Administration of (remarks) 6273 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que., (Montreal barracks) 3152 (ii).
Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept., (Ques.) 1723 (i).
Tadousac Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges *re*, Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 5133 (iii).
Tobacco Duties of Canada and U. S., (Ques.) 7025 (iv).
——— Leaf Tobacco, Total Imports, &c., for last three years (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
Trade Commissioner to Mexico, Date of Apptmt. of Mr. Bouley (Ques.) 8993 (v).
Transportation—Georgian Bay as a Waterway (amt.) on M. for Sup., 5137, on Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5163 (iii).
Trusts: *See* "Industrial."
Water Powers (conservation) (B. 49) 1° m., 1277 (i).
Water Powers, Conservation of, Legislation *re* (remarks) 7261 (iv).
Water Powers owned by Dom., Legislation Regulating (Ques.) 7803 (iv).

MURPHY, Hon. C., (Secretary of State), *Russell.*
Aliens employed by Govt. living outside of Canada, on Inquiry for Ret., 7554 (iv).
Book-keeping in Depts., Names of Employees, &c., (Ans.) 1718 (i).
'Canada's Farthest South,' Cost of Printing and Preparing (Ans.) 2886 (ii).
Canned Peas, imported into Canada (Ans.) 3279 (ii).
Civil Service, Appointments from South Grey, on Inquiry for Ret., 2555 (ii).
Civil Servants, filling Municipal Positions, on Inquiry for Ret., 7554 (iv).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. S Sharpe) on M. for 2°, 1297 (i).
Dom. Steel Co. of Canada, Date of Incorporation, Capital Stock, &c. (Ans.) 9690 (v).
External Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Govt. Printing, Amounts paid to Newspaper Offices, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Stmt., 944 (i).
Loughrin, Police Commissioner, Number of Convictions before (Ans.) 1569 (i).
Ministers, Travelling Expenses, on Inquiry for Ret., 3954, 4568 (iii).
Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons Imported (Ans.) 1721 (i).
Postoffice Dept., Money Orders, &c. (Ans.) 1101 (i).
Printing Bureau Employees, Religious Status (Ans.) 3606 (ii).
Printing Bureau Investigation, Report (presented) 8 (i).
——— Printing, &c. (M.) 8 (i).
——— Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 1364 (i).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7706, 7729 (iv).
——— Dismissal of Mr. R. E. Cook (Ans.) 2672 (ii).
——— Money Loss, &c., (Ans.) 794 (i).
——— Number of Dismissals, Names, &c. (Ans.) 709 (i).
——— Paper purchased, Inspection of (Ans.) 2375 (ii).
Public Buildings, Inquiry for Ret., 7348 (iv).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 701 (i).
Reciprocity, Canadian Coasting Laws affecting Grain and Hogs (Ans.) 5134 (iii).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8093 (v).
'Rexall' Registration by United Drug Co. of U. S. in Canada (Ans.) 4672 (iii).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).
Statutes, French Translations, Corrections (remarks) 8089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 1472; Secretary of State (salaries) 1472 (i).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of, (remarks) 10096 (v).
Yukon Ter. Ordnances (presented) 8 (i).

NANTEL, Mr. W. B., *Terrebonne.*
Address, The, 179 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6312 (iv).
Arthabaska and Drummond Election (remarks) on Address, 179 (i).
Laurier Reception at Montreal, Montreal Harbour Commission's Expenditure (Ques.) 9982 (v).
Militia Surveys, Expenditure in each of last five years (Ques.) 1102 (i).
Naval Service for Can.. Par. in Ottawa 'Journal' *re* Cruiser building, 196 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7988 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9427 (v).
Richelieu Electoral District, Charges against Mr. Lanctot *re* Painting Private Dwelling, Notice of Motion, 4566 (iii).
Rigaud Postoffice Buildings, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3067 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 8130 (v).
Ste. Thérèse Postoffice, Purchase of Site (Ques.), 1715 (i).

NEELY, Mr. D. B., *Humboldt.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. *re* Naval Policy, 325 (i).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on Prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2403 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer System, *re* Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3488, (amt.) 3491, Agreed to (Y. 96, N. 54) 3524 (ii).
Fiscal Policy of Can., Speech of P. M. G. at Manufacturer's Banquet, Montreal (remarks) 2079 (ii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4368 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9517 (v).
Homestead Irregularities, Punishment *re*, on Ques. of Order, 5563 (iii).
Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c. (Ques.) 3223 (ii).

NEELY, Mr. D. B.—*Con.*
Privileges, Ques. of, *re* Speech by Member for Dauphin as to Selection of Capital for Saskatchewan, 5620 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3563 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5560, 5595 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3007 (ii).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W., *Oxford, North.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup.. 6297 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s. incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5081, 5572 (iii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3026 (ii).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4241 (iii).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 2433, 3604 (ii).
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6212 (iv).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 201, on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8982 (v).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1°*, 1487 (i); in Com., 3182, 3454 (ii).
Conciliation Board, Settlement of Strikes, Ques. of Order, 4267 (iii).
Co-operative Credit Society's B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1311 (i).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5424 (iii).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Company's incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8550, 8919 (v).
Grand Trunk Railwaymen's Strike, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4257 (iii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7856 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8082, 8747 (v).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2596 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3062, 3182 (ii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1232 (i).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024, 3181 (ii).
Milk and Cream shipped in Western Ont., Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6436 (iv).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*

Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 7723 (iv).

New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com., 8522; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster, 8958 (vi).

Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2337 (ii).

Peoples Ry. Co.'s, (B. 110), 1°*, 2983 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6611 (iv).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9326, 9390 (v).

Railway Committee (M.) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) 7549 (iv).

——— (remarks) 7627 (iv).

——— British Preference, Increase of (remarks) 7214 (iv).

——— Farmers' Interests, &c., (remarks) 5544 (iii).

Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8966 (v).

Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp., B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2596, 2649, 3180, (ii); on Senate Amts., 6610, (iv).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2703 (ii).

Sheldon. C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, (remarks) 1390 (i).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 817 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6238; (seeds) 6219 (iv); Labour Dept., (conciliation board) 4257 (iii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings, East.*

Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 378 (i).

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5080, 5570 (iii).

Canada Cement Co.'s (B. 205) 1°*, 8582 (v).

Dini, Victor, Release from Penitentiary, &c.. (Ques.) 8582 (v).

External Affairs, Absence of Minister from Washington Negotiations (remarks) 1658 (i).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission to Investigate, on Amt., (Mr. Henderson) 5363 (iii).

G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of men, Apptmt. of Judge Barron (M. for cor.*) 2376 (ii).

——— Inaction of Labour Dept., (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

——— (M. for cor.*) 786 (i).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings East.*

G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1077 (i).

——— Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4248 (iii).

Lymburner Contracts with Govt. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 3206 (ii).

Matches, Phosphorus, Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2041 (ii).

Printing Bureau Investigation (M.) for Royal Commission 7687, Neg. (Y. 56; N. 92) 7801 (iv).

——— Evidence under Oath, Printing, Dismissal of Mr. R. E. Cook (Ques.) 2672 (ii).

Private Bills, Second Readings and in Com. (remarks) 8641 (v).

Quebec Bridge, Investigations *re* River Bed, Tests, &c. (Ques.) 658 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8402 (v).

Rainbow' and 'Niobe', Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c. (Ques.) 792 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4861 (iii).

Reciprocity, Denial of Statement of Member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) Ques. of Priv., 5035 (iii).

——— Quotation by Member for Cape Breton (Ques. of priv.) 5293, 5407 (iii).

Reciprocity, Letter of 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7677 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 4248 (iii).

United Shoe Machinery Co., Application *re* Investigation, Govt. Representative, &c. (Ques.) 2672 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F. (Minister of the Interior), *Edmonton.*

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5083, 5568 (iii).

Algoma Timber Permits, Amount of Dues paid (Ans.) 4674 (iii).

Aylwin Irrigation Grant, Papers *re*, on Inquiry for, 8192, 9076 (v).

Bear Indian Reserve, Medical Officer, Payments to (Ans.) 3224 (ii).

Beausoleil Indian Agent at Christian Island, Place of Residence (Ans.) 5289 (iii).

Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits to cut Timber, Agent's Name, &c. (Ans.) 4304-5 (iii).

See 'Christian.'

Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of (Ans.) 3464 (ii).

Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application *re* Homestead (Ans.) 3221 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Bidwell Bay, B.C. Govt. Land Reserve, Disposition of (Ans.) 1284 (i).
B.C.Ry. Belt and Peace River Water (B. 124) 1° m., 4110 (iii).
See 'Homestead Regulations,' &c.
Bradley, Mr. John, Irregularity *re* Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5585 (iii).
Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5191 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8326 (v).
——— (personal explanation) 8187 (v).
——— (remarks) 8092 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com. 8566 (v).
Chacastapsin Indian Reserve, Owner &c. (Ans.) 4301 (iii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 147) 1°*, 5726 (iii); in Com., 7869 (iv).
Christian Island Indian Reserve, Answer to Question (remarks) 4568 (iii).
See 'Beausoleil.'
Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases to (Ans.) 5291 (iii).
Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to as Immigration Agent (Ans.) 8309 (v).
Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S. (remarks) 4471 (iii).
See 'Negroes.'
Courtice, Mr., Emplymt. by Liberal Bureau (stmnt.) 9897 (v).
Creighton, Mr. W. O., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Dominion Lands Act (school lands) Amt. (B. 107) 1° m., 2851 (ii); (M.) to discharge order for 2°, 8088 (v).
——— (B. 194) 1° m., 8187 (v).
Dom. Lands Act Orders in Council, Amendments to, in Com. on Res., 1982 (i), 8087 (v).
Dominion Lands, Sask., Gross Receipts, Cost of Administration, &c. (Ans.) 3221 (ii).
Se 'Saskatchewan,' &c.
Elbow and Bow River Water Powers, Applications *re* (Ans.) 1345 (i).
Elevators, Terminals, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3512 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8113 (v).
Ennis, N. D., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses (Ans.) 3847 (ii).
Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2189 (ii).
——— Stmt. *re*, 2263 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Farm Labourers from U. S., O. C. Regulations *re* Immigration (remarks) 10099 (v).
Forests Reserves and Parks (B. 85) 1° m., 1640 (i); in Com., 8084, 8606, 8652, 9345 (v).
Garden Seeds purchased for Indians in N. W., Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1717 (i).
Graham, Mr. D., Apptmt. as Indian Agent (Ans.) 5291 (iii).
Grain Act (standards) Amt. (B. 209) 1°*, 8887, 2° m., 9512 (v).
Grand Trunk Development Co., Govt. Reserve on Homestead Lands (Ans.) 3466 (ii).
——— Number of Acres sold to, Price, &c. (Ans.) 2366 (ii).
Grazing Leases in Foothills, Applications *re* (Ans.) 1492 (i).
Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1722 (i).
Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908 in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23 (Ans.) 4112 (iii).
Homesteads, Pre-emptions and Purchased, Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 812 (i).
Homestead Regulations in B. C., Application *re* Ry. Belt, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 2857 (ii).
See 'B. C. Ry. Belt,' 'Indian Reserve,' &c.
Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage Available (Ans.) 1907 (i).
Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 1284 (i).
Hope Suburban Townsite, Date of Payment of Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re* (Ans.) 3068 (ii).
——— Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval of Govt. (Ans.) 3846 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Lands, Number of Acres sold *re* Construction Fund (Ans.) 796 (i).
Immigrants entering Canada, Cognizance of Destination (Ans.) 814 (i).
——— Number from G. B., and U. S., Amount expended, Names of Agents, &c. (Ans.) 808 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 47) 1° m., 1069 (i); 2° and in Com., 2005 (ii).
Immigration Agents, Total Amount of Commissions paid (Ans.) 2436 (ii).
Immigration, Amount expended in Belgium and France (Ans.) 9991 (v).
——— Amount expended in U. S. (Ans.) 9991 (v).
——— Bonus paid *re* Three Swiss Girls, &c. (Ans.) 2436 (ii).
——— Commissions to Agents for Western Canada (Ans.) 9991 (v).
——— Efficient Medical Inspection (Ans.) 1716 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Immigration, Expenditure in U.S. and G.B. for 1910 (Ans.) 4300 (iii).
—— Immigration into Eastern Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
—— Money Qualification, *re* Operation of Act (remarks) 151 (i).
—— Number received from Europe, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 809 (i).
—— Number since 31st March last to the present, on M. (Mr. U. Wilson) for Ret., 1498 (i).
—— Organization, Cor. with Miss Wileman (remarks) 9376 (v).
—— Premiums paid by Can. Govt. for 1910-11 (Ans.) 9991 (v).
—— Statistics, Publishing of (remarks) 2366; (stmt.) 2557 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. (B. 177) 2° m., 7825; in Com., 7846 (iv), 8406; 3° m., 8104, 8193, 8403 (v).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Indian Reserve Lands outside of Ry. Belt, B. C., Jurisdiction *re* (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
See 'B. C.'
Indian Reserves in Ont., Fences, Settlement of Disputes *re* (Ans.) 1910 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9123 (v).
James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians, &c. (Ans.) 1083 (i).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9487 (v).
Japaneese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications (Ans.) 791 (i).
Land Patents for S. E. ¼ of Section 6, Tp, 7, Issue of (Ans.) 5834 (iii).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5605 (iii).
McGillicuddy Charges: *See* 'Can. Northern.'
Man. Swamp Lands, Concession to Prov. (remarks) 6759 (iv).
Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B. (remarks) 9376 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of into N. W. (remarks) 5912 (iii).
—— Restrictions *re* (remarks) 5944, 6524 (iv).
See 'Colored Aliens.'
New Westminster, Govt. Land Grants issued, &c., (Ans.) 1291 (i).
Northern Ontario, Settlement of, Govt. Assistance (remarks) 6767 (iv).
Obabikong and Sabikong Indian Reserves, Tenders *re* burned Timber (Ans.) 1344 (i).
Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8590 (v).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9419 (v).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10192 (v).
Regina and Moosejaw Town Sites, C.P.R.'s Interest, &c. (Ans.) 3281 (ii).
Ruddick, R. F.. Application *re* Homestead (Ans.) 3279 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions, &c., to Rev. J. McDougall, on M. (Mr. Bradbury) for Copies, 1292 (i).
—— Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Amount of Sales, Expenses. &c., (Ans.) 787 (i).
—— Cor. *re* Original Documents (remarks) 8111 (v).
—— Investigation by Rev. J. McDougall, &c., (Ans.) 787 (i).
—— Moneys paid Govt., Complaints, &c., (Ans.) 1974 (ii).
—— Original Documents before Royal Commission (stmnt.) 8477 (v).
—— Original Documents, &c., (remarks) 8192 (v).
—— (remarks) 8356 (v).
—— Rep. in Winnipeg 'Telegram' *re* Speech, Ques. of Priv., 3840 (ii).
—— Request for Official Documents (remarks) 9899 (v).
School Lands in Man., Sask., and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal (Ans.) 1345 (i).
—— Procedure *re* Disposal (Ans.) 800 (i).
—— Total Acreage, Amounts realized, &c. (Ans.) 1489, 1908 (i).
See 'Dom. Lands Act.'
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers, on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10133 (v).
—— Refusal of Claims, &c. (Ans.) 1294 (i).
Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amounts still owing by Farmers (Ans.) 3848 (ii).
—— Amount *re* (Ans.) 3225 (ii).
Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Emplymt. of (Ans.) 6272 (iv).
Songhees Indian Reserve (B. 179) in Com. on Res., 7248; in Com., 7824-5 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Indians (contingencies) 4726; (salaries) 4725; Interior (clerical assistance) 4739; (salaries) 4726 (iii).
Dom. Lands—(Banff, water works) 6052; (buffalo) 6049; (forestry convention) 6052; (parks) 6049 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5165 (iii); (seed grain) 3836 (ii), 6047 (iv).
Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 8884 (v); N.W.T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046; (payments to Rev. J. Semmens) 6036; N.S. (medical attendance) 6036; Que. (medical attendance) 6035 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Interior (boundary surveys) 9546 (v); (Dom. lands, homesteads) 5553. 5561 (iii); (Dom. lands, surveys) 9547 (v); (immigration agents) 4729 (iii); (seed grain) 9551; (water investigations) 9550 (v).

Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 1723 (i).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Lands reserved, &c. (Ans.) 803 (i).

Timber Berths in B.C., Removal of from Hall's Prairie (Ans.) 3282 (ii).

Timber Lands, &c., on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3955 (iii).

Timber Licenses in New Westminster District, Pets. against Renewals, &c. (Ans.) 3222 (ii).

Water Powers Conservation B. 49 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 1°, 1278 (i).

Western Farmers as Immigration Agents to Europe (Ans.) 799, 1284 (i).

Winnipeg River Water Powers, &c., on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bradbury) 3955 (ii).

Yukon Beer Import Tax, Repeal of, in Com. on Res., 1977 (ii).

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *Toronto West.*

Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 1302; in Com., 1303 (i).

Farmers' Bank Proceedings, Stmnt. *re* Warning to Fin. Minister (remarks) 10472 (v).

Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10517 (v).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *Northumberland East (O.)*

Brighton Wharf, Vote *re* (remarks) 1655 (i).

Census Enumerators, Inaccuracies in Quebec (remarks) 7217 (iv).

Fish Ladders on Trent Canal (remarks) 4824 (iii).

Fish Preservation in Trent River, Action of Govt. (remarks) 1503 (i).

Homestead Applications in New Westminster Districts, Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1237 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to refer Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 845 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2449 (ii).

—— Opposition to in Riding, Ques. of Priv., 6767 (iv).

—— Ques. of Priv. *re* Vote, 3343 (ii).

OWEN, Mr. C. L.—*Con.*

—— Tel. of Senator Cummins, *re* Manufactured Products (remarks) 4115 (iii).

Supply for Public Works, &c. (remarks) 10354 (v).

Victoria Museum, Ottawa, Inspection *re* Defects in Building (remarks) 7349 (iv), 9252 (v).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Address, The, 197 (i).

Agriculture, Govt Aid to, on Amt (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv).

Archives Dept., Commission of Historical Work, Care of Documents, &c. (Ques.) 2156 (ii).

—— Names of Staff (Ques.) 2155 (ii).

Census Commissioner, French Apptmt. (Ques.) 2155 (ii).

Cold Storage Depots during 1907-10, Total Amounts paid (Ques.) 2437 (ii).

Cruisers manned by Canadian Marines, Names, &c. (Ques.) 805 (i).

English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters (Ques.) 1080 (i).

Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Negotiations *re* Transfer (Ques.) 799 (i).

Exhibition Grants, Subsides paid *re* (Ques.) 2437 (ii).

Fisheries Service, Control by Federal Govt. (Ques.) 983 (i).

—— Number of Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 805 (i).

Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4378 (iii).

Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplmt. by Govt., fined for Electoral Corruption (Ques.) 2673 (ii).

Immigration, Amount expended in Belgium and France (Ques.) 9990 (v).

—— Amount expended in U.S. (Ques.) 9991 (v).

—— Commission to Agents in Western Canada (Ques.) 9991 (v).

—— Number received from Europe, Names of Agents, &c. (Ques.) 809 (i).

—— Number from G.B., U.S., &c., Amount expended, Names of Agents, &c. (Ques.) 807 (i).

—— Premiums by Canadian Govt. for 1910-11 (Ques.) 9991 (v).

I.C.R. Mail Clerks allowing friends to travel in mail cars (Ques.) 8584 (i).

Naval Bill, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) on Address, 197 (i).

Nicolet Military Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 8585 (v).

Nicolet Customs Collections for 1906-11 (Ques.) 8584 (v).

PAQUET, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Nicolet Post Office Building, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 8584 (v).
——— Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c. (Ques.) 8789 (v).
——— Pet. *re* Annex, &c. (Ques.) 8584 (v).
Nicolet River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ques.) 8585 (v).
Paper Imports into U.S., Value, &c. (Ques.) 2674 (ii).
Paris Exposition, 1900, Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 7602 (iv).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 8019 (v).
——— Ques. of Order, 8010 (v).
Pulp Wood Exports to the U. S., Value of (Ques.) 2674 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Advances to, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 2851 (ii).
——— Members *re* (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Railway Commission, Aptmt. of French Canadian (Ques.) 1103 (i).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents) 5182 (iii).
Trade Commissioners for Can., Names of Countries, &c. (Ques.) 2156 (ii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *Lambton, West.*
Currie, Wm. Francis Relief (B. 215) 1°*, 8955 (v).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7836 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2959 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1518 (i).
Ontario, Michigan Ry. Co.'s (B. 168) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Railway Locomotive Boiler Inspection (B. 30) 1° m., 699 (i).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (overseers) 3810; Public Works —Buildings, Ont. (Brantford) 2098 (ii).
U.S. Immigration Officers residing in Can., &c. (Ques.) 1723 (i).

PATERSON, Hon. W. (Minister of Customs), *Brant.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 346 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Imports into Can. since 1908, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 1350 (i).
——— Complaints *re* Manipulation of Duties &c. (remarks) 1359 (i).
Agricultural Products imported into B.C. from U.S., Australia, &c. (Ans.) 7345 (iv).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Agricultural Products and Dairy Produce imported from U.S., Value, &c. (Ans.) 9992 (v).
Agricultural Products imported into Canada, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 5402 (iii).
Beef, Pork, &c., Quantity imported from Oct. 1910 to Feb. 1911 (Ans.) 6265 (iv).
Bounded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 4464 (iii).
Bricks, Tiles, &c., Number imported from G.B. and U.S., 1909-10 (Ans.) 2370 (ii).
Butter, Cheese and Meats imported into Canada, Weight, Value, &c. (Ans.) 4927 (iii).
Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada for Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911 (Ans.) 4671 (iii).
——— Suppl. Answer laid on Table, 6177 (iv.)
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U.S. Officials (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Canada and W. Indies Trade Relations Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Canned Peas, Amount imported, Revenue received (Ans.) 3221 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. (B. 203) M. for Com. on Res., 8477; in Com. on Res., 8715 (v).
Coal and Coke, Quantity, Value imported into Canada from U.S. (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
Coal imported from U.S. into Ont., Value of Duties (Ans.) 4011 (iii).
Coasting Trade Act, Changes *re* (Ans.) 4675 (iii).
Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity (Ans.) 7025 (iv).
Customs Act Schedules, Average Value in 1910 and 1896 (Ans.) 801 (i).
Customs Collections in Cities, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 985 (i), 4042 (iii).
Customs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Customs Entries at Vancouver, by Kelly & Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Barnard) for Copies, 713 (i).
Customs Free Entry of Goods, Date of last Entry (Ans.) 804 (i).
Customs Goods entered free at Vancouver by Kelly & Co., on M. (Mr. Bernard) for Copies, 932 (i).
Customs Preventive Officers, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).
Dairy and Farm Products, Quantity, Value, &c. of Importation from U.S. (Ans.) 9362 (v).
Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron (Ans.) 6268 (iv).
Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value on Articles in Schedules of Customs Act, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Ret., 1105 (i).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries (Ans.), 4467 (iii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks), 8116-18 (v).
Exports and Imports, Quantity and Value to Australia, Japan, &c. (Ans.), 9369 (v).
Farm and Garden Products, Imports, Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.), 7034 (iv).
Farm Products entered at Windsor, (Ans.), 7597 (iv).
——— exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 8701 (v).
Farm Products imported from U. S. into Kingston, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3668 (ii).
Farm Products, Dutiable Exports by Provs. into U. S. (Ans.) 7026 (iv).
Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U. S. (Ans.) 1496 (i).
Fire Bricks imported into N. S., Number, &c. (Ans.) 3471 (ii).
Fish Tariff, Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty (Ans.) 2886 (ii).
Govt. Officials in Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1058 (i).
——— *See* "Mercier."
Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &c. (Ans.) 794 (i).
Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ans.) 2161 (ii).
Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U. S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 8984 (v).
Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Value, &c. (Ans.) 5634 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3470 (ii).
Loans in 1909, 1910, Negotiations *re*, &c. (Ans.) 797 (i).
Mahone Bay Customs Collector, Dismissal of (Ans.) 4302 (iii).
Mercier, Mr. George, Customs Official, Member of Town Council (Ans.) 4044 (iii).
Mica Exports 1900 to 1910 (Ans.) 5290 (iii).
Mica Imports, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Milk and Cream, Quantity exported (Ans.) 6269 (iv).
——— Exports to U. S. for March and April, 1911 (Ans.) 8790 (v).
——— Exports to U. S. for 1910-11, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 7038 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Customs Duties on Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 8583 (v.)
Newfoundland Export Trade, Imports, &c. Total Value (Ans.) 2854 (ii).
Nicolet Customs Collections from 1906-11 (Ans.) 8584 (v).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Oshawa Customs Collector, Resignation of Mr. G. F. Blamey (Ans.) 3225 (ii).
Paper Imports into U. S., Value of (Ans.) 2674 (ii).
Pig Iron imported for Steel Rail Mills, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 4829 (iii).
Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3223 (ii).
Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections (Ans.) 985 (i).
Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910 (Ans.) 6271 (iv).
Pulp Wood, Exports to the U. S., Value, &c. (Ans.) 2674 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer, 5126 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3316 (ii).
——— Absence of Ministers during discussion (remarks) 8365 (v).
——— Dairymen's Ass'cn. of Ont., (remarks) 4570 (iii).
——— French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 8098 (v).
——— Inquiry for Pets, &c. (Mr. Bradbury) 3058 (ii).
——— Oleomargarine, Admission of (Ans.) 6668; (remarks) 6504 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order *re*, 4137 (iii).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6889 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6820 (iv).
——— Statistics from Trade and Commerce Dept., Reply of Dep. Min. (remarks) 6511 (iv).
——— Summerland 'Review,' Editorial *re* Fruit Growers (read) 4123 (iii).
Shafting imported since April, 1910, Quantity and Value, &c. (Ans.) 7594 (iv).
Sheep, Lambs, Horses, &c., imported or admitted into Canada, &c. (Ans.) 8988 (v).
Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c. (Ans.) 4467 (iii).
Sinking Funds, Legal Amounts required, Bounties paid, &c. (Ans.) 982 (i).
Stone Cut, Duty between Can. and U. S., Value, &c. (Ans.) 1288 (i).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1048 (i)., 5992 (iv).; Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3008 (ii).
Tobacco, Duties on Imports and Exports to U. S. (Ans.) 7025 (iv).
Tobacco Leaf, Total Imports, &c. into Canada for last three years (Ans.) 5405 (iii).
'Wanda,' Yacht, Date of Entry at Customs Port in Canada, Notice *re* (Ans.) 5934 (iv).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
'Wanda' Yacht, Ques. of Priv., 5623 (iii).
West Indies Trade, Exports and Imports, Total Value, &c. (Ans.) 2854 (ii).
Wilhelm Telephone Factory, Seizure at, Compromise, &c. (Ans.) 7601 (iv).
Wolfe Island Custom Official, Apptmt., &c. (Ans.) 8100 (v).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220 (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. orders, 9350 (v).
Bank Act. Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9340 (v).
British Development Ry. Co.'s incorp, B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 5127 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9274 (v).
Census, Omissions in Enumeration (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9711 (v).
Census Taking, System *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4340 (iii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices. Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2222 (ii).
Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9710 (v).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1310 (i).
Coronation Celebration at Ottawa, Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10354 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Moneys used, &c. (personal explanation) 196 (i).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8124 (v).
Estimates, Mail Service, Objection *re* passing, 4296 (iii).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8472 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada and P. M. G.'s Speech in Montreal (remarks) 2266 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8606, 8669, 9346 (v).
Franking for Fraudulent Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of (Ques.) 930 (i).
—— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 4224 (iii).
Indian Reserve Lands outside of Ry. Belt, B. C., Jurisdiction *re* (Ques.) 2678 (ii).
I. C. R., Excursion Rates *re* Monument Nationale Demonstration in Montreal, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).
—— (remarks) 2996 (ii).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3061 (ii).
Montreal Legal Firms, Answer to Question, (remarks) 1012 (i).
Mounted Police—Death of Inspectors on Northern Patrol (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
N. T. Ry., Rails and Fastenings, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1099 (i).
Naval Dept., Boot Contract, Tenders, Patterns, &c. *re* (Ques.) 2675 (ii).
'Niobe' Wages of Seamen, Discontent *re* (remarks) 530 (i).
Nominingue Postoffice Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2335 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).
Postoffice Act (stamp vending machines) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 8069 (v).
Privileges and Elections Com., (A. Lanctot) 3rd Rep. of Com. (remarks) 6756 (iv).
Public Works Contracts, Penalties, *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, Inquiry for Rets., 4567 (iii).
Public Works Supply, Objection *re* Full Vote, 9555 (v).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9345 (v).
Questions and Answers, Orally and Written (remarks) 989 (i).
Ques. of Priv., Riordon Paper Co., Cor. *re* Connection with, 10197 (v).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 2°, 3943 ; in Com., 3947 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Can., 6769; Amt. Neg. (Y. 64; N 98) 6837 (iv).
—— Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper by U.S. (Ques.) 4468 (iii).
—— Butter and Eggs Prices in London, Information *re* by Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (remarks) 6508 (iv).
—— Negotiations at Washington, Reported Draft of Proposals (remarks) 2065 (ii).
—— U.S. Trade Statistics, Inquiry for, 6675 (iv).
—— Vote of Member for Labelle, Question *re* hearing Motion Read, 6839 (iv).
St. Andrew's Wharf, P.Q., Tenders *re* Construction, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3608 (ii).
Ste. Marie de Monnoir Post Office (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1698 (i).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9082 (v).
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coin) 6060 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1485 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 6065 (iv).
Fisheries (Robichaud, Wm. compensation) 6106 (iv).
Geological Survey (explorations) 9551 (v).
Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9548 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 8777; (Canada and Mexico) 8782; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8784; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 8786; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8788 (v).
Militia (allowances) 8533 (v)
Miscellaneous — (Coronation decorations) 9565; (coronation trip, members and senators) 8681 (v).
Mounted Police (pay of force) 8598; (subsistence) 8602 (v)
Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Chatham) 1610; (Fairville) 1611; (Hartland) 1619; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (St. John drill hall) 1624 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Parrsboro) 1629 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2619 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (generally, repairs) 1675; (Lévis armoury) 1679; (Maisonneuve) 1692; (Marieville) 1698; (Quebec custom house) 1885; (Quebec immigrant) 1886; (Roberval) 1887; (Rock Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (Three Rivers) 1902; (Westmount) 1903 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 9561; (highway protection) 9560 (v).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*
Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1277 (i).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8769 (v).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *Hastings, West.*
Belleville Docking Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iv).
Belleville Public Building, Draping for His Maj.'s Death (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board, incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7565 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8850; in Com., 9268 (v).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7818 (iv).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5321, 5487 (iii).
Fisheries Appointments, Inquiry for Ret. 5836 (iii).

PORTER, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7829 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Contractors and Labour Conditions (remarks) 8597 (v).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidies, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8336 (v).
Ontario Fisheries Service, Number of Officers, Services, Salaries, &c (Ques.) 6157 (iv).
Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8590 (v).
Port Credit Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7712 7771 (iv).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9318, 9381 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 9745 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order, referring to previous debate, 8258 (v).
——— Res. from Trent River Paper Co. (read) 4117 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, Quarantine, &c (animals health) 5962; (dairying) 6244 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8768; (Canada and Cuba) 8776 (v).
Mounted Police (subsistence) 8599 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 6027; (quarantine stations) 6027; (draping buildings) 6026 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville drill hall) 6033; Ottawa (heating, &c.) 6027 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (L'Ardoise) 6029; Margaree) 6029; Ont. (Victoria) 6023 (iv).

PRICE, Mr. W., *Quebec West.*
Dry Dock at Quebec, Construction *re* by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 9988 (v).
Freight Car Service, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Contract, Plans, &c. (remarks) 7103 (iv).
Reciprocity, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6820 (iv).
——— (remarks) 6894 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 1697 (i); Railways—I.C.R. (freight car service) 5983 (iv).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*
Constantineau, Judge, Number of Motions Heard, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).

PROULX, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Hawkesbury Interprovincial Bridge (remarks) *re* Answer to Questions, 4227 (iii).
Naval Defence, Govt. Policy (remarks) on Address, 497 (i).

PROWSE, Mr. L. E., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3901 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W. (Minister of Public Works), *St. John City and County.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5568 (iii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3392, 3459 (ii).
Armouries, &c., in Canada, on Inquiry for Ret., 1461 (i).
Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7470 (iv).
Bathurst, N.B., Dredging, Total Quantity and Cost (Ans.) 803, 1285 (i).
Battleford Public Buildings, Cor. (read) in Com. of Sup., 3005 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3030 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, Grantees, Rentals, Sums expended, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2281 (ii).
Belleville Docking Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6012 (iv).
Bracebridge Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).
Breakwaters in Digby County, N.S., Contracts *re* Construction (Ans.) 657 (i).
Brighton Wharf, Vote *re* (remarks) 1657 (i).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1683 (i).
Bronte Harbour Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 7341 (iv).
—— (remarks) *re* Questions, 7349 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7561 (iv).
Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities dredged, Earnings, &c. (Ans.) 1905 (i).
Canadian Light and Power Co., Date of Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 7591, 7806 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8840; in Com., 9265 (v).
Canada West Loan Corporation incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8564 (v).
Carman Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3020 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Carrier-Lainé Public Works, Purchase of, &c. (Ans.) 8992 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8566 (v).
Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 8984 (v).
Chatham, N.B., Public Buildings, Purchase of Site, Names of Owners (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Capital Cost, &c. (Ans.) 10337 (v).
—— Subsidy (prop. res.) 9244 (v).
Coronation Celebration in Ottawa, Absence of Ministers (Ans.) 9990 (v).
—— Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10353 (v).
Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for current year (Ans.) 814 (i).
Drill Halls Generally, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2116 (ii).
Drill Halls in Man., Cost of (Ans.) 1975 (ii).
Dry Dock at Quebec, Construction *re*, &c. (Ans.) 9988 (v).
Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by "International", on M. (Mr. S. Sharpe) for Ret., 1498 (i).
Eastern Dredging Co., Letting of Contracts to (Ans.) 813 (i).
Ellis, J. A. & Ottawa Lighting Contracts: *See* 'Woods.'
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Dept., (remarks) 2994 (ii).
—— *See* 'Public Works,' &c.
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Number of Buildings decorated at Govt. Expense (Ans.) 4667 (iii).
—— Authority of Govt. *re* Decorations of Govt. Buildings (Ans.) 925 (i).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4350 (iii).
Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders *re* (remarks) 2648, 3671 (ii), 4724 (iii).
—— Names of Days ordered by Dept., 4382 (iii).
See 'St. George's.'
Fredericton Pavement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
French River Dam (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re* (Ans.) 1489 (i).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10248 (v).
Georgetown Govt. Buildings, Drainage *re* (Ans.) 3469 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5157 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8543, 8917 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Grand Bend, Right of Way, Purchase of (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. Subsidy, Cor. &c. (Ans.) 9371 (v).
See 'St. John Valley Ry.'
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of Men (remarks) 1507 (i).
G.T.P. Developing Co., Land purchased from (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 7806 (iv).
Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of (Ans.) 930 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 4225 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1543, 1778 (i).
House of Commons, Ottawa, Water supplied to (statement) 2553 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4480 (iii).
——— Rep. of Agriculture Dept. (read) 5401 (iii).
——— *See* 'Smallpox,' 'Typhoid.'
——— Ventilation in House of Commons (remarks) 4210 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4480 (iii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' 'Typhoid.'
Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation incorp. B. 56 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 3994 (iii).
Humber River Bridge, G. T. Ry. Plans *re* (Ans.) 2885 (ii).
——— Obstruction to Navigation (Ans.) 5403 (iii).
Hydro Electric Power, Connection across McGann Property (remarks) 1598 (i).
Imperial Realty Co.. *See* 'Woods Building.'
Imperial Steamship's Co.'s incorp., B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) on Senate Amts., 6611 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 979, 1524 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (B. 36) in Com. on Res., 867; 1°* of B., 923 (i); 2° m. 9091, (amts.) 9094; on M. for 2°, 9139; in Com., 9156, 9183 (v).
See 'Waterways' 'Long Sault.'
——— Ques. of Order in Com., 9180 (v).
International Waterways Commission (Lake Erie) Rep. (presented) 924 (i).
See 'Waterways' 'Long Sault.'
Jardine, Mr. John, Payment by Govt. in excess of Work (Ans.) 4670, 5405 (iii).
Jesus River Improvements, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 804 (i).
King, Dr., Cost of Residence at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 804 (i).
——— Rental *re* (Ans.) 1349 (i).
Kingston Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7805 (iv).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv)
Lake Winnipeg Navigation, Icebreaker *re* (remarks) 4222 (iii).
Lethbridge Postoffice, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).
Levis Dry Dock, Plans filed, Subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 713 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3234 (ii).
——— *See* 'International B. 36.'
Lorneville Wharf, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Lunenburg Tower Clock, Specifications *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2578 (ii).
——— Stmt. of Chief Architect (read) 2360 (ii).
Lunenburg, N.S., Dredging, Plans *re* (Ans.) 2158 (ii).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3389 (ii).
Marieville Postoffice, Purchase of Site (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c. (Ans.) 1348 (i).
Meteghan Landing Place, Rep. *re* Defective Condition (Ans.) 4044 (iii).
Military School, Montreal, Selection of Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 1714 (i).
Milton Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1872 (i).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 7440 (iv).
See 'Public Works.'
Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site *re* (Ans.) 9993 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3049 (ii).
Monetteville Cut, Lake Nipissing, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1495 (i).
Montreal Postoffice, Electrical Fixtures, Drawings, &c. (Ans.) 1714 (i).
——— Mailing and Registering Facilities (Ans.) 1715 (i).
Napanee River Dredging, Papers laid on Table, 1903 (i).
——— (remarks) 4050 (iii).
Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of (remarks) 5913 (iii).
New Edinboro, N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 1283 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 8642; on Amt., 8956; on M. for 3°, 8963 (v).
Niagara River Water Power, Regulations, &c. (stmnt.) 8890 (v).
——— *See* 'International B. 36.'
Nicolet Military Accommodation (Ans.) 8585 (v).
Nicolet Post Office, Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c. (Ans.) 8789 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 8584 (v).
——— Pet. *re* Annex (Ans.) 8584 (v).
Nicolet River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ans.) 8585 (v).
Nominingue Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 2435 (ii).
Ottallie Creek Public Works, N.B., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2275 (ii).
——— New Leases, &c. (Ans.) 1281 (i).
——— *See* 'Victoria Museum.'
——— Parliament Grounds, Water Supply, &c. (remarks) 2583 (ii); 7346 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'
——— Seybold Building Elevator, Reimbursement *re* Installation (Ans.) 1350 (i).
——— Sussex Street, Deptl. Block, Plans laid on Table, 4824 (iii).
——— Sussex St. Govt. Properties, Names of Owners, &c. (Ans.) 6666 (iv).
Ottawa Municipal Lighting Plant, Number of Govt. Buildings lighted (Ans.) 1280 (i).
——— *See* 'Woods Building, &c.'
Ottawa City Sanitary Conditions, Conditions *re* Public Health (remarks) 5539 (iii).
Ottlecock Dam, Construction of (Ans.) 2852 (ii).
Owen Sound Dock, Proceeding with Work (Ans.) 10337 (v).
Parrsboro Public Building, Instructions *re* Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. Rhodes) for copy, 1728 (i).
——— Post Office Return, on Inquiry for, 8535 (v).
Parry Sound Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1879 (i).
Perley, Mr., Connection with Riordan Paper Co. (remarks) 10197 (v).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April, 1910 (Ans.) 6267 (iv).
Petawawa Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).
Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 7590 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Piles Federal Works, Charges *re* (Ans.) 8104 (v).
Port Credit, Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).
——— Public Works Expenditure, for 1909-10 (Ans.) 5638 (iii).
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1101 (i).
——— Lowest Tender (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Port Perry Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1881 (i).
Post Office Buildings, Advertisement for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1882 (i).
——— Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1871 (i).
P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2181 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Lennox) *re* Blocking Public Accounts Com., 997 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 840 (i).
Public Buildings, on Inquiry for Ret., 7347 (iv).
Public Buildings, Cost of, Ques. of Order *re* discussion in Sup., 2101 (ii).
Public Buildings in former estimates, given Precedence over new ones (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2113 (ii).
Public Works Building Plans, approved by Dept. previous to Aug. 5th, (Ans.) 698 (i).
Public Works Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).
Public Works Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4567 (iii).
Public Works, Travelling Expenses, on Inquiry for Ret., 7440 (iv), 8356, 9071 (v).
Public Works, Vote for Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Discussions *re* in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Quebec Public Works Estimates (remarks) 1639 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9331, 9380 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6806 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10024, 10051 (v).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7610, 7673; Letter from Hansard Reporter, (read), 7675; Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, 7675 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, 7616 (iv).
Red Point Wharf, Expenditures *re* (Ans.) 3469 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Returns, on Inquiry for, 4570 (iii).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7257 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8577, 9166 (v).
Rigaud Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3067 (ii).
Riviere des Prairies, Completion of Deepening, &c. (Ans.) 1714 (i).
—— Rep. of *re*, on M. (Mr. Wilson) for Copy, 2164 (ii).
St. Andrews. Man., Dam Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3039 (ii).
St. Andrew's Dam, Sum for Completion, (remarks) 1509 (i).
St. Andrews Rapids, Fish Ladder, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
St. Andrew's Wharf, P.Q., Tenders *re* Construction Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3608 (ii).
St. Charles Rifle Range, Winnipeg, Sale, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 7343 (iv).
St. Croix River, N.B., Construction of a Public Work, Proposal *re* (Ans.) 1348 (i).
St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
—— Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 1489 (i).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly the Flag (remarks) 7553, 7687 (iv).
See 'Flags.'
St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 2675 (ii).
St. John Drill Hall, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 5129, 5631 (iii).
St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 814 (i).
—— Rental of Office, &c. (Ans) 2673, 3065 (ii).
St. John River Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5646 (iii); in Com., 8411 (v).
St. Lambert Govt. Lands, Options on Land, &c. (Ans.) 2677 (ii).
St. Lambert Public Buildings, Option *re* (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 2577 (ii).
St. Lambert River Dam, Legislation *re* at Washington, 3283 (ii).
—— *See* 'Long Sault.'
Ste. Marie Post Office Division, Defective Site, &c. (Ans.) 10336 (v).
St. Peter's Breakwater, Repairs, &c. 7344 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
St. Peter's Bay Wharf, Repair of (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
Ste. Therese Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 1715 (i).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9168 (v).
Seagull Dock, Date of Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).
Security (Stirling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2600, 2655 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6609 (iv).
Senate Chamber, Expenditure *re* Decorations (Ans.) 1100 (i).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue, &c., (Ans.) 4826 (iii).
Smallpox Epedimic, Condition of House of Commons, 7253 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'
South African Parliament, Rep. of Postmaster General (remarks) 1580 (i).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry, (Mr. Blain) for Ret., 3346 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Militia— (salaries), 1027; Public Works (contingencies) 1047 (i); 5993 (iv); (salaries) 1032 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 3007; (Lethbridge) 3009; (Macleod) 3003; (Strathcona) 3011; (Vegreville) 3011; (Wetaskiwin) 3011 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 3012; (Cranbrook) 3013; (Duncan) 3014; (Fernie) 3014; (Grand Forks) 3015; (Greenwood) 3015; (Nanaimo) 3015; (Nelson) 3016; (Prince Rupert) 3016; (Revelstoke) 3017; (Vancouver) 3018; (Vernon) 3018 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers, &c.) 6027; (electric power) 3210; (engineers, salaries) 3212; (fire escapes) 3160; (quarantine stations) 3213 (ii), 6027 (iv); (renewals) 2969; (rents, &c.) 3212 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3157; (immigration buildings) 3156; (sundries) 3161 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3019; (Souris) 3019; (Winnipeg) 3018, 3029; (Winnipeg armoury) 3052 (ii).
Public Works—Buildngs—N. B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Chatham) 1610; (Fairville) 1611; (Fredericton pavement) 1612; (Grand Falls) 1614; (Hampton) 1614; (Hartland) 1617; (Hillsborough) 1621; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (St. John drill hall) 1624; (Tracadie) 1625 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 1592; (Halifax citadel) 1581; (Halifax post office) 1583; (Lunenburg) 1592, 1625; (Parrsboro) 1598, 1625; (Weymouth) 1601;

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(Wolfville) 1599; (iv); (Yarmouth) 1600 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2088 (ii); (Belleville drill hall) 6033 (iv); (Brantford drill hall) 2098; (Chesley) 2103; (Dresden) 2105; (Dundas) 2109; (Elora) 2109; (Essex) 2110, (Fergus) 2111; (Fort William) 2111; (Gananoque) 2112; (Goderich) 2115; (Harriston) 2115; (Kingston P. O.) 2130; (Kingston, R. M. C.) 2130, 3156; (Listowel) 2141; (Midland) 2142; (Mitchell) 2146; (Mount Forest) 2149; (Peterborough) 2603; (Seaforth) 2626; (Sudbury) 2626; (Tilbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2627; (Uxbridge) 2630; (Wallaceburg) 2634; (Waterloo) 2634; (Wiarton) 2636 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 3161; (furniture) 3163; (heating, &c.) 2190, 3162 (ii), 6027, (iv); (H. of C. improvements) 2590 (ii); (lavatories) 2583; (lighting) 3173, 3187 (ii); (McGillivray's contract) 5993 (iv); (pavements) 2593, 2602 (ii), 8883 (v); (Printing Bureau) 2361, 2582; ; (Rideau Hall) 3170 (ii), 8872 (v); (steel cases) 2582; (Sussex St. block) 3172; (telephones) 3169; (water supply) 2583; (Woods building lighting) 3175 (ii).

Public Works — Buildings—Miscellaneous (coronation decorations) 9565 (v); (draping buildings) 6026 (iv); (tobacco curing stations) 3161 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—P. E. I. (Summerside armoury) 1602; (Tignish) 1602 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1665; (Aylmer) 1672; (generally, repairs, &c.) 1675; (Grosse Isle) 1675; (Levis armoury) 1678; (Maisonneuve) 1685; (Marieville) 1697; (Megantic) 1710, 1860; (Montreal barracks) 1863 (i), 2567, 3144 (ii); (Montreal postal station) 1861; (Montreal P.O. alterations) 1862; (Napierville) 1865; (Que. custom house) 1885; (Quebec drill hall) 1886; (Quebec immigrant) 1886; (Rigaud) 1887; (Roberval) 1887; (Rock Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1890; (St. Lambert) 1894; (Shawinigan) 1890; (Three Rivers) 1901; (Westmount) 1903 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2970, 3001; (Battleford cor. read) 3005; (Humboldt) 3007; (Lloydminster) 3009; (Melfort) 3010; (Moosejaw) 3010; (Saskatoon) 3010; (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3215; (salaries) 3214 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 9555 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Amaguadees Pond) 9509; (Argyle Sound) 9501 (v); (Cribbins Point) 6029 (iv); (generally) 9554 (v); (L'Ardoise) 6029; (Margaree) 6029; (Upper Prospect) 6030; (West Dublin Bay) 6030; (Yarmouth) 6030 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ontario (Port Arthur, &c.) 5994 (iv); (repairs, &c.) 9551 (v); (Victoria) 6021 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. and Alberta (repairs, &c.) 9553 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Telegraphs, B. C. (Okanagan) 6033; Sask. and Alta., (maintenance) 6034 (iv).

Railways—I. C. R. (Halifax) 5922 (iii); (Halifax docks) 9561 (v).

Sussex Street, Ottawa, Deptl. Buildings, Alterations, &c. (remarks) 2077 (ii).

See 'Ottawa,' 'Supply—Public Works—Ottawa.'

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings for 1910 (Ans.) 2159 (ii).

Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Amount paid in Interest, &c. (Ans.) 814 (i).

Three Rivers Post Office, Temporary Building (Ans.) 8984 (v).

Tilbury Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).

Toronto Federal Buildings, Plans of Erection (remarks) 8479 (v).

Toronto Harbour Consolidation Act Amt. B. 175 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 8234, 8536 (v).

Toronto Post Office, Addition to, Change *re* Specification (Ans.) 805 (i).

Typhoid in Ottawa: *See* 'House of Commons, Ottawa,' &c.

Uxbridge Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 1084 (i).

——— Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 9782 (v).

Vancouver Dry Dock Subsidy, Nature of (Ans.) 3469 (ii).

Victoria Memorial Museum, Ottawa, Total Cost, Space allotted (Ans.) 1975 (ii).

——— Cor. *re* Foundation, on Inquiry for (Mr. Hughes) 7666 (iv).

——— Cracking of Tower, &c. (Ans.) 5938 (iv).

——— Inspection *re* Defects in Building (remarks) 7350 (iv).

Walkerville Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of (Ans.) 1101 (i).

Water-Power on St. Lawrence, Concession *re* (Ans.) 9780 (v).

——— *See* 'Long Sault.'

Waterways Treaty, on Inquiry for Plans, 3681 (ii).

——— *See* 'International Waterways' B. 36.'

Westville Postoffice, Number of Bricks used (Ans.) 3471 (ii).

Wharfs, N.S., Contracts *re* Construction (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of (Ans.) 6272 (iv).

Wingham Public Building Clock, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 6664 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Winnipeg, Govt. Buildings, Pavements, &c., Corrected Stmnt., 8923 (v).
—— Rifle Range: *See* 'St. Charles.'
Wolfe Island Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Woods and Canadian Buildings, Cancellations of Heat and Lighting Contract (Ans.) 795, 1088, 1344 (i).
—— Cor. with Mr. Ellis (read) 3672 (ii).
—— Inaccurate Answer to Question (remarks) 1000 (i).
—— Stmnt., *re* Discrepancy in figures, 1011 (i).
—— Last Cheque paid to Imp. Realty Co. (Ans.) 1280 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3175, 3187 (ii).
See 'Supply — Pub. Works — Buildings — Ottawa.'

RANKIN, Mr. J. P., *Perth North.*
Commercial Travellers' Accident Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1°*, 1277 (i).
Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 817 (i).
Imperial Traction Co.'s incorp. (B. 102) 1°*, 2434 (ii).
Logan, Robt. William, Relief (B. 173) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Meyer, Paulina Verena, Relief (B. 145) 1°*, 5933 (iv).
Robertson, Lorne Forbes, Relief (B. 142) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Western Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 1969 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*
Advertising Policy of Government. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4239 (iii).
'Alva' Str., Purchase of, Dimensions, &c. (Ques.) 1909 (i).
—— Expenditure *re* to Philip & Son (Ques.) 2438 (ii).
Baggage Smashing Prevention B. 124 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 4199 (iii).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2432 (ii).
Boat painted by Govt. Officials, Denial *re*, 7942 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9261 (v).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3455 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Cardinal Canal Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Civil Service Apptmt. of Coloured Persons (remarks) 4930 (iii).
Coal Miners' Strike in West, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9709 (v).
Coloured Person appointed to Experimental Farm (remarks) 5039 (iii).
Conciliation Boards, Principle *re* Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4244 (iii).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8713 (v).
Courtice, Howard, Emplymt. by Liberal Bureau (remarks) 9784 (v).
Customs Free Entries of Goods, Date of last Entry (Ques.) 803 (i).
Drummond, &c., Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 479 (i).
'Earl Grey,' Ice-breaker, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Depts. (remarks) 2994 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9612 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10235 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s. incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8916 (v).
Grand Trunk Trainmen's Strike, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
—— Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1078 (i).
House of Commons Galleries, Applause by Visitors (remarks) 4468 (iii).
I. C. R., Accidents, Causes of (remarks) 6680 (iv).
—— Construction, Letter of Gloucester Farmers Union (read) in Com. of Sup., 5985 (iv).
—— Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1162 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 913 (i); on M. for 2°, 9099 (v); in Com., 9157, 9182 (v).
Lighthouse Construction, and Marine Purchases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2397 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3231 (ii).
See 'International B. 36,' 'Long Sault.'
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchasing of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 6764, 6914 (iv).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Montreal Legal Firms, Amounts paid for Services (Ques.) 984 (i).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8887 (v).
Naval Service, Date and Port of Sailing of 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow' (Ques.) 1091 (i).
Negroes in Civil Service: *See* 'Civil Service.'
Order, Ques. of *re* Homestead Irregularities (remarks) 5563 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2282 (ii).
——— Plaza, Removal of Poles, &c. (remarks) 6507 (iv).
——— Sussex St. Deptl. Buildings, Tenders *re* (remarks) 4824 (iii).
P. E. I. Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments (remarks) 6925 (iv).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7731 (iv).
Privileges and Elections Com., (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7970 (v).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 857 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 700 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., Alterations, &c., Better Information placed before House (remarks) 4933 (iii).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10062 (v).
——— Importations from Favoured Nation Countries (Ques.) 4111 (iii).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer, 4113 (iii).
——— Names of Countries affected by Treaty *re* importations into Canada, 4131 (iii).
——— Oshawa Fruit Growers' Association (remarks) 5747 (iii).
——— on Ques, of Order *re* Referring to previous debate (remarks) 8253 (v).
——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3610 (ii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6829 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Prices, Information *re* from Trade and Commerce Dept. (remarks) 6512 (iv).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, Statement (read) 6840 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., on Ruling (Dep. Speaker) *re* Amendments, 5723 (iii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence River, Damming the Long Sault, Letter from Mr. J. Wesley Allison (read) 3767 (ii).
——— Legislation at Washington, &c. (remarks) 3282 (ii).
——— Letter from Gov. Dix (read) 3839 (ii).
——— Protests *re* Bill now before U.S. (remarks) 4210 (iii).
——— *See* 'Long Sault.'
Sadler, Maggie Florence Relief (B. 137) 1°*, 6116 (iv).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9171 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp., B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3843 (ii).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry (Mr. Blain) for Ret., 3345 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3790 (ii).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6395; Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6392; Welland (Port Colborne) 6400 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3810 (ii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5613 (iii).
Labour Dept. (conciliation board) 4244 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6460; (lighthouses) 6461 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8769; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8783; (Canada and South Africa) 8784; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 8788 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 3161; (furniture) 3163; (heating) 3162; (lighting contracts) 3196(ii); (Rideau Hall) 8874 (v); (Rideau Hall Grounds) 3170; (telephones) 3169 (ii)
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 3002 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (freight cars) 5985 (iv).
Woods Building Lighting Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3196 (ii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N., *Cumberland.*
Athol Mail Route, Establishment of, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 2161 (ii).
Battleford Public Buildings, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 3029 (ii).
Civil Servants in Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1054 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 6913 (iv).
Collingwood Corner Postmaster, Name, Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 656 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8712 (v).
Crittenden, Mary Kathleen Relief (B. 180) 1°*, 7666 (iv).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*
Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co., Strike of Employees, Reports, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1340 (i).
Drummond, &c., Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 480 (i).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P.M.G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2269 (ii).
Fisheries Regulations, Penalties *re* Violation of, Inquiry for Ret., 1806 (ii).
G. T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5779 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1753 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Demand for Repeal, &c., (remarks), 6929 (iv).
I. C. R., Accidents, Pars. from N.S Newspaper (read) 6676 (iv).
——— Branch Lines, Acquisition of (remarks) 6769 (iv).
——— Hay transported free from Quebec Prov. to Mar. Proves. (Ques.) 5134 (iii).
Jackson Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ques.) 656 (i).
Parrsboro, N.S., Public Building, Instructions *re* Plans, &c. (M. for copy) 1727 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 8535 (v).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 854 (i).
Railways, Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5078 (iii).
Reciprocity Announcement, Par. in Winnipeg 'Free Press,' *re* Treatment of Reporters (remarks) 2642 (ii).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks 10066 (v).
——— Kentville Board of Trade Res. (read) 5749 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 1001 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1054; Militia (salaries) 1021; Public Works (salaries)) 1033 (i).
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3378 3399 (ii).
Mounted Police (subsistence) 8600 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg) 3029 (ii); N.S. (Lunenburg) 1625; (Parrsboro) 1625 (i); Ont. (Wiarton) 2636 (ii); Ottawa (lighting) 3174 (ii); Sask. (Battleford) 2978, 3001 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (airbrakes) 5913; (airbrakes, freight cars) 5915; (bridge strengthening) 5914; (Campbellton) 5915; (draw bars) 5915; (fire extinguishers) 5927; (Fredericton) 5916; (Halifax) 5924; (highways protection) 5918; (rolling stock) 5927; (Truro) 5929; (surveys) 5928 (iii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*
Vancouver Dry Dock Subsidy, Nature of (Ques.) 3469 (ii).
Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of (Ques.) 1101 (i).
Woods Building Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3195 (ii).

RICHARDS, Mr. J. W., *Prince, P.E.I.*
P.E.I. and Mainland Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3879 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorial Reps., &c. *re* Survey (M. for copies) 176 (ii).

RIVET Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*
Address, The, 208 (i).
Goldschmidt Thermit Co. Patent Relief B. 165) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1514 (i).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Munderloh and Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 203) in Com., 8970 (iv).
Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 208 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 2574 (ii).

ROBB, Mr. J. A., *Huntingdon.*
Beauharnois Canal, Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
——— Rentals, Sums expended, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2199 (ii).
C.P.R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Cor., 769 (i).
Commission to Immigration Agents, Total Amount paid (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3487 (ii).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8460 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7328 (iv).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette*
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1361 (i).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N. W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9041 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3519 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2417 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8085, 8631 (v).
Fort Osborne, Purchase of Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Homestead Irregularities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5616 (iii).
Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 1284 (i).
Immigration Act. Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2018 (ii).
Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site (Ques.) 9993 (v).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3046 (ii).
Ry. Rates, Comparison with U. S. Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6431 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., Fleming Grain Growers' Association Res. (read) 5550 (iii).
—— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7623 (iv).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Pet. *re* Withdrawal of Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8636 (v).
St. Andrews Dam Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3046 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 4728 (iii).
Immigration (seed grain) 3836 (ii).
Indians—N.W.T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5616 (iii).
Militia—(Winnipeg rifle range) 6053 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic) 6089 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Ry. Commission) 6431 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (inspectors) 6059 (iv).
Western Farmers as Immigration Agents to Europe (Ques.) 799, 1284 (i).

ROSS, Mr. D. C., *Middlesex West.*
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).

ROY, Mr. C., *Montmagny.*
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1770 (i).
I. C. R. Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1168 (i).
Light-House Keepers, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 775 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, Montmagny Electors, Correction in Hansard, 1356 (i).

ROY, Mr. E., *Dorchester.*
Naval Service for Can. (remarks) on Address, 204 (i).

RUSSELL, Mr. J., *Toronto East.*
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8721 (v).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8913, 8928 (v).

RUSSELL, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of (remarks) 9996 (v).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9570 (v).
SUPPLY.
Canals—Miscellaneous (working expenses) 6453; (Newmarket) 6453; Welland (Port Colborne) 6397 (iv).
Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 8885 (v).
Post Office (letter carriers' boots) 4283; (ry. mail clerks) 4286 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers, &c.) 6027 (iv); Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 8882 (v).

RUTAN, Mr. W. W., *Prince Albert.*
Alberta, Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 133) 1°*, 4740 (iii).
Canadian Loans and Investments in U. S., Amount, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6505 (iv).
Farm Products, Dutiable Exports from Provs. for 1908-10 into U.S. (Ques.) 7026 (iv).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. (B. 171) 1°*, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8095, 8236, 8536, 8916 (v).
Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Co.'s incorp. (B. 166) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Amounts (Ques.) 5634 (iii).
Railways owned, Operated in U. S. and Can., Mileage, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6158 (iv).
Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7626 (iv).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1941 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8807 (v).
Chacastapasin Indian Reserve, Owner, &c. (Ques.) 4301 (iii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, System *re* Operating (prop. res.) 3472, Neg. (N. 96; Y. 54) 3524 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2414 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8122 (v).
Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c. (Ques) 10196 (v).
—— *See* 'Parcel.'
Farmers' Bank, Par. in 'News' *re* Endorsation of Premier (remarks) 2264 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation *re* Tariff Changes, Distribution of Copies (remarks) 6908 (iv).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8610 (v).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9526 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8095, 8243 (v).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull,' Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1558 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 968 (i).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iii).
Order, Ques. of *re* Homestead Irregularities (remarks) 5562 (iii).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9923 (v).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9313 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8281 (v).
—— Consolidated Boards of Trade, Sask., Despatch from W. A. Shepherd (read) 5752 (iii).
—— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10019 (v).
—— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6815 (iv).
Rural Mail Routes, Number operating in Man. (Ques.) 1105 (i).
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coin) 6060 (iv).
Dom. Lands—(Forestry convention) 6053 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5171 (iii); (seed grain) 6048 (iv).
Indians—N. W. T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046; (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6038 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5587 (iii).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4230 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Prince Rupert) 3016; Man. (Souris) 3019; Sask. (Humboldt) 3007; (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).
Typhoid Epidemic and Water Supply (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4481 (iii).
Yukon Beer Import Tax, Repeal Bill (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 1978 (ii).

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *Oxford South.*
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6212 (iv).
Canadian Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnson before Agricultural Com. (remarks) 2992 (ii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1258 (i).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O., *Wentworth.*
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 7341 (iv).
—— (remarks) *re* Question, 7348 (iv).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O.—*Con.*
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8995 (v).
Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 101) 1°*, 2434 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7530, (amt.) 7547 (iv).
—— Vote *re* Amendment, Ques. of Priv., 7666 (iv).
Selkirk Route, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6398 (iv).

SEXSMITH, Mr. J. A., *Peterborough, East.*
Cement Production, Total Production annually since 1900 (Ques.) 10196 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8952 (v).
Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 7806 (iv).
Indian Reserves in Ont., Fences, Settlement of Disputes *re* (Ques.) 1910 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8079 (v).
Marriages, Validity of, Law respecting (Ques.) 6269 (iv).
Milk and Cream exported, Quantity for 1910 (Ques.) 6269 (iv).
Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910 (Ques.) 6271 (iv).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Statement (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5072 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7224 (iv).
—— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8372 (v).
—— Par. *re* Quaker Oats Co. (read) 4120 (iii).
—— Peterborough Board of Trade Res. (read) 5750 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6814 (iv).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6190 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c (animals health) 5963; (dairy experiments) 6235; (seeds) 6221 (iv).
Canals—Trent (improvements) 6419 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 1478 (i).
Post Office—Outside Service (rural) 6089 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2603 (ii).
Victoria Museum, Cracking of Tower, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 5937 (iv).

SHARPE, Mr. S., *Ontario, North.*
Agricultural Imports into Canada, Quantity, Average Price, &c. (Ques.) 5401 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Agriculture and Militia Expenditure from 1867 to 1910 (Ques.) 9371, 9432 (v).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5079, 5574, 5630 (iii).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 14) 1° m., 261 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9335 (v).
Bank Failures, Statement of Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
See 'Farmers' Bank.'
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., Ref. to Justice Dept. (Ques.) 926, 1091 (i).
See 'Justice.'
Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency, Charge *re* Frauds (Ques.) 1716 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9277 (v).
Census of North and South Ontario, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 9431 (v).
Companies Act (annual stmnts.) Amt. (B. 7) 1° m., 149; 2° m., 1296 (i).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr Monk) in Com., 1336 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4662 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (counting ballots) Amt. (B. 16) 1° m., 377 (i).
Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron (Ques.) 6288 (iv).
See 'Steel.'
Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by 'International' (M. for ret.*) 1498 (i).
Eclipse Mfg. Co., Office Specialty Co., and Ahearn & Soper, Payments to, Contracts *re*, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
Ellis, Mr., Ottawa City Lighting Co. *See* 'Woods.'
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission, *re* (remarks) 1510 (i).
——— Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston (Ques.) 4826 (iii).
——— Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5465 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9624 (v).
Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &c. (Ques.) 794 (i).
Graham, Mr. Duncan, Apptmt. as Indian Agent (Ques.) 5291 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8921 (v).
G.T.P., Classification, Arbitrator's Rep. (Ques.) 696 (i).
Hague Arbitration *re* Newfoundland Fisheries, Counsel, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 797 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1408, 1527 (i).
House of Commons, Sessional Employees since 1896, &c. (M. for ret.) 3471 (ii).
Immigration Bonuses paid *re* Three Swiss Girls, &c. (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Imperial Realty Co.: *See* 'Woods.'
Indian Act (fences) Amt. (B. 95) 1° m., 1969 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8408 (v).
I.C.R. Freight Rates on Coal, &c., in Mar. Provs., Classification, &c. (Ques.) 6156 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1522 (i).
Justice, Deputy Minister of, acting as counsel for outside Cases (remarks) in Sup., 1014 (i).
See 'Bank of Montreal.'
Loans, Negotiations for, 1909, 1910, Financial Agents, &c. (Ques.) 797 (i).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c. (Ques.) 3281 (ii).
Militia and Agriculture, Expenditure from 1867 to 1910 (Ques.) 9371, 9432 (v).
Militia Regiments, Number in Montreal, Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 7595 (iv).
Ministers of Crown, Absence on Public Business, for 1908-10, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1340 (i).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses for 1908-9-10 (Ques.) 817 (i).
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7442 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10502 (v).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup.. 2300 (ii).
——— New Leases, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 1281 (i).
Ottawa Municipal Lighting Plant, Number of Govt. Buildings lighted (Ques.) 1280 (i).
See 'Woods.'
Parry Sound Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1881 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 849 (i).
Railway Accidents, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3933 (ii).
Railway Act (express cos.) Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 149; 2° m., 1298 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9312, 9320 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9227 (v).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 10151, 10310 (v).
—— Conferences Length of Sessions, Names of Representatives, &c. (Ques.) 7036 (iv).
—— Stmnt. in White Book, &c. (Ques.) 10193 (v).
—— Statistics, Purpose of Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 7037 (iv).
—— Trade with other Countries affected (Ques.) 3667 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4569 (iii).
Ross Rifles, Number issued to Queen's Own Regiment (Ques.) 9781 (v).
St. Lambert Govt. Buildings, Option on Lands (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2577 (ii).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Annual Payments *re* Light and Power, &c. (Ques.) 3468 (ii).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9167 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, (remarks) 1385 (i).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Subsidies *re* (M. for memorials*) 3948 (ii).
—— Govt. Inspectors, Salaries, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 5936 (iv).
—— Renewal of (remarks) 3274 (ii).
—— Total Amounts paid since 1896 (Ques.) 3607 (ii).
See 'Dumping.'
Sub-targets, Number purchased by Govt., Price, &c. (Ques.) 8583 (v).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 1014; Militia (salaries) 1029 (i).
Militia (allowance) 8518 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2610; (Seaforth) 2626; (Tilbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2628; (Uxbridge) 2630; (Wiarton) 2637 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Quebec (Napierville) 1867; (Roberval) 1888; (Rock-Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (St. Lambert) 1895; (Shawenegan) 1890 (i).

Uxbridge Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 1084 (i).
—— Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 9782 (v).
'Wanda' Yacht, Appraising by Customs, &c. (M. for reps.*) 4678 (iii).
—— Changed from American to Canadian Register, Date, &c. (Ques.) 4300 (iii).
—— Date of Entry at Canadian Port, Notice to Customs Dept. (Ques.) 5933 (iv).
—— Length, Motive Power, &c. (Ques.) 5834 (iii).
—— Valuation by Customs, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Paterson) 5624 (iii).
See 'Farmer's Bank.'

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Whitby Post Office Site, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).
Woods and Canadian Buildings, Heating and Lighting Contract, Cancellation of (Ques.) 794, 1088, 1344 (i).
—— Inaccurate Answer (remarks) 999 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 3948 (ii).
—— Lighting Contracts, *re* Cor. with Mr. Ellis (remarks) 3675 (ii).
—— Lighting Contracts (remarks) 1011 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3176 (ii).
—— Date of last cheque paid to Imperial Realty Co. for Lighting (Ques.) 1279 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'

SHARPE, Mr. W. H., *Lisgar.*
Battleford Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
British Preference Trade Policy (remarks) 5545, 5619 (iii).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9726 (v)
Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases issued, &c. (Ques.) 5291 (iii).
Elevators, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3495 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8125 (v).
Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Milk Average, Sale of Eggs, &c. (Ques.) 662, 1285 (i).
G.T.P. Developing Co., Land Purchase from (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
—— Govt. Reserve on Homestead Lands (Ques.) 3466 (ii).
—— Number of Acres sold by Govt., Price, &c. (Ques.) 2366 (ii).
Homestead Irregularities &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5593 (iii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, Policy, &c. (Ques.) 660 (i).
Interest Act Amt B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 972 (i).
Lands, Mineral Rights, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 3955 (iii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1253 (i).
Pembina Fish Dam, Placing of Ladder, &c. (Ques.) 1090 (i).
See 'St. Andrews.'
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5052 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8162 (v).
—— British Preference, &c. (remarks) 5545, 5619 (iii).
—— Farm Products imported from other countries (Ques.) 3668 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

St. Andrews Rapids, Fish Ladder, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
See 'Pembina.'

St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of (remarks) 10509 (v).

Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amount *re* (Ques.) 3225 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 6226 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 1484 (i).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5587 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Wetaskiwin) 3011 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. Chilliwack) 3013; (Cranbrook) 3013; (Fernie) 3015; (Nanaimo) 3016; (Prince Rupert) 3016 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg) 3032, 3053 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3008; (Melfort) 3010; (Moosejaw) 3010; (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).

Wheat Prices in West and in Canada and Liverpool Market (Ques.) 6267 (iv).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6146 (iv).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4385 (iii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H. *Guysborough.*

Canadian Northern Ry., Guarantee of Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8862 (v).

Grain Stored in Port Arthur and Ft. William Elevators, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 3605 (ii).

Guysborough, 'Times,' Application *re* Postal Privileges, (M. for cor.*) 6505 (iv).

I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1115 (i).

——— Westbound and Eastbound Traffic for five Years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2162 (ii).

Life Saving Rewards, Names of Recipients (Ques.) 3849 (ii).

Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2774 (ii).

Post Office Service in N.S., Weekly and Biweekly, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).

Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7626 (iv).

Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 4467 (iii).

Sick Mariners, Law *re* Payment of Dues, &c. (Ques.) 1904 (i).

Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting (prop res.) 3074, 3138 (ii).

Steam Trawlers, 'Wren' and 'Croquette,' Registration in Can. (Ques.) 4046 (iii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (farm bulletins) 6187 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1057 (i).
Fisheries (fish transportation) 6101 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8760 (v).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8688 (v).
Ocean and River Service—Govt. Steamers —(maintenance, &c.) 5813 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2609 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods Act (wood) Amt. (B. 21J) 1°*, 8887, in Com., 9349 (v).

SMITH, Mr. A. W., *Middlesex, North.*

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1248 (i).

Reciprocity Treaty, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6776 (iv).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 402 (i).

British Columbia and Central Can. Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 113) 1°*, 3143 (ii), in Com., 5127, 5253 (iii).

Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s (B. 204) 1°*, 8582 (v).

Chinese Immigration, Stmt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion with Prime Minister (remarks) 2738 (ii).

——— Total Number, Capita Tax, Exempts, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i).

Co-operation (B. 29) 1° m., 699 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1431 (i).

Immigration into Western Canada, Article in "John Bull", Conditions *re* (remarks) 1564 (i).

'Iroquois,' Str., Report *re* Wreck (remarks) 7104 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications, &c. (Ques.) 790 (i).

Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 548 (i).

Netherland Mortgage Loan Co., Rep. of W. T. R. Preston, Cor. with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 789 (i).

Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2352 (ii).

Pacific and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 167) 1°*, 6906 (iv).

Railway Accidents, since 1st April ,1909, on running trains, construction work, &c. (M. for ret.) 713 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6709 (iv).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Ry. Employees Protection (B. 114) 1° m., 3218 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Nanaimo) 3016 (ii).
Truesdell, Frances Whittington Relief (B. 183) 1°*, 7666 (iv).
Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 377 (i).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Stormont.*
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3240 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland—(enlargement) 6407 (iv).

SMYTH, Mr. W. R., *Algoma, East.*
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie, 4371 (iii).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 8959 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6141 (iv).
Porcupine Disasters by Fire, Aid by Govt. (remarks) 9635 (v).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 827 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 9966 (v).
——— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10011 (v).
——— Resolutions *re*, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com., 10146 (v).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8681 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1695 (i).
Thessalon Breakwater, Construction of (remarks) 10532 (v).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Delay, &c. (remarks) 9907 (v).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C..) *Bonaventure.*
Address, The, Order, Ques, of *re* 'coward,' member asked to withdraw expression, 462, Apology asked for, 463 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6321 (iv).
Alien Labour Law, Emplymt of Foreign Labour in B.C., Members remarks checked 10372 (v).
Bank Act Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 6442 (iv).
Beauharnois Canal Grantees, &c, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., Member's remarks checked, 2213 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C.)—*Con.*
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 4231, 6574 (iii), 9536 (v).
Bois Blanc Island Dam: (ruling) *re* Discussion, 1575 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Oliver) Member's remarks checcked, 8190 (v).
Cobalt Mail Service, Members' remarks checked, 1650 (i).
Divorce Bills, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Ethier) Members' remarks checked, 4204 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Electoral District, Certificate *re*, 259 (i).
——— Election, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Gauvreau) insulting language (ruling) 77 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Macdonald) 144 (i).
——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) (ruling) 472-3 (i).
Electricity Exportation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 2260 (ii).
——— Ruling *re* Introduction of, 2364 (ii).
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 159 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Amt. (Mr. Monk) (ruling) 5164 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox) 9524 (v).
Hours of Labour Bill, on M. for 3° (ruling) *re* Ques. of Order (Mr. Lancaster) 2874 (ii).
House of Commons Speaker's Gallery, Rules *re* Allotment of Seats (remarks) 270 (i).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions (ruling) 1551 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Limiting remarks, 6946 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amts., 3460 (ii).
Labour Strikes, Cor. with Mr. Geo. Taylor (ruling) 10349 (v).
Mails, Illegal Use of *re* C. D. Sheldon (ruling *re* M. to adjn. hse., 1357 (i).
See 'Sheldon.'
Markey Fishing Leases, Cancellation of, Members remarks checked, 6763 (iv).
Ministerial Association Ottawa, Res. *re* Member checked, 3059 (ii).
Ministers' Speeches distributed by Postmasters, Members' remarks checked, 9255 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Boyce) 2769, 2814 (ii).
Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse., Members' remarks checked, 2262 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C.)—*Con.*
National Battlefields in Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on Regularity of Proceedings (ruling) 9500 (v).
Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) Members' remarks checked, 10522 (v).
Offensive Weapons, Sale of (Mr. Lewis) Members' remarks checked, 2559 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill (Mr. Conmee) on M. to introduce, 2829, Ruled out of Order, 2850 (ii).
——— Printing in English (remarks) in Com., 3184 (ii).
——— Ruling *re* Procedure, 2883 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, Member asked to apologize for using word 'liar,' (remarks) 463 (i).
——— Member asked to withdraw and apologize, 462 (i).
Parliament, Opening of, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 1 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Ques. of Order, 7974 (v).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Boyce) irrelevancy of debate, 6361 (iv).
——— (Mr. Paterson)—(remarks) 5626 (iii).
——— (Mr. Geo. Taylor) Unparliamentary Language (ruling) 9784 (v).
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies, Ques. of Order (ruling) 3073 (ii).
Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Perley) on Ques. of Order (ruling) 10202 (v).
Questions, Procedure *re* Answering, Orally or Written (remaks) 700 (i).
Railways, Capitalization of, Member asked to withdraw words, 5258 (iii).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to meet during sittings of the House (ruling) 9228 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., Absence of Miinsters, Ques. of Order, 8359 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk). Ques. of Order. (Mr. Currie) 4055 (iii).
———Answers of Ministers to Questions (ruling) 4137 (iii).
——— Importation from other Countries, Members' remarks checked, 4114 (iii).
——— Members' remarks checked, 5545 (iii).
——— Negotiations at Washington, Instructions to Mr. Bryce *re* (ruling) *re* answers of Ministers, 4141 (iii).
——— Objections *re* Interruptions (remarks) 4451 (iii.)
——— Obstruction *re*, Member requested to withdraw stmnt., 10008 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox), Sustaining of Deputy Speaker's Ruling (ruling) 5032 (iii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C.)—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U. S., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Obstruction by Ministers of the Crown (ruling) 4124 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) Remarks checked, 5744 (iii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5948 (iv).
——— Statistics, Members' remarks checked, 4473 (iii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6835 (iv).
——— Tel. read by Mr. Burrell, Remarks checked, 3771 (ii).
——— Vote of Member for Labelle. 6839 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7616 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7675 (iv).
Returns, Notice of, Member's remarks checked, 5939 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Ltd., incorp. B. 159 (Mr. Devlin) on M, for 1°, 6439 (iv).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly the Flag. Member's remarks checked, 7687 (iv).
St. Lawrence Dam, Member's remarks checked, 4211 (iii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Bradbury) 5865 (iii).
Senate Amendments to Public Bills, Consideration of (ruling) 3845 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (ruling) *re* M. (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).
See 'Mails.'
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) Member's remarks checked, 3350 (ii).
Speech from Throne (read) 2 (i).
Sterling Trusts Corporation incorp., B. 32 (Mr. Martin) on Senate Amts.. 6609 (iv.)
SUPPLY—
House of Commons (charwomen) 6174; (committees) 6170; (debates) 6171; (Dep. Clerk Crown in Chancery) 6167; (electric light attendant) 6175; (messengers) 6172; (pages) 6174; (servants) 6175; (sessional clerks) 6168; (stationery) 6176; (telephones) 6171, (Senate stationery) 6337 (iv).
Typhoid Epidemic in Ottawa, Member's remarks checked, 4657 (iii).
Vacancy, Arthabaska and Drummond Electoral District (notification) 1 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy, (McIntyre, Mr. G. H.), *Perth South.*
'Arctic,' Capt. Bernier's Report, Member's remarks checked, 6541 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy, (McIntyre, Mr. G. H.)—*Con.*
British Columbia Development Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., Objection to proposed Amt., 5127 (iii).
Canada Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Middlebro) 7564 (iv).
Canada and Japan Trade Relations, on Ques of Order, 9484 (v).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 201, on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8982 (v).
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 206 (Mr. D. A. Gordon) in Com., 8970 (v).
Conciliation Board and Labour Dept., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Nesbitt) 4267 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir', 482 (i).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8921 (v).
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., (ruling) *re* Power of Govt. to introduce word 'Equipment,' 5721 (iii).
Homestead Irregularities, &c., on Ques. of Order (rulings) 5561-3 (iii).
Hours of Labour B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., Irrelevancy of deb. (remarks) 1433 (i).
Indian Act (Treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (remarks) *re* discussion 7857 (iv).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in com., 9158, 9180 (v).
——— Irrelevancy of debate, 9177 (v).
Lethbridge, Speech of Member for Pictou, Acceptance of Denial (remarks) 1877 (i).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7724 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Irrelevancy of Debate, 10523-4 (v).
Order, Ques. of, Member asked to withdraw word 'Liar', 5561 (iii).
Postoffice Estimates, on objection to passing (remarks) 4298 (iii).
Public Buildings, Cost of (ruling) *re* Ques. of Order, on Discussion in Com. of Sup., 2101 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., Interruptions not relevant (ruling) 7527 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) Quotations, &c. (read) 7548 (iv).
——— Interruptions to speakers (remarks) 5030 (iii).
——— Letter read by member for Saltcoats, Giving of Names (ruling) 7265 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy, (McIntyre, Mr. G. H.)—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U. S., Letter of Sir Charles Tupper (ruling) *re* reading, 8279 (iv).
——— Member (Mr. Geo. Taylor) referring to previous debate (ruling) 8252 (v).
——— Obstruction by Opposition (remarks) 9889 (v).
———on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) *re* 'Cowardice' applied to Minister of Crown, 10564 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3705 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Guthrie) *re* ref. to former debate, 3690-91 (ii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, Irrelevancy of debate (ruling) 6899 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Ques. of Order *re* Addressing the Chair, 6890 (iv).
——— Talking of Ministers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 7293 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (explanation) 7670 (iv).
——— (remarks) 7619 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com. on amts. 8966 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9168 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2649 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture (animals health) member's remarks checked, 5964; (dairying) Member's remarks checked, 6247 (iv); (exhibitions) Member's remarks checked, 3796 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board), Ques. of Order, 3448 (ruling) 3448, 3450, 3451 (ii).
Marine—Public Works—St. Lawrence ship channel, Discussion *re*, 6555 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Mitchell) 2148 (ii).
Whitby Postoffice Site (ruling) on Ques. of Order, 1870 (i).
Winnipeg World's Fair, Irrelevancy of debate, in Com. of Sup., 5982 (iv)
Woods Building Lighting Contract, Ques. of Order, 3194 (ii).
SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *Grey East.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 334 (i).
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Cash) on Senate Amts., 6469 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5080; on M. for 3°, 5252 (iii).
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 9225; on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. Orders, 9350 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3459 (ii).
Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty, Communication *re* (remarks) 5619 (iii).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Favoured Nation Clause &c. (remarks) 6758 (iv).
—— Cor. *re* Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6906 (iv).
Annual Drill, Number of Officers, Men, &c. (Ques.) 8699, 9352 (v).
Bahama Islands, Annexation to Canada, Rumours *re* (remarks) 9372 (v).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1341 (i).
—— B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9337 (v).
—— B. 207 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 8698 (v).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 2431, 3600 (ii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7480 (iv).
Births and Deaths in Canada, Number &c., on M. (Mr. McCarthy) for Ret., 2680 (ii).
British Columbia Development Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 5127 (iii).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1682 (i).
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6208 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7564 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827; in Com., 9261, 9297 (v).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3454 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Broadeur) on M. to ref. to Committee on Marine and Fisheries, 6675 (iv).
Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Cement Merger, Charges of Sir Sanford Fleming (remarks) 9372, 10468 (v).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work (remarks) 7220 (iv).
Chinese Immigration, Encounter of Mr. Jardine and Min. of Inland Revenue (remarks) 2739 (ii).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9832 (v).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).
Cholera Precautions &c. (remarks) 10197 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8716 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Civil Servants and Municipal Office, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2225 (ii).
Civil Servants earning Extra Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1019 (i).
Coal Miners' Strike in the West, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9701 (v).
Cocaine: *See* 'Opium,' 'Poisons.'
Consuls General, Foreign, Status at Official Receptions &c. (M. for Cor. with Imp. Govt.), 949 (i).
Convicts liberated from Penitentiaries, Clothing &c. (remarks) 2069 (ii).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1316 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7813 (iv).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8714 (v).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7016 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act, Orders in Council, Amendments to, in Com. on Res., 1984 (ii).
Drill Halls Generally, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2128 (ii).
Drummond &c. Elections, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir', 473 (i).
Electricity Exportation Act Amt. (B. 101) on M. for 1°, 2260 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3502 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2379 (ii).
Embargo on British Cattle (remarks) 10344 (v).
Estimates, Discussion of (remarks) 2970 (ii).
—— Order of Discussion *re* Depts. (remarks) 2995 (ii).
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Ref. to Questions, Ques. of Order, 158 (i).
—— Deputy Governor or Administrator, Apptmt. of Mr. Justice Girouard, Tel. to Cardinal Vannutelli *re* Eucharistic Congress (Ques.) 702 (i).
—— Guards of Honour, Authority for (Ques.) 704 (i).
—— Reception to Cardinal Vannutelli, Telegram *re* Govt., Answers *re* (remarks) 6518 (iv).
—— Speaker's Attendance in Official Robes (Ques.) 706 (i).
—— *See* 'House of Commons.'

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Eucharistic Congress, Telegram from Mr. Justice Girouard *re* Visit of Cardinal Vannutelli (Ques.) 702 (i).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8453 (v).
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'
Farmers' Bank, Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8215 (v).
——— Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2244 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation &c., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9607 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P.M.G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2270 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8422 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8480 (v).
Flags Flying on Public Buildings (remarks) 3672 (ii).
Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale, on prop. Res. (Mr. Stanfield) 3227 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks (B. 85) Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8619, 8655 (v).
Gaspereau Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) Ques. of Order, 10228 (v).
'Globe' Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Morning Sittings, 10095 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M for 2° 9522, 9528 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238 (v).
G. T. P. Branch Lines B. 73 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3021 (ii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306; in Com., 9510 (v).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10102 (v).
High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay. Ry. Co.'s incorp., B. 202 (Mr. W. M. Martin) on M. for 2°, 8642 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 8 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1423 (i); on M for 3°, 3526 (ii).
House of Commons, Speaker of, Wearing of Official Robes on State Occasions, &c. (Ques.) 705 (i).
See 'Eucharistic.'
——— Sessional Employes, Names. Ages. &c. (M. for ret.*) 980 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
House of Commons, Ventilation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4479 (iii).
Imperial Steamship Co.'s incorp., B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) on Senate Amts., 6616 (iv).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6938, 6946 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8745 (v).
I. C. R., Branch Lines Lease, (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9590 (v).
I. C. R., Special Excursion Trains &c.. (remarks) 2999 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9091 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations B. 223 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9495 (v).
See 'China.'
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3182 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for ret. (remarks) 773 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System (prop. res.) 1184, neg. (Y. 66; N. 111) 1275 (i).
McClary's Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024 (ii).
Militia Annual Drill, Number called out from 1894 to 1910 (Ques.) 8699 (v).
See 'Annual Drill.'
Ministers. Travelling Expenses, Tips, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7476 (iv).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) on M. for 3°, 7717; in Com., 7720 (iv).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9230; in Com., 9495 (v).
Naval Service of Canada, Total Cost of Cruisers, &c. (Ques.) 791 (i).
Negro Immigration, Restrictions *re* (remarks) 6525 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co.'s Investments in Canada, on prop. Res. for Com. (Mr. Monk) 780, 783 (i).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 8648 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Oliver, Hon. Mr.. Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8329 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2848 (ii).
Opium, Importation of, Prohibition B. 22 (Mr. King) on M. for 1°, 469 (i).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 2532 (ii).
Ottawa City Sanitary Conditions, Rep. of Dr. Hodgetts (remarks) 5535 (iii).
Ottawa Government Buildings, Parliament Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 7024 (iv).
Oyster Culture, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor. (remarks) 762 (i).
Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Associations, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7340 (iv).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9920 (v).
Pelagic Sealing, Treaty between G.B. and U.S. *re* Protection (remarks) 3670 (ii).
——— Further information *re* (remarks) 3839 (ii).
——— Ratification of (remarks) 3769 (ii).
See 'Sealing.'
People's Railway Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Nesbitt) on Senate Amts., 6611 (iv).
Pig Iron Imports, used in Steel Rail Mills, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).
Poisons, Sale of, B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 261 (i).
Post Office Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Post Office Dept., Overcrowding in Basement (Ques.) 6667 (iv).
Precedence at Official Receptions (M. for cor.) 949 (i).
Preston, Mr.: *See* 'Netherlands.'
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 846 (i).
Public Works Supply, Objection *re* Full Vote, 9558 (v).
Quebec Boundaries, Cor. with Ont. and Dom. Govts, O.Cs, &c (M. for copies*) 981 (i).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9343 (v).
Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Use of (remarks) 7109 (iv).
Ques. of Order, *re* Mr. Pugsley's Record in Public Life, 10202 (v).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 701 (i).
Rabies Outbreak, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Race Track Gambling, on M. (Mr. Miller) to print evidence, 10467 (v).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 2°, 3944, in Com., 3946 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 959 (i).
Railway Accidents, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3939 (ii).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5254 (iii).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5066 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3980, 3995 (iii).
——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8370 (v).
——— Berlin Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5729 (iii).
——— Editorial in Montreal 'Star' (remarks) 4139 (iii).
——— Letter read by Member for Saltcoats, Giving Name of Writer (remarks) 7264 (iv).
——— Oleomargarine, Admission of (remarks) 6504 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, *re* Interruptions, 4451 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Obstruction by Ministei of Crown (Mr. Paterson) 4124 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order, *re* referring to previous debate (remarks) 8253 (v).
——— in Com. on Res. (remarks) on handing in Statements, 6954 (iv).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6823 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7613, 7669 (iv).
——— Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, Reading of, Ques. of Order, 7675 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 9166 (v).
St. Lawrence River, Damming Long Sault, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3230 (ii).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9168 (v).
Scrip to Northwest Settlers, Claims of Pioneers (remarks) 10138 (v).
Seal Fisheries Negotiations (remarks) 9594 (v).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 10196 (v).
See 'Pelagic.'

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2597, 2649, 3844 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6610 (iv).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2715 (ii).

Sewage Disposal B. 122 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 4040 (iii).

Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1373 (i).

Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7249 (iv).

South African Parlt., Rep. *re* from P.M.G. (remarks) 1581 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals health) 5955; (dairying) 6238 (iv); (exhibitions) 3781 (ii); (seeds) 6223; (tobacco production) 6262 (iv).

Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6412 (iv)

Canals—Chambly — (macadamizing) 6408; (machinery) 6357 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (working expenses) 6453 (iv)

Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6396 (iv).

Canals—Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6391 (iv).

Canals—Trent—(lift lock) 6398 (iv).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6398 (iv).

Canals—Williamsburg (machinery) 6426 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 5955 (iv); Justice (salaries) 1019; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1472; Militia (salaries) 1031 (i); Privy Cuncil (clerkships) 8752 (v); Public Works—(salaries) 1033 (i).

Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 6661; Ont. (inspectors) 6618 (iv).

Indians—Man. Sask. &c. (annuities) 8884 (v); Que. (medical attendance) 6036 (iv).

Labour Dept. (technical education commission) 3803 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6455; (pensions to pilots) 6533; (shipbuilding) 6484; (Thunder Bay) 6500 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8752; (Canada and G.B.) 8774; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784; (Gaspe and Dalhousie) 8786; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 8786; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8788; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 8788 (v).

Militia (allowance) 8518 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 5828; (schools of navigation) 5824 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 3210; (engineers) 3213; (Quarantine stations) 3213 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2096; (Dresden) 2107; (Dundas) 2109; (Essex) 2110; (Fort William) 2111; (Kingston) 2130; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2132; (Listowel) 2141; (Midland) 2144; (Mitchell) 2146; (Peterborough) 2604 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 2591; (Montreal barracks) 2569; (Printing Bureau) 2361 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8878 (v); (water supply) 2583 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1686; (Marieville) 1697 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2971 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3215; (salaries) 3214 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Amaguadees Pond) 9500 (v); Ont. (Victoria) 6022 (iv).

Railways—I. C. R. (working expenses) 6338; Miscellaneous (ry. commissioners) 6429 (iv).

Victoria Museum, Defects in Building (remarks) 7350 (iv).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 135) in Com., 6950 (iv).

Winnipeg International Exposition, Govt. Assistance to (Ques.) 708 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 5982 (iv).

Woods Building Lighting Contract, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3195 (ii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 3°, 5253 (iii).

Coal and Coke, Quantities imported into Canada from U. S. (Ques.) 4674 (iii).

Creighton, Mr. W. O., Farmer Delegate to G. B., Payments to (M. for ret.*) 6505 (iv).

——— (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

'Earl Grey' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (ii).

Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale (prop. res.) 3226 (ii).

See 'Inspection.'

Hickman, W. A., Payments to *re* Immigration Agent to G. B. (M. for ret.*) 6505 (iv).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 3276 (ii).

Inspection and Sale Act (flour and meal) Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 3453 (ii).

I. C. R., Accidents, Passes, &c., Inquiry for Return, 1571 (i).

——— I. C. R. and P. E. I. Pension Fund, Delegation *re* Amendments (Ques.) 2159 (ii).

——— Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees &c. (Ques.) 2152 (ii).

——— Porters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6339 (iv).

——— Special Excursion Trains *re* Political Meetings (remarks) 2999 (ii).

'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 1724 (i).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Mormon Propaganda, Prevention by Govt. (Ques.) 5135 (iii).
Nash, Fred. J., Emplymt. by Govt. in Inland Revenue, P.E.I. (Ques.) 2668 (ii).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 2435 (ii).
Postoffice Savings Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Names &c. (Ques.) 1568 (i).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3889 (ii).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5066 (iii).
St. Peter's Canal, C.B., Construction &c. (Ques.) 8103 (v).
Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3607 (ii).
'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 1910 (i).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3112 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Fredericton pavement) 1612 (i)
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax post office) 1586; (Lunenburg) 1592; (Parrsboro) 1599 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c., 6027 (iv); (lighting) 3175 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Tignish) 1603 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2971 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 5914; (Campbellton) 5915; (Chatham) 5915; (facilities and accommodation) 5929; (highways protection) 5917; (Moncton car shops) 5926; (Truro) 5930 (iii); (working expenses) 6339 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (working expenses) 6356 (iv).
Truro Political Meeting, Instructions *re* Special Rates over I.C.R. (remarks) 2999 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Expenditures *re*, Space allotted, &c. (Ques.) 1975 (ii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*
Agricultural Implements, Imports since 1908, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).
——— Imported into Can., Valuations, &c., Complaint *re* Manipulation of Duties, &c. (remarks) 1359 (i).
Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Carman Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii.
Census Enumerators for Man., Recommendations *re* Apptmt (remarks) 8889 (v).
——— Apptmt. of by Liberal Organizers, Cor., &c. (read) on M. for Sup., 9006, (amt.) 9015; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 84) 9068 (v).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*
Crop Statistics, Policy of Collecting, &c. (Ques). 5937 (iv).
Drill Halls, Man., Cost *re* (Ques.) 1975 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8128 (v).
Estimates for Man. Buildings, Objection to Discussing, 2969 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation from the West, and Govt. Ownership of Elevators (remarks) 1504 (i).
Flax exported from Saskatchewan (remarks) 10521 (v).
Fort Osborne Grounds, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9520 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8095, 8550, 8921 (v).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver)) in Com., 7848 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. (B. 146) 1° m., 5618 (iii).
Krenzer, Mr. J., Dispute with Mr. Greenway *re* Purchase of Land (M. for cor.*) 2225 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv).
Land Patents for S.E. ¼ of Sec. 6, Tp. 7, Issue of, &c. (Ques.) 5834 (iii).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iii).
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6201 (iv).
——— Negotiations with Dom. Govt. (M. for cor*) 980 (i).
——— Speech of Prime Minister at Winnipeg *re* Cor., &c. (Ques.) 709 (i).
Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents, Cor. with Miss Wileman (remarks) 9376 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 2770 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10514 (v).
Pratt's Siding, Establishment of Post Office, Requests *re* (Ques.) 3067 (ii).
Ry. Commission, Vacancy on, Apptmt. of Farmer (Ques.) 1291 (i).
Reciprocity Statistics, Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (remarks) 6510 (iv).
——— Western Farmers' Interests (remarks) 5543 (iii).
Rosendale Mail Service, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 1291 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Extravagance of (remarks) 10519 (v).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6194 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6251 (iv); (exhibitions) 3794 (ii), 9076 (v); (Quarantine, public health) 5981; (seeds) 6217; (tobacco production) 6263 (iv).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6400 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 5955; Postoffice (contingencies) 6068 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3825 (ii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9547 (v).
Militia (rifle ranges) 6056 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3019; (Souris) 3019; (Winnipeg) 3018 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3008 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (repairs) 9553 (v).

Winnipeg World's Fair, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv), 9076 (v).

STRATTON, Mr. J. R., *Peterborough West.*

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 66) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1313 (i).
Fergus Postoffice Site, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1883 (i).
Postoffice Buildings, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).
Reciprocity, Peterborough Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5750 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (seeds) 6218 (iv).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Drummond &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir', 483 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8749 (v).
Naval Defence, Govt. Policy (remarks) on Address, 127 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot) Ques. of Order, 7973 (v).
Quebec Members, Revolt against extra Session, Newspaper Articles, Denial of, 10096 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., Ques. of Order, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 4066 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order, calling Minister a coward, 10564 (v).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6808 (iv).
——— Vote of member for Labelle &c., 6839 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (public health) 5980; Fisheries (inspectors) 6635 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. G., *Leeds.*

Agriculture Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1944 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry Co., Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 3853 (ii).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2433 (ii).
Beef, Pork, &c. and other Animal Products, Imports, Quantity from Oct. 1, 1910, to Feb. 1911 (Ques.) 6264 (iv).
Bliss, Lt. Col. D. C. Foster, Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 8100 (v).
Butter, Cheese and Meats, Imported, Value, Weight, &c. (Ques.) 4926 (iii).
Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911 (Ques.) 4670 (iii).
Buoys, Stolen at Sorel Shipyards, Investigation *re* (remarks) 7216 (iv).
Cab Fares and Street Ry. Fares. Payments for last year to Govt. Employees, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
See 'Ministers Travelling Expenses.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8835 (v).
Census, Omissions *re* Enumerations (remarks) 9720 (v).
Cheese Cool Curing Room, Brockville, Sale of (Ques.) 8095 (v).
Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909 (Ques.) 1103 (i).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8908 (v).
Coal Strike in the West, Agreement of Two Years past (remarks) 6365 (iv).
——— Suggestions to Minister of Labour (remarks) 9720 (v).
See 'Labour.'
Committees, Sel. Standing, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* (remarks) 5 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8714 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections (personal explanation) *re* Speech of Mr. Miller. M.P., *re* 'disloyalty,' 489 (i).
Dry Docks, Applications for Subsidies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4383 (iii).
Escott Postmaster, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
——— Salary, Date of Increase (Ques.) 7101 (iv).
Escott Postmastership, Date of Apptmt., Complaints *re* late Postmaster (Ques.) 4926 (iii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Farmers' Bank Failure, Applications *re* Establishment (M. for papers*) 1726 (i).
—— Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5450 (iii).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., appointed by Dom. Govt., Duties, &c.. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6614 (iv).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp., B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8243 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1779 (i).
House of Commons, Number of People Residing in, (Ques.) 3847 (ii).
—— Restaurant and Speaker's Rooms, Number of Employees (Ques.) 1085 (i).
—— Speakers' Chambers, Expenditure *re* Piano Rental (Ques.) 927 (i).
—— Speakers' Chambers, Purchase of Birds (Ques.) 928 (i).
—— Speakers' Chambers. Purchase of Glassware (Ques.) 928 (i).
—— Speakers' Chambers, Purchasing of Gramophone Records (Ques.) 927 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8750 (v).
I.C.R., Bell, G. W., Pass Investigation, (Ques.) 6665 (iv).
—— Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* appropriating Scrap Brass, &c., (Ques.) 6664 (iv).
—— Gaskin, Mr. John, Investigation *re* Charges, &c., (Ques.) 7601 (iv).
—— Hawke, Mr. J. T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds, &c., (Ques.) 6665 (iv).
—— Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept., (Ques.) 6666 (iv).
—— Payments to Dr. C. A. Murray, *re* Tickets, &s. (,Ques.) 7031 (iv).
Kelly, Robt., Emplymt. by Govt. at Vancouver, B.C. (Ques.) 2665 (ii).
Labour Strikes, 'Point of the Bayonet,' Ques of Priv., 9784 (v).
—— Use of Militia, Cor., &c., (remarks) 10345 (v).
See 'Coal.'
Letter Carriers, Free Transportation on Electric Rys. (Ques.) 1104 (i).
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3266 (ii).
Mahone Bay Customs Collector. Dismissal, &c., (Ques.) 4301 (iii).
—— (M. for cor.*) 4383 (iii).
Marriages, Power of Parlt. to Legalize (Ques.) 8585 (v).
—— Govt.'s Intention *re* (Ques.) 10195 (v).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2060 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Menzies, Wm., Payments to *re* Meteorological Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).
Ministers, Speeches of, Distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
—— Speeches of Prime Minister, Distribution by Postmasters (remarks) 9071 (v).
—— Travelling Expenses of Ministers, Govt. Employees, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1340 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 3954 (iii).
—— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means. 7432 (iv).
See 'Cab', 'Public Works.'
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9243 (v).
Post Office Buildings, Necessity of, Quotation from President Taft's Speech (read) in Com. of Sup., 1873 (i).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 954 (i).
Printing Bureau Investigation, Number of Dismissals, Names, &c. (Ques.) 708 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Aud. Gen.'s Report, 839 (i).
Public Works, Travelling Expenses, Inquiry for Ret., 8356, 9071 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8244 (v).
—— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8358 (v).
—— Admission of Agricultural Products free from Foreign Countries (remarks) 4934 (iii).
—— Letter of Sir Charles Tupper (read) 8277 (v).
—— Negotiations at Washington, Instruction to Mr. Bryce, Cable Dispatch (read) 4140 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices, Ques. of Order, 6835 (iv).
—— accepting as read and printing in Hansard (remarks) 6857 (iv).
Rideau Canal Lockmen, Increased Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
St. Lawrence, Aids to Navigation, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c. (Ques.) 799 (i).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3777 (ii), 9080 (v); (farm bulletins) 6187; (Patent Record) 6184; Quarantine (public health) 5980 (iv).
Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6411; Chambly (macadamizing) 6409; Cornwall (Robertson's culvert) 6409; Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6412; Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6391; (mooring posts) 6389 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt—Agriculture (contingencies) 5955 (iv); (salaries) 1475; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1464 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6614; (overseers) 6159 (iv).
House of Commons (messengers) 6172 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 6546; (Lime Kiln Crossing) 6546; (maritime road) 6545 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6556 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax post office) 1587; (Parrsboro) 1598; (Wolfville) 1599 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting contracts) 3174, 3191 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Napierville) 1865 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 5994 (iv).
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 6187 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (freight cars) 5989 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6558; (meteorological service) 6561, 6566 (iv).
Senate (address to His Ex.) 6167 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 6572 (iv).

Technical Education, Progress re, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1721 (i).

Truro Freight Shed Fire (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Whip, Chief, Retirement of, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Sel. Com. (remarks) 6 (i).

Winnipeg, St. Charles Rifle Range, Sale of, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 7343 (iv).

Woods Building, Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3194 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D., *New Westminster.*

Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of (Ques.) 3463 (ii).

Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application *re* Homestead, &c., (Ques.) 3221 (ii).

Bidwell Bay, B.C., Govt. Land Reserves, Disposition of (Ques.) 1284 (i).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 17) 1°*, 376; in Com., 1682 (i).

Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1487 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7870 (iv).

Chinese Investigation Commission. Censure to Govt. (Amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10383, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 10454 (v).

—— Rep. of Mr. Justice Murphy, Inquiry for, 9594 (v).

—— (evidence read, &c.) 9786 (v).

—— Accusation *re* Obstruction (Mr. Fielding) 9888 (v).

—— Discussion *re* Rep., 9926 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Conciliation Board of Labour Dept., Principle of Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4242 (iii).

Dog Fish Industry (remarks) 8049 (v).

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of (M. for cor.) 2188 (ii).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9630 (v).

Fisheries Act (B.C. licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8044; in Com., 8419 (v).
See 'Supply Fisheries'.

Fisheries Treaty. 1908, Non-fulfilment by U. S. (remarks) 6528 (iv).

—— Proclamation *re* (remarks) 5035 (iii).

Fisheries Treaty, Further Information *re* (remarks) 8479 (v).

—— Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup., 8479 (v).

Fishery Regulations *re* International Commission, Date of Operation *re* (Ques.) 3465 (ii).

—— Regulations, Mess. from Wash. (remarks) 6504 (iv).

Fraser Mills, Postmaster, Defalcation of Funds, Bonds *re* (Ques.) 1566 (i).

Fraser River Mail Service, Applications *re* (Ques.) 3463 (ii).

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions &c., (Ques.) 1285 (i).

Fruit Growers Association, B.C., Protest *re* Duty, &c. (read) 3373 (ii).

G. T. P. Labourers at Lafond, in Alberta, Amounts owing for work, &c., (Ques.) 3669 (ii).

Hall's Prairie P.O., Pet. *re* Location, Postmaster, &c., (Ques.) 3468 (ii).

Hall's Prairie Timber Limits, Requests *re* Removal of Timber, &c. (Ques.) 3282 (ii).

Homestead Applicants in New Westminster District, Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).
See 'New Westminster.'

Homestead Regulations in B.C., Application, &c., Ry. Belt, &c., (M. for ret.) 2855 (ii).

Hope Townsite, Date of Payment by Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 3068 (ii).

—— Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval by Govt. (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1447 (i); on M. for 3°, 2864 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works, Printing of Proceedings of Com. (Ques.) 3280 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Japanese Immigration, Application *re* Special Purposes (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s (B. 18) 1°*, 376 (i).
Letter Carriers in New Westminster, Free Transportation on Tramways (M. for cor.) 2194 (ii).
Miner. Bill, Capture of, Return to Canada (remarks) 4384 (iii).
New Westminster District, Govt. Lands, Grant issued, &c. (Ques.) 1291 (i).
See 'Homestead,' 'Timber,' &c.
New Westminster Penitentiary, Increase of Pay to Employees (M. for cor.) 2183 (ii).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8343 (v).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7785 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res. 9673 (v).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 2988 (ii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5948 (iv).
——— Tels. read from B.C. Agricultural Associations, 3955 (iii).
See 'Fruit.'
Ruddock, R. F., Application *re* Homestead in B.C., &c. (Ques.) 3279 (ii).
Springhill Strike, Action of Conciliation Board (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4241 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6238 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3825 (ii).
Labour Dept (conciliation board) 4244; (Labour Gazette) 4235 (iii); Ques. of Order, 3451 (ii).
Post Office (clerks) 4288; (postmasters' salaries) 4290; (stamps) 4280 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Chilliwack) 3012; (Cranbrook) 3014; Generally (experimental farms) 3159 (ii).
Timber Licenses in New Westminster District, Pets. against Renewals, &c. (Ques.) 3222 (ii).
See 'New Westminster.'

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W. (Minister of Inland Revenue, *Comox-Atlin.*
Astronomers Rep. (presented) 9690 (v).
Barlow, John R., Emplymt by Govt. (Ans.) 8583 (v).
Canning, J. H., Inland Revenue Inspector, Retirement of (Ans.) 1350 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Encounter with Mr. Jardine (remarks) 2740 (ii).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10392, 10422 (v).
——— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9805 (v).
Elections Deferred (remarks) 10381 (v).
Elliott, George E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1497 (i).
Explosives Regulations (B. 79) M. for Com. on Res., 989; in Com. on prop. Res., 1577 (i); in Com., 8451 (v).
Explosives, Number of Factories, Employees, &c. (Ans.) 2374 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B.C. licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8426 (v).
Gas Meters in Toronto, Excessive Measurements (Ans.) 3280 (ii).
Geological Survey Rep. (presented) 9690 (v).
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt., Fined for Electoral Corruption (Ans.) 2673 (ii).
Holland Peat Bog (Ans.) 4303 (iii).
Inland Revenue Act (French version), Correction of Clerical Error (B. 132) 1°*, 4566 (iii); in Com., 8088 (v).
Inland Revenue Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Maple Sugar, Adulteration, Pet. *re* Amt. to Foods Act (Ans.) 5131 (iii).
Mineral Notices, Circular of Mr. F. H. Fourchet, &c. (Ans.) 4306 (iii).
Nash, Fred. J., Emplymt by Govt in Inland Revenue, P.E.I. (Ans.) 2668 (ii).
Niagara Falls Water Power, Quantity developed, &c. (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Peat Gas, Generating Electric Power, Process, &c. (Ans.) 708, 986 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4811 (iii).
Statutes, French Translations, Corrections (remarks) 8089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Inland Revenue (contingencies) 1048; Inland Revenue (salaries) 1047; Mines (salaries) 1475 (i).
Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 9551 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3216 (ii).

THOBURN, Mr. W., *Lanark, North.*
Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders from P.W Dept (remarks) 2648 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 2880 (ii).
James Bay, Fishing Lease to A. McNee, Duration of, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1206 (i).
Mississippi Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9252 (v).

THOBURN, Mr. W.—*Con.*
Negro Immigration, Restrictions *re* (remarks) 6523 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 9764, 9879 (v).
SUPPLY—
House of Commons (charwomen) 6174 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1893 (i).
Telegraph and Cable Services, Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9644 (v).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J., *Durham.*
Brown, George Addison, Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 5525 (iii).
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6211 (iv).
Farmers' Bank, Failure, Assets, &c., Keely Mine, Value &c. (Ques.) 2152 (ii).
—— Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5315, 5440 (iii).
Forest Reserves B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8085 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8080 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7040 (v).
—— Canadian Coasting Laws, affecting Grain and Hogs (Ques.) 5133 (iii).
—— Prime Minister's Visit to Imp. Conference, Editorials in 'Christian Guardian' (read &c.) 9072 (v).
SUPPLY—
Art, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6248 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3158 (ii).
Sussex Street, Govt. Properties, Names of Owners (Ques.) 6666 (iv).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Denial by Mr. Begin *re* words quoted by Mr. Monk *re* Naval Defence, 134 (i).

TODD, Mr. W. F., *Charlotte.*
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8447 (v).

TOLMIE, Mr. J., *Bruce North.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1487 (i); in Com., 3392, 3459 (ii).
Bell, Hugh Samuel Relief (B. 191) 1°*, 8187 (v).
Johnston, Mary Hamilton Relief (B. 140) 1°*, 5619 (iii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 159) 1°*, 6439 (iv).
Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 76) 1°*, 1488 (i).

TOLMIE, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 1°*, 1640 (i).
Stapleton, Dalton Mabel Relief (B. 141) 1°*, 5619 (iii).
Sutherland, George Mackay Relief (B. 218) 1°*, 9089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2609 (ii).
Western Canal Co.'s incorp. (B. 195) 1°*, 8308 (v).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*
Naval Policy and Arthabaska Election (remarks) on Address, 494 (i).

TURCOTTE, Mr. J. P., *Quebec County.*
Address, The, 190 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6320 (iv).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4579 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election (remarks) on Address, 190 (i).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 1710 (i).
I.C.R., St. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Privileges and Elections Com., Ques. of Order, 8000 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7506 (iv).
—— Convention at Washington, Cor. with G. B. and Can. *re* Negotiations &c. (M. for copy*) 3948 (ii).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Limited, incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*
I.C.R., Branch Lines Lease (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9590 (v).
—— Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1166 (i).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5082, 5575; on M. for 3°, 5252 (iii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3028 (ii).
Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 1453 (i).
Bradley, Mr. John, Irregularity *re* Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5586 (iii).
Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 70) 1°*, 1488 (i); in Com., 3062 (ii).
Coal Miners' Strike in West, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9705 (v).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2421 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9620 (v).
Flax Exports from Saskatchewan, &c., (remarks) 10521 (v).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8620 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp., B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238, 8559 (v).
G. T. P. Branch Lines (B. 73) 1°*, 1488 (i); in Com., 3021 (ii).
Homestead Irregularities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5592 (iii).
I. C. R. Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie), 1124 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3265 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6145 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 8148 (v).
——— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10023 (v).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7679 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5559 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—Sask., (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).
Telegraph and Cable Services Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9645 (v).
Waterways Treaty Bill, Govt. Intention, (remarks) 8895 (v).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1333 (i).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, (B. 3) 1°*, 148; 2° m., 1407, in Com., 1408, 1527, 1728-9 (i); 3° m., 2864, 3276, 3526 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause, &c. (Ques.) 5835 (iii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G., *York Centre (O.)*
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res., (Mr. Beattie) 4360 (iii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, Arrangement *re* re-instatement (Ques.) 654 (i).
Humber River Bridge, Obstruction to Navigation (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. and Cor. of Mr. Walsh (read) 10474, (amt.) 10489, Neg., Y. 45; N. 79) 10533 (v).
——— Cor. with Mr. E. J. Walsh and Dept. (M. for copies*) 5136 (iii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G.—*Con.*
——— Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 7556 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 7556 (iv).
Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5830 (iii).
Porcupine Fire Sufferers, Request for Tents, Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 9983 (v).
Reciprocity Vote, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Ques. of Priv., 3461 (ii).
Sections 11, 12, 14, 22, &c., in Tp. 10, Range 22, Applications *re* (M. for copies*) 980 (i).
Shafting imported, Quantities and Values, since April, 1910 (Ques.) 7593 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (free delivery) 4295 (iii).

WARBURTON, Mr. A. B., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Oyster Industry, Memorials, Surveys, &c. (M. for cor.) 714 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication, Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 3863, 3917 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorial, &c., on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2179 (ii).
Public Accounts Com. (M.) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Committee, 527, 818 (i).
——— on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 836 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3709 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Marine ('Earl Grey') 6477 (iv).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *Renfrew, North.*
American Bank Note Co.'s Contract *re* Bank Notes, Acceptance of Designs for Postage Stamps (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
See 'Stamps.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8823; in Com., 9304 (v).
Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries (Ques.) 4467 (iii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4348 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5148 (iii).
——— Estimates *re* &c. (remarks) 2004 (ii).
Ontario and Abitibi Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 3° m., 8962 (v).
Pensions to Veterans (remarks) 6915 (iv).
Petewawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Forces in Training (Ques.) 4465 (iii).
——— Extent of Damage by Fire (remarks) 9090 (v).
Petawawa Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).
Postage Stamps, Canadian Design, (remarks) 7106 (iv).
——— New Issue, Condemnation *re* (Ques.) 9990 (v).

WHITE, Mr. G. V.—*Con.*

Postage Stamps, Prizes *re* Best Design, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 5402 (iii).
See 'American.'

Quebec Bridge, Caisson, Damage to, Claims *re* (Ques.) 4045 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (farm bulletins) 6185 (iv); Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 1032 (i).

Tariff Resolutions, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2641 (ii).

WHITE, Mr. W. H., *Victoria, Alta.*

Elevators, Terminal, &c. on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3509 (ii).

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1274 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Vegreville) 3011 (ii).

WILCOX Mr O. J., *Essex, North.*

Animals transported between Can. and U.S., Disregard of Rules, &c. (remarks) 310 (i).

Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiations with U.S. *re* (remarks) 1575 (i).

Canning, J. H., Inspector of Inland Revenue, Retirement of, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).

Farm Products entered at Windsor, from 1906-1910 (Ques.) 7596 (iv).

Farm Products exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8701 (v.)

Fisheries on the Great Lakes, Regulations *re* Commission (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5217 (iii).

Fisheries Regulations, Modification of (remarks) 1803 (i)

G.T.Trainmen's Strike, Inaction of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5809 (iii).

Leamington Post Office, Cost in Detail, &c. (Ques.) 9782 (v).

Negro Immigrants, Treatment of, Prohibition of into Canada (remarks) 5941 (iv).

Post Office Revenue at Tlbury, Essex, &c., for the years 1904-10 (Ques.) 807 (i).
See 'Walkervlle.'

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hartland) 1617; Que. (Maisonneuve) 1685 (i).

Walkerville Post Office Building, and Mail Distribution (remarks) *re* Post Office Staff 2559 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).
See 'Post Office.'

Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of (Ques.) 6272 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. C. A., *Laval.*

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6316 (iv).

Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3603 (ii).

Canadian Commissioner at Paris, Contradiction of Question asked in Senate, 9545 (v).

Jesus River Improvements, Completion, Suspension, &c. (Ques.) 804 (i).

Montreal Customs House, Employees leaving since 1st July, 1896 (M. for ret.*) 1340 (i).

National Weekly Indemnity Co., Change of Name (B. 77) 1°*, 1488 (i).

Racial and Religious Prejudices in Liberal Pamphlets (remarks) on Address, 542 (i).

Riviere des Prairies Dredging, Rep. *re* (M. for copy) 2162 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1685; (Marieville) 1698 (i); (Montreal barracks) 3149 (ii).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Cameron, Miss, Immigration Agent in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5191 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827 (v).

Immigration Agents in G.B. and Europe, List, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 981 (i).

Immigration Expenditure in U.S. and G.B. for 1910 (Ques.) 4300 (iii).

Immigration, Number since 31st March last to present, &c. (M. for ret.) 1498 (i).

Immigration Statistics, Publication of (remarks) 2366, 2556 (ii).

Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8745 (v).

Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 1104 (i).

Napanee River Dredging, Instructions, &c. (M. for cor.*) 981 (i).

—— Cor. *re* (remarks) 1903 (i), 2065 (ii), 4049 (iii).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 9727 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture — Quarantine (public health) 5981 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (lock keepers) 6453; Welland (Port Colborne) 6398 (iv).

Dom. Lands—(Forestry convention) 6052 (iv).

Immigration (agents) 5166, Reply to Minister, 5177 (iii).

Interior (immigration agents) 4729 (iii).

Justice—Miscellaneous (Hague arbitration) 6164 (iv).

Labour Dept—(Labour Gazette) 6057 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses) 6460, 6496 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine (supplies) 6473 (iv).

Miscellaneous (coronation decorations) 9565 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2089; (Peterborough) 2603 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 1677; (Montreal barracks) 1864; (Napierville) 1866 (i).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's cars) 6446 (iv).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Bracebridge Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Reciprocity with U.S. in Com. on Res., 7461 7481 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (Agents) 5166 (iii); Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Victoria) 6023 (iv).

Technical Education Commission, Completion of Work (remarks) 1662 (i).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Absence of Ministers during Discussion *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8358 (v).

Accidents on Rys: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

——— *See* 'Railways.'

Accounts Outstanding, Total Amounts *re* Financial Statement: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5403 (iii).

———*See* 'Finance.'

Acton Vale, Upton and St. Pie Post-office Revenues: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 980 (i).

Address, The, M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Precedence, 5 (i).

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech: Moved (Mr. McGiverin) 10; Seconded (Mr. Lapointe) 16 (i).

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 22; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 44; (Mr. Foster) 60; (Mr. Guthrie) 77; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 98; (Mr. Monk) 111; (amt.) 133, Neg. (Y. 67; N. 120) 651; (Mr. Brodeur) 135, 152; (Mr. Blondin) 169; (Mr. Beland) 172; (Mr. Nantel) 179; (Mr. Jos. Turcotte) 190; (Mr. Paquet) 197; (Mr. Rivet) 208; (Mr. R. L. Borden) Amt. to Amt., 228, Neg. (Y. 70; N. 126) 649; (Mr. Miller) 229; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 246; (Mr. Fowke) 254, 271; (Mr. M. Clark) 297; (Mr. Burrell) 303, 311; (Mr. Neely) 325; (Mr. Sproule) 334; (Mr. Paterson) 346; (Mr. Blain) 355; (Mr. Kyte) 369; (Mr. Northrup) 378; (Mr. Ralph Smith) 402; (Mr. Middlebro) 423; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Borden) 441; (Mr. Crothers) 491; (Mr. G. A. Turcotte) 494; (Mr. Proulx) 497; (Mr. Carvell) 512; (Mr. Foster) 531; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 567; (Mr. Monk) on Amt. (Mr. Borden) 595;(Mr. Lafortune) 615; (Mr. Gilbert) 624; (Mr. Fisher) 626; (Mr. Campbell) 640; (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 664 (i).

Address in Ans. to His Ex's Speech: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 694 (i).

Address, the, Reply from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1487 (i).

Address to His Ex., Casket for: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).

Adjournment for Coronation, Definite Date: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9090 (v).

———Extension of Time: Remarks (Mr. Miller) 9566 (v).

——— M. (Mr. Fielding) 9580 (v).

See 'Coronation', 'Business.'

Adjournment of House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 866 (i).

Administration of Oaths: *See* 'B. No. 1.'

Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change: M. for Cor. (Mr. McKenzie) 2166 (ii).

Administrator of the Govt. during His Ex.'s Absence, Emoluments for: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1089 (i).

Adulteration of Foods: *See* 'B. No. 35.'

Advertising Govt. Works, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).

See 'Public Works.'

Agricultural and Farmers Associations, Res. approving Reciprocity; Read (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5546 (iii).

Agricultural Implements: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5745 (iii).

See 'Agriculture, Implements.'

Agricultural and Manufactured Products of the U. S. *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Stmnt. made by Mr. M. Clark, 4196 (iii).

———*See* 'Reciprocity.'

AGRICULTURE:

Agriculture, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup. 1474 (i), 5955 (iv), 9076 (v).

——— Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to: Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).

——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Gilbert) 5938 (iv).

Agricultural Imports into Canada, Quantity, Average Price, &c: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5401 (iii).

Agricultural Products, imported into B. C. from U. S., Australia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7344 (iv).

Agricultural Products and Dairy Produce imported from U. S., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9991 (v).

Agriculture, Total Expenditure from Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 4302 (iii).

Agricultural Products of Canada, Total Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6756 (iv).

Animals Health, Quarantine, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Animal Industry in Canada, Reps. Data, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Magrath) 4677 (iii).

Animals transported between Can. and U.S., Disregard of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 310 (i).

Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 10350 (v).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Beef, Pork, &c., and other Animal Productions, Imports, Quantity, &c. from Oct. 1910 to Feb. 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6264 (iv).

Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Govt., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 655 (i).

Butter, Cheese and Meats imported, Value, Weight, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).

Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4670 (iii).

—— Suppl. Answer laid on Table (Mr. Paterson) 6188 (iv).

Cattle exports to the U.S., Bonded to G.B.: Remarks (Mr Blain) 7426 (iv).

—— Reshipped to G.B.: Remarks *re* Return (Mr. Blain) 7558 (iv).

Cattle Inspection on Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

Cattle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).

Cheese Cool Curing Room, Brockville, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8095 (v).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5406 (iii).

Cholera Precautions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10197 (v).

Cold Storage in Can., Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1455 (i).

Cold Storage Depots, Total Amounts paid from 1907-10: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii).

Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).

Crop Statistics, Policy of Collecting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5937 (iv).

Dairy Industry, Memorials *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2671 (ii).

Dairy and Fruit Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6234 (iv).

Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 662 (i).

Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries: Ques.(Mr. G. V. White) 4467 (iii).

Embargo on British Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10344 (v).

Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii), 9076 (v).

Exhibition Grants, Subsidies paid to: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii).

—— See 'Winnipeg.'

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Expenditurec on Militia and Agriculture from 1867 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9371, 9432 (v).

Expenditures in Ontario for 1910; Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6668 (iv).

Experimental Farm Bulletins: in Com. of Sup., 6185 (iv).

Experimental Farms Reps.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Milk Average, Eggs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 662, 1285 (i).

Experimental Farms, Stock *re*: Remarks (Mr. Best), in Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Number established for past year: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 656 (i).

—— Number operated in Dom., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1102 (i).

Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) on M. for Sup., 8995 (v).

Farm Products, Dutiable Exports by Provs. into U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 7026 (iv).

Farm Products entered at Windsor from 1906 1910: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 7596 (iv).

Farm Products exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 8701 (v).

Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets, 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8096 (v).

Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1496 (i).

Farm and Dairy Products, Quantity and Value of Importation from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9361 (v).

Farm Products imported from U.S. into Kingson Port, Quantities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3668 (ii).

Farm and Garden Products imported from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7034 (iv).

Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Apptmt. Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 8701 (v).

Hay Claims, Delay in repayment to Canadian Exporters: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5403 (iii).

Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8984 (v).

Horses admitted into Canada from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).

Horses Diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 7427 (iv).

Implements, Reduction of Duties: Prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1915 (i).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

——— Resuming adjd. Debate: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 2253 (ii), 4383 (iii).

Implements, Imports into Can. since 1908, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1350 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1358 (i).

Imports into Canada, Quantity, Average Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5401 (iii).

King, Dr., Residence at Experimental Farm, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 804, 1349 (i).

Live Stock Industry and Cold Storage Systems: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1184; Neg. (Y. 66; N. 111) 1275 (i).

Maple Sugar, Adulteration, Pet. *re* Amt. to Foods Act: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5131 (iii).

Milk and Cream shipped from Western Ont., Accommodation *re* Handling: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported, Quantity for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6269 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported to U.S. for 1910-11. Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7038 (iv).

——— Exports to U.S. for March and April, 1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8790 (v).

Pork Packing Industry, Delegation *re*: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Blain) 3530 (ii).

Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6271 (iv).

Quarantine Stations, Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3213 (ii).

Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase by Govt.: Ques., (Mr. Monk) 8992 (v).

Rabies, Outbreak of, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9995, 10095 (v).

Seeds and Farm Weeds: in Com. of Sup., 6213 (iv).

Sheep and Lambs imported into Canada from U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).

Soil Fertility, Memorandum from Experimental Farm: Read (Mr. Armstrong) 5965 (iv).

Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

Tobacco Duties, Imports and Exports from and to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).

Tobacco Leaf, Total Imports, &c. into Canada for last three years: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5405 (iii).

Tobacco Production, Encouragement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Wheat Prices in West and Canada and Liverpool Market: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 6267 (iv).

Winnipeg World's Fair, Grant to: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9076 (v).

Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 6455 (iv).

Aids to Navigation on St. Lawrence, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 799 (i).

See '*Marine*'.

Air Brakes for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Air Brakes, Triple Valve, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Alaskan Boundary Commission's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3952 (iii).

Alberta Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 92'.

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 93'.

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51'.

Alberta Rangers, Macleod Squadron, Organisation of, Capt. D. J. Campbell's Connection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7340 (iv).

Alberta-Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 133'.

Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 220'.

Alcoholism International Congress, Delegates to: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5632 (iii).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 62'.

Algoma Timber Permits, Amounts paid *re* Dues: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4673 (iii).

Alien Labour Law, Administration at Sault Ste. Marie: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).

——— Employment of Foreigners on Public Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 10367 (v).

Aliens Naturalization, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2666 (ii).

See 'Labour'.

Aliens, Outside of Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 7554 (iv).

All Red Steamship Co.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

See 'Atlantic'.

Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* , B. No. 162.'

'Alva' Str., Expenditure *re* to Philip & Son.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2438 (ii).

——— Purchase of, Dimensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1909 (i).

Amaguadees Pond, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9500 (v).

American Bank Note Co.'s Contract, Expiration of: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 7247 (iv).

See 'Post Office'.

American Boats through Can. Canals, Reciprocity for: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
American Silver Coin, Amount exported from Canada: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).
—— *See* 'Coin.'
American War Vessels passing through Canadian Canals, Permission from Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10334 (v).
—— *See* 'U.S.'
Ancona Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Anglo-American Treaty, Arbitration, Communications *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5619 (iii).
Anglo-Japanese Commercial Treaty, Signing of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6673 (iv).
—— Cor. *re* Favoured Nation Clause: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6758, 6906 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Copy (Mr. Burrell) 7255 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 2271 (ii).
—— Termination of, Cor. *re* Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 2003 (ii).
—— *See* 'Japan.'
Animals Health, Quarantine, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).
Animal Industry in Canada, Reps. Data, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Magrath) 4677 (iii).
Animals transported between Can. and U.S., Disregard of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 310 (i).
Annapolis and London Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8752 (v).
Annual Drill, Number of Officers, Men, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 9352 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Annuities for Indians, Man., Sask., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8884 (v).
Answers of Ministers to Questions *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4137 (iii).
Arbitrations, &c. and Awards, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
Archives, Historical Researches, Names of Staff: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2155 (ii).
'Arctic,' Rep. of Capt. Bernier: Inquiry for (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
—— Provisions: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).
Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 10350 (v).
Argyle Sound, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
Armouries, &c. in Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 1460 (i).
See 'Militia,' 'Public Works,' &c.
Arrow Lake Postal Clerk: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Arthabaska Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 1474 (i), 5955 (iv), 9076 (v).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4115 (iii).
Assiniboine River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii), 6006 (iv).
Associated Boards of Trade of Ont. and Reciprocity: Res. Read (Mr. Middlebro) 4121 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity.'
Astronomers Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 9690 (v).
Athens Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2088 (ii).
Athol Mail Route, Establishment of, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Rhodes) 2161 (ii).
Atlantic Fast Service and All Red Route, Establishment of: M. for Cor. (Mr. Armstrong) 1726 (i).
Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).
See 'Post Office.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3853 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Quebec Oriental Ry. Co., and New Canadian Co., Date of Incorporation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2161 (ii).
—— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 4048 (iii).
See 'Charing Cross.'
Aud. Gen., Cor. *re* Overpayments by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Best) 1010 (i).
Aud. Gen's Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1485 (i).
Austin Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
Australia and Can., Reciprocal Negotiations since 1900: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).
Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Aylmer Post Office Revenue for 1908-9, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 984 (i).
Aylmer, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1672 (i).
Aylwin Irrigation Grant: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 6445 (iv), 8192, 9076 (v).
—— *See* 'Interior.'
Babcock, Mr., Payments *re* Extra Work: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6108 (iv).
Baby Farm, Toronto Sale of, Competition *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2155 (ii).
——*See* 'Militia'

Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8763 (v).
Baggage Smashing: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
Bahamas and Canada, Negotiations *re* Annexation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8955 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9372 (v).
Bait Freezer at Barrington Passage, Assistance *re* Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Jameson) 3947 (ii).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) 8889 (v).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5039, 5293 (iii), 8791 (v).
Bait Freezers Construction in Louisburg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 6505 (iv).
Banff Park Water Works: in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).
Bank Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 5, 14, 50, 213, 219.'
Bank Act, Consideration of by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6674 (iv).
Bank Act, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6441, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).
Bank Act, Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govt. Action: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5632 (iii).
———*See* 'Finance.'
Bank Charters, Extension: *See* 'B. Nos. 213, 219 and 221.
Bank Curators' Reports: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 3142 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4569 (iii), 7556 (iv).
——— Explanation (Mr. Foster) 5038 (iii).
Bankers Association, Agreement *re* Competition: Ques. (Mr. Low) 3466 (ii).
——— Bylaws, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4116 (iii).
Bank Failures, Rep. of Curators to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2670 (ii).
——— Stmnt. of Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2670 (ii).
———*See* 'Finance.'
Banking and Commerce Com.: M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 2364, 2429, 3599 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Miller) to sit during Sessions of House, 8355 (v).
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt. ref. to Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 926, 1091 (i).
Bank Officers and Creditors: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Baptist Convention of Ont. and Que.: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
See 'Can. Baptist.'
Bark Lake Post Office, Closing and Opening: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).
Barlow, John R., Emplymt. by Geological Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8533 (v).
Barrett, Mr., Payments to *re* Lifting Buoys: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).
Barrington Bait Freezer: *See* Bait 'Freezer.'
Bathurst Dredging Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 803, 1285 (i).
——— *See* 'Gaspereaux.'
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2970 (ii).
——— Cor. Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3005 (ii).
——— Further Cor.: Read (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 3029 (ii).
Bay of Fundy Buoy Lights: in Com. of Sup., 6458 (iv).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).
——— *See* 'Hague Arbitration.'
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 88.'
Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Bear River Indian Reserves, Medical Officer, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3223 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range, Pets *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3606 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii), 6057 (iv).
Beatty, Mary Jane, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Beauharnois Canal, Alienation of, Reps. *re*: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2214 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).
——— Grantees, Improvements, Valuation of Franchise, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1711 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2194 (ii).
——— Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2677 (ii).
——— Privileges, Advertisement for Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1712 (i).
——— Total Cost, Revenue from Grantees, Arrears, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).
See 'Canals.'
Beausoleil Indian Agent at Christian Island, Place of Residence: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5288 (iii).
Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits *re* cutting Timber, Agent's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4304-5 (iii).
See Indians.'
Beddington, Mr., Pension *re* Pilotage: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Beef, Pork, &c., and other Animal Productions, Imports, Quantity, &c. from Oct., 1910 to Feb., 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6264 (iv).
See 'Butter.'
Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application re Homestead, Date of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3221 (ii).
Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Bell, G. W., Pass Investigation *re* I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

Bell, Hugh Samuel, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 191.'

Belleville Docking Facilities: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iv).

Belleville Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Belleville Govt. Buildings, Draping for King's Death: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

Bellevue Mining Disaster, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 1079 (i).

Berlin Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) 5726 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity.'

Bermuda, Information *re* Annexation: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 5216 (iii).

Bidwell Bay, B.C., Govt. Land Reserves, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1284 (i).

Big Bay Point Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6574 (iv) 9536 (v).

Bills, Royal Assent, 9591 (v).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).
1°*, 2 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 8; 2°, 956, 1407, 1797 (i).

Bill (No. 3) Respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).
1°*, 148; 2°, 1407; in Com., 1408, 1527, 1728 (i); 3° m., 3276, 3526 (ii).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).
1°*, 148 (i); 2°, 3943; M. for Com., 3945; in Com., 3946 (ii); 3°*, 4583 (iii).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Demers).
1°, 148 (i).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 149; 2°, 968; in Com., 976, 1294, 1510; 3°*, 1728 (i).

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 149; 2°, 1296 (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 8789 (v).

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 149; 2°, 1298 (i).

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°, 150; 2°, 1300; in Com., 1301, 1526; 3°*, 1527 (i); Sen. Amts., 3460, 3845 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 10) To prohibit the Manufacture and Importation of Matches made with White Phosporus.—(Mr. King).
1°, 194; 2°, 1576 (i).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting Co-operative Credit Societies.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 194; 2°, 1302; in Com., 1302 (i).

Bill (No. 12) To amend the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908.—(Mr. Beauparlant).
1°, 195 (i); Order dschgd., 4464 (iii).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the Sale of Poisons. (Mr. Lewis).
1°, 259 (i).

Bill (No. 14) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 261 (i).

Bill (No. 15) To amend the Canada Medical Act.—(Mr. Black).
1°, 309 (i); 2°, 2253 (ii); in Com., 6067; 3°*, 6068 (iv).

Bill (No. 16) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 377 (i).

Bill (No. 17) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 376; 2°*, 700; in Com., 1682; 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 18) Respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 376; 2°*, 700; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 19) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 376; 2°*, 700 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2100 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 377; 2°*, 700 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 377; 2°*, 700 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2100 (ii).

Bill (No. 22) To prohibit the Importation, Manufacture, Sale and Use of Opium for other than Scientific or Medicinal Purposes.—(Mr. King).
1°, 468 (i).

Bill (No. 23) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1°, 529 (i).

Bill (No. 24) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Edwards).
1°, 530 (i).

Bill (No. 25) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Barnard).
1°, 663 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Saving of Daylight.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°*, 663 (i).

Bill (No. 27) Respecting Licenses to Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 698 (i).

Bill (No. 28) To amend the Elections Act.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 699 (i).

Bill (No. 29) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°, 699 (i).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Inspection of Railway Locomotive Steam Boilers.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°, 699 (i).

Bill (No. 31) Respecting the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company.—(Mr. Rankin).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1080; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the Sterling Trusts Corporation.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1032 (i); in Com., 2596, 2648, 3021, 3180, 3453, 3841 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4664 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6609 (iv).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1032; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. Donnelly).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1032; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 35) Respecting Pure Foods.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).
1°, 865 (i).

Bill (No. 36) Relating to the establishment and expenses of the International Joint Commission under the Waterways Treaty of January the eleventh, nineteen hundred and nine.—(Mr. Pugsley).
Prop. Res., 695; in Com. on Res., 867; 1°* of B., 923 (i); 2° m., 9091; in Com., 9156, 9172; 3°*, 9220 (v).

Bill (No. 37) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 924 (i).

Bill (No. 38) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°, 924 (i).

Bill (No. 39) To amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°, 924 (i).

Bill (No. 40) To amend the Criminal Code, respecting Homicide while Hunting.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 987 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 41) Respecting Wireless Telegraphy on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 988 (i).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting a Patent of Conduits Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); 3°*, 4241 (iii).

Bill (No. 44) Respecting the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 2594, 3021 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Ecrement).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3180, 3389, 3454 (ii), 3993 (iii); 3°, 7560, 7717; in Com., 7718 (iv); 3°*, 8069 (v).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company. —(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2601 (ii).

Bill (No. 47) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 1069 (i); 2° and in Com., 2005; 3°*, 2740 (ii).

Bill (No. 48),to amend the Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act, 1894.— (Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 1069 (i); 2° and in Com., 8451; 3°*, 8451; Sen. Amt., 9534 (v).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting Water Powers.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 1277 (i).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting Banks and Banking.—Mr. Fielding).
1°, 1340 (i).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr Magrath).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3024, 3181 3391; 3°*, 3392 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) To incorporate the Commercial Travellers Accident Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Rankin).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Pickup).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684; in Com., and 3°* 2601 (ii).

Bill (No. 54) Respecting the E. B. Eddy Company.—(Mr. Devlin).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3028 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 55) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation. (Mr. Knowles).

1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3994; 3°*, 3995 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6952 (iv).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the London & Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Beattie).

1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) To amend the Fisheries Act. —(Mr. Barnard).

1°, 1343 (i).

Bill (No. 59) Respecting the Athabasca Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1453; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 60) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).

1°*, 1453; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3060, 3182; 3°*, 3183 (ii).

Bill (No. 61) Respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 1453; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3064 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 3392, 3459; 3°*, 3460 (ii).

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the British Columbia and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3064 (ii).

Bill (No. 64) To incorporate the British Columbia and White River Railway Company.—(Mr. Congdon).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6951 (iv).

Bill (No. 65) Respecting the British Crown Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. McColl).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1848 (i).

Bill (No. 66) Respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Stratton).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2601 (ii).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Burrard. Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company. — (Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Fowke).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°* 3808 (ii).

Bill (No. 69) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 3183, 3454; 3°*, 3459 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) Respecting the Canadian Western Railw y Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3062; 3°*, 3064 (ii).

Bill (No. 71) To incorporate the Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3021; 3°*, 3024 (ii).

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the International Railway Company and International Traction Railway.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3808 (ii).

Bill (No. 75) Respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Beattie).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 3024, 3181, 3389; 3°*, 3391 (ii).

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3392 (ii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the National Weekly Indemnity Company, and to change its name to the National Guarantee and Accident Company.—(Mr. Wilson, Laval).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3993 (iii).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Macdonnell).

1°, 1551 (i); order dschgd, 4464 (iii).

Bill (No. 79) To regulate the Manufacture, Storage and Importation of Explosives.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 989; in Com. on Res., 1577; 1°* of B., 1580 (i); 2° and in Com., 8451 (v).

Bill (No. 80) Respecting the Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Lancaster).

1°*, 1640 (i); 2°*, 2100,* in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 81) To incorporate the Canadian Northern Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Cash).

1°*, 1640; 2°*, 1848 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii); Sen. Amts., 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company, and to change its name to the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).

1°*, 1640; 2°*, 1848 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

Bill (No. 83) To incorporate the Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 1640 (i); 2°*, 2100; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°*, 1640; 2°*, 1848 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3808 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) Respecting Forest Reserves and Parks.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 1640 (i); 2° and in Com., 8084, 8606, 8650, 9345; 3°*, 9348 (v).

Bill (No. 86) To amend the Criminal Code respecting Offensive Weapons.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1642 (i).

Bill (No. 87) To prevent giving and taking Secret Commissions.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1646 (i).

Bill (No. 88) Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie, Prince Edward).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 89) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Lafortune).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Indian River Railway Company.—(Mr. Turcotte, (Quebec).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 91) To incorporate the Pacific and Peace Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3993 (iii).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company .—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 1969; 2°*, 2295; in Com., and 3°*, 3809 (ii); Sen, Amts., 6469 (iv).

Bill (No. 93) To incorporate the Alberta Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy).

1°*, 1969; 2°*, 2295 (ii); in Com., 5079, 5252, 5568, 5630; 3°*, 5631 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Western Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°* 1969; 2°*, 2295 (ii), in Com., and 3°*, 6066 (iv).

Bill (No. 95) To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).

1°, 1969 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To prohibit the Manufacture and Importation of Matches made with White Phosphorus.—(Mr. King).

Res. prop., 1802 (i); in Com. on Res., 2021; 1°* of B., 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) To prohibit the Importation, Manufacture, Sale and Use of Opium for other than Scientific or Medicinal purposes.—(Mr. King).

Res. prop., 1803 (i); in Com. on Res., 2062; 1°* of B., 2063; 2°, 2518; in Com., 2532; 3°, 2740 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8090 (v).

Bill (No. 98) Respecting Load Lines on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2063 (ii).

Bill (No. 99) To incorporate the Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 2254; 2°*, 2602; in Com., and 3°*, 3809 (ii).

Bill (No. 100) Respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Hunt).

1°*, 2254; 2°*, 2602; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Sealey).

1°*, 2434; 2°*, 2665 (iii), in Com., and 3°* 4606 (iii).

Bill (No. 102) To incorporate the Imperial Traction Company.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 2434; 2°*, 2665 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5128 (iii).

Bill (No. 103) Relating to Steamship Subsidies.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Res. prop., 1802 (i); in Com. on Res., 2503; 1°* of B., 2518 (ii); 2° and in Com., 8675; 3°*, 8678 (v).

Bill (No. 104) To amend paragraph (*l*) of Section 2, and paragraphs (*n*) and (*o*) of Section 9 of the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1° m., 2736 (ii); 2°, 8065; in Com., 8070; 3°*, 8077 (v).

Bill (No. 105) To incorporate the All Red Steamship Company (title changed to Imperial Steamship Company). — (Mr. McKenzie).

1°*, 2827; 2°*, 3064 (ii); in Com., 4239; 3°*, 4428 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6610 (iv).

Bill (No. 106) To incorporate the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).

1°*, 2828; 2°*, 3064 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4606 (iii).

Bill (No. 107) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 2851 (ii); wthdwn., 8088 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 108) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. — (Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 2983; 2°*, 3183 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5631 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) Respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°*, 2983; 2° m., 3184; 2°*, 3393 (ii); in Com., 6121; 3°*, 6156 (iv).

Bill (No. 110) Respecting the People's Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).

1°*, 2983; 2°*, 3393 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5128 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6611 (iv).

Bill (No. 111) To incorporate the Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).

1°*, 2983; 2°, 3184 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) Respecting the Storage of Food.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2983 (ii).

Bill (No. 113) To incorporate the Dominion Development Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 3[illegible] 2°*, 3393 (ii); in Com., 5127, 5253 3°*, 5254 (iii).

Bill (No. 114) For the Protection of Railway Employees.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 3218 (ii).

Bill (No. 115, from the Senate), To incorporate the Guardian Accident and Guarantee Company.—(Mr. Doherty).

1°*, 3453, 2°*, 3563 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3993 (iii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Telegraphs Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 3453 (ii).

Bill (No. 117) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Stanfield).

1°, 3453 (ii).

Bill (No. 118) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. McLean, Queens).

1°, 3664 (ii).

Bill (No. 119, from the Senate), Respecting the Ontario Northern and Timagimi Railway Company.—(Mr. Proulx).

1°*, 4109; 2°*, 4241; in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 120, from the Senate), Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).

1°, 4110; 2°*, 4241 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6066 (iv).

Bill (No. 121, from the Senate), Respecting the Globe Printing Company.—(Mr. Harris).

1°, 4040; 2°*, 4300; in Com., 5127; 3°*, 5128 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) Respecting Sewage.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 4039 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 123) To incorporate La Banque Internationale du Canada.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 4109; 2°*, 4241; in Com., 5631, 5766 (iii), 6120; 3°*, 6121 (iv).

Bill (No. 124) Relating to the Water in the Railway Belt and Peace River Block of Land.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 4110 (iii).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate), Respecting the Pacific, Northern and Omenica Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

2°*, 4300; in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Fortier).

1°*, 4384; 2°*, 4606; in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate), To Incorporate the Universal Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Low).

2°*, 4300; in Com., and 3°*, 4664 (iii).

Bill (No. 128) For granting to His Majesty certain sums for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1911.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4210 (iii).

Bill (No. 129) Respecting Baggage Smashing.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 4198 (iii).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate), For the Relief of Matilda Emo.—(Mr. Hodgins).

1°*, 4298; 2°*, 4428; in Com., and 3°*, 5128 (iii).

Bill (No. 131) Respecting Drinking Water.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 4564 (iii).

Bill (No. 132) To correct certain Clerical Errors in the French Version of the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).

1°*, 4566; 2° and in Com., 8088; 3°*, 8090 (v).

Bill (No. 133 from the Senate), To incorporate the Alberta-Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Rutan.)

1°*, 4740; 2°*, 5129; in Com., and 3°*, 5631 (iii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate), To incorporate the Canadian Inter-Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve.)

1°*, 4740; 2°*, 5129; in Com., and 3°*, 5631 (iii).

Bill (No. 135, from the Senate), Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas.)

1°*, 4740; 2°*, 5129 (iii); in Com., 6950; 3°*, 6951 (iv).

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate), To correct a Clerical Error in the Title of the French Version of Chapter 142 of the Statutes of 1910.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°*, 4740 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate), For the relief of Maggie Florence Sadler.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

2°*, 6224; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate), For the relief of Gertrude Maud Grant.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 5619; 2°*, 5776 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate), For the relief of George Addison Brown.—(Mr. Thornton).

1°*, 5525; 2°*, 5631 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 140, from the Senate), For the relief of Mary Hamilton Johnston.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 5619; 2°*, 5776 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate), For the relief of Dalton Mabel Stapleton.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 5619; 2°*, 5776 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate), For the relief of Lorne Forbes Robertson.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6066; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 143, from the Senate), For the relief of Cecil Ernest Freeman.—(Mr. Blain).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6066; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 144, from the Senate), For the relief of Ethel May Hornell.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6066; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 145, from the Senate) For the relief of Paulina Verena Meyer.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 5933; 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 146) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Staples).

1°, 5618 (iii).

Bill (No. 147, from the Senate), To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2° and in Com., 7869 (iv).

Bill (No. 148, from the Senate), Respecting the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Molloy).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 149, from the Senate), Respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) To authorize the Government of Canada to acquire, by lease, a certain line of railway in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 4200; in Com. on Res., 5640; 1°* of B., 5726 (iii); 2°, 8410; in Com., 8411; 3°*, 8419 (v).

Bill (No. 151, from the Senate) To incorporate The Canadian Surety Company.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 5933; 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 7024 (iv).

Bill (No. 152, from the Senate) Respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Fowke).

1°*, 6439; 2°*, 6504; in Com., and 3°*, 7470 (iv).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act, as regards the Weight of a bushel and a bag of certain articles.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 6035 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8078, 8743 (v).

Bill (No. 154) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 6034 (iv).

Bill (No. 155) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 6112; 2° and ref. to Marine Com., 6675 (iv).

Bill (No. 156) To amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 6188 (iv); 2°, 8409; in Com., 8409; 3°*, 8410 (v).

Bill (No. 157) Respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. Fisher).

In Com. on Res., 6188; 1°*, 2°* of B., 6196 (iv); in Com. on B., 8077; 3°*, 8078 (v).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) To incorporate Revillon Frères Trading Company, Limited.—(Mr. Devlin).

1°, 6439; 2°, 7147, 7590 (iv); in Com., 8577, 8966, 9165, 9575; 3°*, 9576 (v).

Bill (No. 159, from the Senate) To change the name of the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 6439; 2°*, 6504; in Com., and 3°*, 6951 (iv).

Bill (No. 160) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the thirty-first March, 1911, and the thirty-first March, 1912.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 6440; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 6441 (iv).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board.—(Mr. Fowke).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 6951; in Com., 7470, 7560; 3°*, 7589 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 162, from the Senate) Respecting the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 6952 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8069 (v).

Bill (No. 163, from the Senate) For the relief of Mary Jane Beatty.—(Mr. Congdon).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 6952; in Com., and 3°*, 7590 (iv).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of Walter Harvey Kirkland.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 165, from the Senate) Respecting a Patent of the Goldschmidt Thermit Company.—(Mr. Rivet).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024; in Com., and 3°*, 7590 (iv).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) To incorporate the Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Rutan).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) To incorporate the Pacific and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8070 (v).

Bill (No. 168, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ontario-Michigan Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8070 (v).

Bill (No. 169, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canada West Loan Corporation.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., 8563; 3°*, 8566 (v).

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) To incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Nipissing).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., 8094, 8233, 8519, 8535, 8642, 8916, 8956; 3° m., 8962 (v).

Bill (No. 171, from the Senate) To incorporate the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.—(Mr. Rutan).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., 8095, 8236, 8536, 8916; 3°*, 8923 (v).

Bill (No. 172 from the Senate) Respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(Mr. Barker).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8069 (v).

Bill (No. 173, from the Senate) For the relief of Robert William Logan.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7025; in Com., and 3°*, 7590 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) To incorporate the Casualty Company of Canada.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7025; in Com., 8566; 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate), To amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Harbour of Toronto.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., 8234, 8535; 3°*, 8536 (v).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate), to incorporate the Restigouche Riparian Association.—(Mr. Geoffrion).

1°*, 7019; 2°*, 7148; in Com., 7589; 3°*, 7590 (iv).

Bill (No. 177), To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 7019; 2°, 7825; in Com., 7846 (iv); 3°m., 8104, 8193, 8403 (v).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate), Respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

1°*, 7339 (iv).

Bill (No. 179), Respecting the Songhees Indian Reserve.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 7248; in Com. on Res., 7248; 1°* of B., 7252; 2° and in Com., 7824; 3°*, 7825 (iv).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate), For the relief of Mary Kathleen Crittenden.—(Mr. Rhodes).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 181, from the Senate), For the relief of Pauline Winslow Saunderson.—(Mr. Todd).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate), For the relief of Nellie Bridgland Morrison.—(Mr. Harris).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577(v).

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate), For the relief of Frances Whittington Truesdell.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 184), Respecting Copyrights.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 7807; in Com. on Res., 7817; 1°* of B., 7824 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8895 (v).

Bill (No. 185), To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 4201 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8042; 1°* of B., 8065; in Com., 8419; 3°*, 8451 (v).

Bill (No. 186, from the Senate), Respecting The Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 187, from the Senate), Respecting a Patent of the Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8969; 3°*, 8970 (v).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate), To confer on the Commission of Patents certain Powers for the relief of Trussed Concrete Steel Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8308; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8970; 3°*, 8970 (v).

Bill (No. 189, from the Senate), To amend The Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—(Sir Allen Aylesworth).

1°*, 8187 (v).

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate), For the relief of Violet Jane Dakin.—(Mr. McCarthy).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 191, from the Senate), For the relief of Hugh Samuel Bell.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate), To provide for increasing the Capital Stock of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8969; 3°*, 8969 (v).

Bill (No. 193, from the Senate), Respecting La Sauvegarde Life Insurance Company—(Mr. Geoffrion)

1°*, 8308; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 ,v).

Bill (No. 194), To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8187 (v).

Bill (No. 195, from the Senate), To incorporate the Western Canal Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 8308; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 196, from the Senate), To incorporate The Continental Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Molloy).

1°*, 8403; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8968; 3°*, 8969 (v).

Bill (No. 197), To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 8399; 2° and in Com., 9312, 9377; 3°*, 9430 (v).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate), To incorporate the Quebec and Great North Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Hodgins).

1°*, 8476; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 9936 (v).

Bill (No. 199, from the Senate), For the relief of Fanny Mary Healey.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8476; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 200, from the Senate), For the relief of Gertrude Mary Grantham.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8477; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8971; 3°*, 8981 (v).

Bill (No. 201, from the Senate), Respecting the Canada National Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8476; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8981; 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 202, from the Senate), To incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8582; 2°, 8642; in Com., and 3°*, 9576 (v).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate), Respecting certain Patents of Munderloh and Company, Limited.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8641; in Com., 8970; 3°*, 8970 (v).

Bill (No. 204, from the Senate), Respecting the Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8641; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 205, from the Senate), Respecting the Canada Cement Company, Limited. (Mr. Northrup).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8642 (v).

Bill (No. 206, from the Senate), Respecting the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8642; in Com., 8970; 3°*, 8971 (v).

Bill (No. 207), Respecting Bank Officers and Creditors.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 8635 (v).

Bill (No. 208, To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Paterson).

Res. prop., 8477; in Com. on Res., 8716; 1°* of B., 8743 (v).

Bill (No. 209, from the Senate), Respecting Grain.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 8837; 2°, 9512 (v).

Bill (No. 210, from the Senate), To amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act as regards the delivery of wood.—(Mr. Sinclair), 1°*, 8887 (v).

Bill (No. 211) Respecting aid towards the construction of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 8704; M. for Com. on Res., 8801; in Com. on Res., 8825; 1°* of B., 8872; 2° and in Com., 9222, 9255; 3°m., 9294 (v).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°*, 8887; 2° and in Com., 9348; 3°*, 9349 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 213) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 8887; 2°, 9221; in Com., 9222; 3°, 9334 (v).

Bill (No. 214, from the Senate) Respecting the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 8955; 2°*, 8983; in Com., 9167 (v).

Bill (No. 215, from the Senate) For the relief of William Francis Currie.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 8955; 2°*, 9172 (v).

Bill (No. 216) To amend the Post Office Act, —(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 8585; in Com. on Res., 8906, 8924; 1°* of B., 8954; 2°, 9567; in Com., 9568, 9576; 3°*, 9580 (v).

Bill (No. 217) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 8586; in Com., on Res, 8954; 1°* of B., 8955 (v).

Bill (No. 218, from the Senate) For the relief of George Mackay Sutherland.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 9089; 2°*, 9576 (v).

Bill (No. 219) To amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 9089; 2°, 9343; in Com., and 3°, 9343 (v).

Bill (No. 220 from the Senate) To incorporate the Albert and Moncton Railway Company.—(Mr. Emmerson).
2°, 9224; M. for Com., 9350; in Com., 9351; in Com., and 3°*, 9377 (v).

Bill (No. 221) To amend the Penny Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 8104; M. for Com. on Res., 9220; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°* of B., 9221 (v).

Bill (No. 222) Respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.—(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 9228; 2°, in Com., 9495; 3°*, 9499 (v).

Bill (No. 223) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
M. for 1°, 9305; 1°*, 2°*, and ref. to Ry. Com., 9308; in Com. of the Whole, 9509, 3°*, 9511 (v).

Bill (No. 224) Respecting Duties of Customs on Importations from Japan.—(Mr. Fielding).
M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9432; in Com., 9445; 1°*, 2°* and in Com. on B., 9494; 3°, 9533 (v).

Bill (No. 225) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively 31st March, 1911, and 31st. March, 1912.—(Mr. Fielding).
In Com. on Ways and Means, 9580; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 9589 (v).

Birch Grove Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) 6073 (iv).

Birthday Congratulations to Prime Minister (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8 (i).

Births and Deaths in Canada, Number, &c.; M. for Ret. (Mr. McCarthy) 2679 (ii).

Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Govt., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 655 (i).

B'iss, Lt. Col. D. C., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8100 (v).

Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co., Ltd., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 187.'

Boiler Inspection on Vessels: *See* 'B. No. 155.'

Bonaventure River, Quebec, and N. B. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8764 (v).

Bonded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 4464 (iii).

Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiation with U. S. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1575 (i).

Bookkeeping: *See* 'Falconer.'

Boot and Shoe Lasts, Names of Manufacturers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Hughes) 1340 (i).

Boot Contract: *See* 'Naval Service,' &c.

Boston Speech of Min. of Militia, *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 5751 (iii).

Boundary Surveys and Demarcation: in Com. of Sup., 9546 (v).

Bracebridge Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Bradford Channel, Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

Brantford Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).

Bricks, Tiles, &c., Amount Imported from G. B. and U. S., 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2369 (ii).

Bridge Strengthening on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Brier Island Light, Application *re* new house: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

—— Lightkeeper's Salary: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

Brighton Wharf, Vote *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 1655 (i).

Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4825 (iii).

Britain's Demand for Tariff Concession *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6574 (iv).

British Ambassador's Warning to Can. Ministers *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6200 (iv).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

B. C. and Central Can. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'

B. C. Coal Strike, Agreement of Two Years ago: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6365 (iv).

B. C. Coal Strike: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6363 (iv).
——— *See* 'Coal,' 'Militia.'
British Columbia and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
B. C. Fisheries Regulations: *See* 'B. No. 185.' *See* 'Fisheries.'
B. C. Militia, Complaints *re* Treatment, Par. in B. C. Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 9248 (v).
B. C. Ry. Belt, Water: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
British Columbia and White River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
British Crown Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
British Patriotic Songs in Western Schools and American Pupils: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 656 (i).
——— Remarks of Mr. Armstrong: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4931 (iii).
British Preference Trade Policy: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5619 (iii).
British Preference, Increase of, Readjustment of Tariff, Reciprocity, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7210 (iv).
British Tariff Commission, Rep. *re* Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6268 (iv).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3859 (ii).
Bronte Harbour Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).
Brown, George Addison, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247 (iv).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 6577 (iv).
——— Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6439 (iv). *See* 'Address,' 'Finance,' 'Reciprocity.'
Buffalo Herds in National Parks: in Com. of Sup., 6049 (iv).
Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 80.'
Builders Woodworking Co., Expropriation of Land for Moncton Extension: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Crocket) 6158 (iv).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Buildings, Public Works, Plans approved by Depts. previous to Aug 5th, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 698 (i).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sealey) 7341 (iv).
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c.: Remarks on Question (Mr. Sealey) 7348 (iv).
Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. and Nav. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Business of the House, Adjournment for Coronation: Stmnt. (Mr. Fielding) 9309 (v).
——— *See* 'Adjournment.'
Business of the House, Morning Sittings: M. (Mr. Fielding) 8887, 10095 (v).
Business of Hse. for Thursdays, Procedure *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1550 (i).
——— Public Bills for Thursdays: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 2064 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Butter, Cheese and Meats imported, Value, Weight, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).
Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada, Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4670 (iii).
——— Suppl. Answer laid on Table (Mr. Paterson) 6188 (iv).
Butter and Eggs, Prices in London, Statistics *re* Reciprocity: Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce *re* Return (Mr. Perley) 6508 (iv).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Cab Fares and Street Ry. Fares, Payments for last year to Govt. Employees: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1339 (i).
——— *See* 'Public Works. &c.'
Calgary Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).
Callender Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 6497 (iv).
Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. by Govt. as Immigration Agent: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 5191 (iii).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
Campbellton Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5914 (iii), 5983 (iv).
Campbellton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).
Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8764 (v).
Canada Cement Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Canada Cement Co., Charges by Sir Sandford Fleming: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9372 (v).
——— *See* 'Cement.'
Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv), 8775 (v).
'Canada's Farthest South,' Cost of Printing and Preparing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2885 (ii).
Canada and G.B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8773 (v).
——— *See* 'Atlantic,' 'Post Office,' &c.

Canada and Japan Mail Subsidy: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1802 (i), 2503 (ii).
—— *See* 'Bill No. 103.'
Canada-Japan Trade Treaty, Expiration of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5638 (iii).
—— *See* 'Japan.'
Can. Medical Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Canada and Mexico SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8781 (v).
Can. National Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Canada and Newfoundland SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8783 (v).
Can. Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 24, 118, 155.'
Canada and S. Africa SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 8784 (v).
Canada and S. America SS. Service, Subsidies to: Ques. (Mr. Daniel), 5290 (iii).
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid *re*, Complaints of Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 661 (i).
Canada and West Indies SS. Subsidy Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5936 (iv).
Canada and W. Indies Trade Relations, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
Can. West Loan Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
See 'Baptist.'
Canadian Coasting Laws, Reciprocity affecting Grain and Hogs: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 5133 (iii).
Canadian Commissioner for France, Vacancy, Apptmt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1971 (ii), 8103 (v).
—— Contradiction of Question asked in Senate (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 9545 (v).
Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities, Dredges, Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1905 (i).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibition: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Canadian Fisheries, Extent in Marine Miles, Amounts realized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1289 (i).
—— Control by Federal Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 983 (i).
—— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Canadian Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnson before Com. on Ag.: Remarks (Mr. Schell) 2992 (ii).
——*See* 'Reciprocity.'
Canadian General Development Co., Total Amounts paid by, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 655 (i).
Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency, Charge *re* Frauds: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1716 (i).
Can. Inter-Mountain Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Canadian Light and Power Co., Lease between Govt., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lortie) 1501 (i).
—— Plans, &c., Date of Approval: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7591, 7805 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).
Canadian Loans and Investments in U. S., Amount, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rutan) 6505 (iv).
—— *See* 'Finance.'
Canadian National Parks: in Com. of Sup., 6049 (iv).
Canadian Naval Service, Applications from Canadians and British Navy: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1339 (i).
—— 'Bristol' Type, Specifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1279 (i).
—— Date and Port of Sailing of 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow': Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1091 (i).
—— Home Rule: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1461 (i).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow', Loan by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 983 (i).
—— Number of Battleships withdrawn from Can. by G. B. during the past five years: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1093 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' Type, Guns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1490 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' listed as ineffective: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1070 (i).
—— Total Expenditure since 31st Oct. 1910: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5638 (iii).
See 'Naval Service,' &c.
Can. Northern Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 69 and 211.'
Can. Northern Quebec Ry Co.: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*: Personal Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 8187 (v).
C. P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
C. P. R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 766 i).
—— Land Tax, Information *re* Privy Council's Decision (Mr. Bradbury) 2992 (ii).
—— Reduction of Rates &c.: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1806 (i); Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1573 (i).
—— *See* 'Railways.'
Canadian Railways, Accidents *re*, Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3922 (ii).
Can. Surety Co.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U. S. Citizens: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4672 (iii).
Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3608 (ii).

Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c.: *See* 'Militia.'
Can. Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
CANALS—
Arbitrations, &c. and Awards, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv).
Beauharnois Canal, Alienation, Rep. *re* Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2214 (ii).
——— Grantees, Improvements, Valuation of Franchise &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1711 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2194 (ii).
——— Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2677 (ii).
——— Privileges, Advertisement for Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1712 (i).
——— Total Cost, Revenue from Grantees, Arrears, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).
Canal Statistics: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7019 (iv).
——— Working Expenses, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 8453 (v).
Cardinal Canal Bridge: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
——— Dock Rebuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).
Carillon Water Power Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8700 (v).
——— Names of Lessee, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2668 (ii).
Chambly Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (iv).
——— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
——— Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup. 6408 (iv).
Clarry, Mr. L. F., Payments to by Govt. for Professional Services: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 813 (i).
——— Charges against: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Cornwall Canal, Enlargement of Office: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Lock, 17: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Lock. 19: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Removing High Spots from Prism: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Robertson's Culvert, Reinforcing Bank: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Farran's Point, Lower Entrance Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Galops Canal—Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal, Use by Americans: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7804 (iv).
——— *See* main heading.
Lachine Canal, Concrete Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6358, 6410 (iv).
CANALS—*Con.*
Lachine Canal: New Tug: in Com. of Sup., 6359 (iv).
——— Tugs: in Com. of Sup., 6388 (iv
——— Wharfs and Basins: in Com. of Sup., 6359 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iv).
Lockmen, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6413, 6453 (iv).
Murray Canal Dredging: in Com. of Su 6410 (iv).
——— New Scow: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Expenditure for 1910, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5830 (iii).
——— Cor. with Mr. E. J. Walsh and Dept. M. for Copies* (Mr. Wallace) 5136 (iii).
——— Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10474; Neg. (Y. 45; N. 79) 10532 (v).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wallace) 7556 (iv).
Newmarket Canal: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
——— Bradford Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).
Quebec, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).
Rapide Plat Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).
Rideau Canal, Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).
——— Lockmen, Increase of Pay: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).
——— Removal of Stumps: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
St. Ours Locks, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).
St. Peter's Canal, C. B., Construction, &c., Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8103 (v).
——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8355 (v).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Lock Gates, Tugs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
——— Concrete Walls: Remarks (Mr Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).
——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup, 6397 (iv).
——— Upper Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Claim for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).
——— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*

Soulanges Canal, Leaks and Trimming Slopes: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

——— Protection Works, Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* administration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6273 (iv).

Trent Canal, Damages by Floods: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).

——— Fenelon Falls Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

——— Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).

——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).

——— Lift Lock: in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).

——— Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).

——— Scugog River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv). *See* 'Newmarket.'

Welland Canal, Enlargement, Change of Route, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).

——— Enlargement, Memorial, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Hodgins) 1500 (i).

——— Jane St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).

——— Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).

——— Selkirk Route, Welland Canal: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).

——— Stone Protection to Banks: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).

——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).

Williamsburg Canal, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6396 (iv).

——— Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).

——— Lockmaster's House: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).

——— Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).

——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).

Canned Goods: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Canned Pease, Impure, Importation of into Canada, Number of Cases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3279 (ii).

——— Quantity imported into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3221 (ii).

Canning, J. H., Inspector of Inland Revenue, Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1350 (i).

Canso and Guysborough Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8994 (v).

Capital Life Assurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'

Cardinal Canal Bridge: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Cardinal Dock Rebuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'

Carillon Water Power, Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c.: (Mr. Monk) 8700 (v).

——— Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2668 (ii).

Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Carrier-Laine Works, Purchase by Govt., Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8992

Casualty Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 174.'

Cattle Exports to the U. S., Bonded to G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7426 (iv).

——— Remarks *re* Return (Mr. Blain) 7558 (v).

Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).

Cattle Inspection on Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

Cattle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

Cement Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 205.'

Cement Merger, Charges of Sir Sandford Fleming: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9372, 10468 (v).

Cement Production, Total Production annually since 1900: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 10196 (v).

CENSUS—

Appointments for East Elgin, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 4302 (iii).

Census Commissioner, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2155 (ii).

Census Methods: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6669, 7556 (iv).

Census of North and South Ontario, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9431 (v).

Census, Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) 9594 (v).

Census Returns: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 8193 (v).

Census, Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 9694 (v).

Census, System of Taking: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4337 (iii).

Commissioner for York County, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8704 (v).

Enumerators, Apptmt. of Enumerators: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9994 (v).

——— Apptmt. of by Liberal Associations: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7021 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2887 (ii), 4933 (iii).

CENSUS—*Con.*

Enumerators, Circulating Pets. *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Pest) 6507 (iv).

—— Completion of Work: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7218 (iv).

—— Inaccuracies in Quebec: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 7217 (iv).

Enumerators in Man., Apptmt. of by Liberal Organizers, Cor. &c., Read: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Staples) 9006, 9015 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Staples) 8889 (v).

Enumerators, Names, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4465 (iii).

Enumerators in Peel County, Number, Apptmt., &c : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10335 (v).

Hochelaga Census Enumerators, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9432 (v).

Jacques Cartier Census Enumerators, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9431 (v).

Omissions *re* Enumerations: Further Information re (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9897 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9711 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 10099 (v).

Questions, Preparation of Lists, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 659 (i).

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7556 (iv).

Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8983 (v).

Certificates to Masters, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'

Chacastapasin Indian Reserve, Owner, &c.: (Mr. Schaffner) 4301 (iii).

Chambly Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (v).

—— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).

—— Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).

Charing Cross Bank and Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. with Govt. (Mr. Ames) 1726 (i).

—— *See* 'Atlantic, Quebec & Western.'

Charwomen, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).

Chatham, Diversion of I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Chatham, N. B., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1610 (i).

—— Purchase of Site, Name of Owners: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (iii).

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 206.'

Cheese Cool Curing Room, Brockville, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8095 (v).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5406 (iii).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Protection *re* Marketing: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).

See 'Butter'.

Chemin Gouin Postmaster, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7038 (iv).

—— A. C. Miquelon, Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7210 (iv).

Chesley Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 2103 (ii).

Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).

China, Japan and Can. SS. Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 103.'

China-Japan SS. Subsidy: M. for Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 147.'

See 'Immigration.'

Chinese Immigration Act, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv).

Chinese Investigation Commission, Censure of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10383, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 10454 (v).

—— Discussion *re* Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9926 (v).

—— Evidence read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9786 (v).

—— Rep. of Mr. Justice Murphy: Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9594 (v).

—— Rep. of Judge Murphy: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9897 (v).

—— Stmnt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion with Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Ralph Smith) 2738 (ii).

Chinese Immigration, Total Number, Capita Tax, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 788 (i).

Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1103 (i).

Cholera Precautions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10197 (v).

Christian Island Indian Reserve, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4567 (iii).

—— *See* 'Beausoleil.'

Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1453 (i).

Chrysler, Mr. F. H., Amounts paid by Govt. *re* Legal Services from 1896 to 1910 (M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1727 (i).

Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4571 (iii).

Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*: M. for O. Cs., &c. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2218 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7553 (iv).

—— Notice (Mr. R. L. Borden) of Discussion, 1912 (i).

Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*: *See* 'Govt. Officials.'
Civil Service Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 12, 208 & 217.'
Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4930, 5038 (iii).
Civil Service Apptmts. from South Grey: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 2555 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Apptmts.'
Clarry, Mr. L. F., Payments to by Govt. for Professional Services: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 813 (i).
——— Charges against: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Clayoquot Life Saving Station, Investigation *re* Irregularities: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Barnard) 785 (i).
Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of: Remarks (Mr. Russell) 9996 (v).
Coal Barges and Pilotage Fees: *See* 'B. No. 118..
Coal and Coke, Quantities imported into Canada from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4674 (iii).
Coal Consumption by Govt. Cruisers, Quantity per Day: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv).
Coal imported from U. S. for 1910 for Ont., Total Amounts of Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. D. Gordon) 4041 (iii).
Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases issued: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).
Coal Miners Strike, Remarks of Mr. Geo. Taylor, 9720 (v).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
Coal Strike in Alberta and B. C., Conciliation by Labour Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6197 (iv).
Coal Strikes in the West, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6363, 6908, 7105 (iv).
Coasting Trade Act, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4675 (iii).
Cobalt Mail Service, Delays and inefficient Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1649, 1663, 1804 (i).
Cocaine, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to *re* Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8308 (v).
Coins, Foreign and Uncurrent, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Cold Storage in Can., Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1455 (i).
Cold Storage Depots, Total Amounts paid from 1907-10: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii). *See* 'Agriculture.'
Cold Storage Warehouses: *See* 'B. Nos. 36 & 112.'
Collingwood Corner Postmaster, Name, Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Capital Cost, Dimensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middleboro) 10337 (v).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Colonial Conference, 1911, Canada's Proposals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1280 (i).
——— *See* 'Imperial Conference.'
Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4470 (iii).
——— *See* 'Civil Service,' 'Negroes,' &c.
Combines Investigation Act: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).
Combines Investigation Act, Charges re: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro), 663 (i).
Combines Investigation Act, Rep of: Inquiry for (Mr. Maddin) 1987 (ii).
Combines Investigation in United Shoe Machinery Co., Restraint, &c.: Remarks (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5953 (iv).
Commercial Agent for Canada at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9511 (v).
Commercial Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Commercial Relations Documents, Translation of: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 3462 (ii).
Commercial Travellers Accident Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Commission to Immigration Agents, Total Amount paid: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2436 (ii).
Commissions, Taking of: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).
——— Lists: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 262 (i).
——— M. to add Names (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 377 (i).
Committees, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).
Commutation Ry. Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Companies Act Amt.: *See* 'B No. 7.'
Compensation to Workmen for Injuries: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Conciliation Board, Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 3378, 3399 (ii), 4244 (iii).
Conciliation Board, Principle of Action: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4242 (iii).
——— *See* 'Industrial.'
Conduits Co.'s Ltd., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
Conservation Commission, Annual Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 698 (i).
Conservation of Natural Resources, Number of Copies printed: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 660 (i).
Consolidated Boards of Trade, Saskatchewan, Despatch from W. A. Shepherd: Read (Mr. Schaffner) 5752 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Constantineau, Judge, Number of Motions heard ,Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 982 (i).

Consuls General, Foreign, Status at Official Receptions, &c.: M. for Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Mr. Sproule) 949 (i).
Continental Fire Insurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 196.'
Convicts liberated from Penitentiary at Kingston without Clothing or Means: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) 1913 (i), 2065 (ii).
——— Stmnt. (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 1986 (ii).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 & 29.'
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Copyright Act Amt., Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7557 (iv), 9594 (v).
Copyright Law and Imperial Copyright Conference, Canada's Action *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5134 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Enlargement of Office: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Lock 17: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Lock 19: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Removing High Spots from Prism: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Robertson's Culvert, Reinforcing Bank: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Coronation of King George V, Invitation to Members of Parlt: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1580 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8709 (v).
——— *See* 'Adjournment.'
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4659 (iii)
——— Apptmt. of Col. Landry: Personal Explanation (Mr. Lemieux) 8093 (iv)
——— Indian Contingent, Par. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6506 (iv).
——— Regulations *re* Apptmt., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3220, 3277 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Selecting Corps: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4464 (iii).
——— Names of Officers, &c., Cadets, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7105 (iv).
——— Selection of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4828 (iii).
Coronation Day Celebration in Ottawa, Absence of Ministers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 9989 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Beattie) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10351 (v).
Coronation Decorations: in Com. of Sup. 9565 (v).
Coronation Expenses of Members and Senators: in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).
Coronation Holiday and Bank Holiday: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 5836 (iii).
Coronation Naval Cadets, Method of Selection &c.: Ques. Mr. Macdonell) 9986 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 706 (i).
Coronation Stamps: Inquiry *re* (Mr. Armstrong) 9247 (v).
Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).
Courtice, Howard, Emplymt. by Liberal Bureau: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9784 (v).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 9897 (v).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3013 (ii).
Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).
Creighton, Mr. W. O., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent,: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4828 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).
Creston Fruit and Produce Association: Reciprocity Treaty, &c.: Res. *re* Read (Mr. Goodeve) 4119 (iii).
Cribbins Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
Criminal Code Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 40, 86.'
'Crissie Toomey' Schooner, Purchase of, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Crittenden, Mary Kathleen, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
Crooks, Mr. Wesley, Postmaster at Peggy's Cove, Increase in Salary: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Crop Statistics, Policy of Collecting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5937 (iv).
Cruisers manned by Canadian Marines, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr.Paquet) 805 (i).
———*See* 'Naval Service &c.
Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co., Strike of Employees, Reps., &c.: M. for Cor.*: (Mr. Rhodes) 1340 (i).
——— *See* 'Conciliation'
Curren, R. C., Gratuity *re* Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3948 (ii).
Currie, Wm. Francis, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Customs Dept. Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 208.'

CUSTOMS:

Bonded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 4464 (iii).
Bricks, Tiles, &c., Amount imported from G.B. and U.S., 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2369 (ii).
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U.S. Citizens: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4672 (iii).
Canned Peas, Quantity Imported into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3221 (ii)
——— Impure, Importation of into Canada, Number of Cases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3279 (ii).
Coal imported from U.S. for 1910 for Ont., Total Amounts of Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. D. Gordon) 4041 (iii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Coal and Coke, Quantities imported into Canada from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4674 (iii).

Customs Act Schedules, Average Value in 1896 and 1910: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 801 (i).

Customs Collections in Cities, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4042 (iii).

Customs Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1048 (i), 5992 (iv).

——— Dept. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).

Customs Duties, Average Value for 1896 and 1910, Units of: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2162 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) *re* Speech of Hon. Mr. Foster, 7022 (iv).

——— Correction (Mr. Foster) 7104 (iv).

Customs Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value of Articles in Schedules of Customs Act: M. for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1105 (i).

Customs Duties *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Customs, Free Entries of Goods, Date of last Entry: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 803 (i).

——— Free Goods entered at Vancouver, by Kelly & Co.: M. for Copies (Mr. Barnard) 931 (i).

Customs Officer at Ingram Dock, Dismissal of *re* Municipal Elections: M. for O. Cs, &c. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2218 (ii).

Customs Preventive Officers, Duties &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2160 (ii).

Customs Tariff with Foreign Countries, Arrangements by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 981 (i).

Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6268 (iv).

Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10196 (v).

Exports and Imports from Canada to Australia, Japan, &c. from 1906-1911, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9369 (v).

Fire Bricks imported into N. S., Number of Ports &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).

Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2161 (ii).

Halifax Customs Officials, Complaint *re* Treatment *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. R.L. Borden) in Com. on Bill, 8723 (v).

Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 5634 (iii).

Mahone Bay Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4301 (iii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4383 (iii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Mercier, Mr. Geo., Customs Official at Dalhousie, Member of Town Council: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4044 (iii).

Mica Exports 1900 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Best) 5290 (iii).

Mica Imports, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4827 (iii).

Montreal Customs House, Employees leaving since 1st July, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1340 (i).

Newfoundland Export Trade, Total Value, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2854 (ii).

Nicolet Customs Collections for 1906-11: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

Oshawa Customs Collector, Retirement of Mr. Blamey: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3225 (ii).

Paper Imports into U. S., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).

Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons Imported: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1721 (i).

Pig Iron Imports, used in Steel Rail Mills, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4828 (iii).

Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 3223 (ii).

Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 985 (i).

Pulp Wood Exports to the U. S., Value of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).

——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Paterson) 5126 (iii).

Shafting imported, Quantities and Values since April, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 7593 (iv).

Stone Cut, Duty between U. S. and Can., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1287 (i).

Vancouver Customs, Entries by Robt. Kelly, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Barnard) 713 (i).

'Wanda' Yacht, Date of Entry at Canadian Port, Notice to Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5933 (iv).

——— Appraising by Customs &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4678 (iii).

——— Changed from American to Canadian Register, Date, &c,: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4300 (iii).

——— Length, Motive Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5834 (iii).

——— Valuation of: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Paterson) 5623 (iii).

Wolfe Island Customs Official, Apptmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8099 (v).

See 'Reciprocity.'

Dairy and Farm Products, Quantity and Value of Importation from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9361 (v).

Dairy and Fruit Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6234 (iv).
Dairy Industry, Memorials *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2671 (ii).
Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario: (Mr. Lalor); Correction *re* Stmnt. (Mr. Paterson) about Reciprocity, 4223 (iii).
——— Denial of Stmnt. of Minister of Customs (Mr. Armstrong) 4570 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Dakin, Violet Jane, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 190.'
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re*: Ans. (Mr. Brodeur) 9374 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9374 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 9247 (v).
Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. re Construction: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5832 (iii).
Daylight, Saving of: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Debates Committee, 1st Rep.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 6438 (iv).
——— Status of: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7015 (iv).
Debates Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).
Declaration of London, Adoption of: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Monk) 3530 (ii).
——— Consideration by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5935 (iv).
Deep Brook, N.S., Wharf, Expenditure *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 4383 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii).
Deferred Elections: *See* 'Elections.'
Deptl. Expenditure of Public Moneys, Investigations *re*: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
Departments Generally, Cleaning, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1486 (i).
Deputy Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Deputy Governor or Administrator, Apptmt. of Mr. Justice Girouard, Tel. to Cardinal Vanutelli *re* Eucharistic Congress: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 702 (i).
Digby Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).
Dini, Victor, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 8582 (v).
Dissolution of Parlt., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Opposition: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 5737 (iii).
Divorce: *See* 'B. Nos. 130, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 163, 164, 173, 180, 181, 182, 183, 190, 191, 199, 200, 215 and 218.'
Divorce Bills: Ques. of Privilege *re* Remarks made by Senator Kirchhoffer (Mr. Ethier) 4201 (iii).
Dixon Postoffice, Pets. *re* Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4669 (iii).
Dog Fish Industry: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 8044 (v).
Dog Fish Works: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).
——— Electric Power: in Com. of Sup., 3210 (ii).
——— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
——— Que., General Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).
——— Rents, Engineers Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3212 (ii).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Dom. Development Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'
Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 107 and 194.'
Dominion Lands, Administration of : in Com. of Sup., 5553, 5581 (iii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).
Dom. Lands in Alberta, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 2271 (ii).
Dom. Lands in Saskatchewan, Gross Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3221 (ii).
See 'Interior.
Dom. Police Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Donland Postoffice, Removal of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 9994 (v).
Don Postoffice, Mail Service to Toronto, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).
Drawbars for Freight Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for Current Year: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).
Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2105 (ii).
Drill Halls, Generally, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
See 'Militia,' 'Public Works,' &c.
Drill Halls, Man., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1975 (ii).
Drinking Water, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Drugs made with Opium, Regulation: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Cartoons used by Min. of Marine, published in 'Le Canada' of 1904: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 223 (i).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 194 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Denial of Mr. Begin *re* words quoted by Mr. Monk *re* Naval Defence (Mr. Tobin) 134 (i).
——— Statements in 'Le Devoir', Denial, &c. (Mr. Blondin) 145 (i).

Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Cartoons displayed to Hse. (Mr. Brodeur) 146 (i).

Drummond and Arthabaska, Electoral Distrist: Certificate *re* (Mr. Speaker) 259 (i).

——— Disloyal Speeches: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) on Address 169 (i).

——— 'Le Devoir,' Quotations: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) 469.

——— Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 472 (i).

Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Moneys used, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Perley) 196 (i).

Drummond and Arthabaska Election, 'pounding England' speech of Notary Begin: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 57; Ques. of Order, Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 57 (i); Telling hon. mem. he 'lied to the House,' (Mr. Gauvreau) 57 (i); Ques. of Order, Insulting Language: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 77 (i).

——— Speeches: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 153 (i).

Drummond and Arthabaska Elections: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Address, 54 (i).

Dry Docks, Applications for Subsidies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4383 (iii).

——— *See* 'Collingwood.'

Dry Docks at Quebec, Construction *re* by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Price) 9988 (v).

Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 662 (i)

Dufferin Board Trade Res., Reciprocity Treaty: Read (Mr. Black) 5547 (iii).

Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6268 (iv).

——— *See* 'Iron.'

Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10196 (v).

Duncan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii)

Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Dunnville Postal Collections, Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3470 (ii).

Dunnville Postoffice; :Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup. 1668 (i).

Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by 'International': M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1498 (i).

Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value of Articles in Schedules of Customs Act: M. for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1105 (i).

——— *See* 'Customs.'

Dynamite, Storage of: *See* 'B. No. 79.'

'Earl Grey.' Ice Breaker, Construction: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).

'Earl Grey', Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1972 (ii).

East Chezzetcook Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).

Easter Adjournment: Notice of M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6758 (iv).

Eastern Dredging Co., Letting of Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 813 (i).

E. B. Eddy Co.: *See* 'B No 54.'

Echo Lake Postoffice, Application *re* Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8993 (v).

Eclipse Mfg. Co., Office Specialty Co., and Ahearn & Soper, Payments to *re* Contracts: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1339 (i).

Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4467 (iii)

Elbow River Conserving of Water Flow: M. for Cor. (Mr. McCarthy) 1912 (i).

Elbow River Water Power License, Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. McCarthy) 1501 (i).

Elbow and Bow Rivers Water Power Privileges, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1345 (i).

Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 16, 28, 37, 38.'

Elections Deferred in B. C. and Generally: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 10376 (v).

Electricians at Sault Ste. Marie, Protest *re* Dismissals, Alien Labour Law Administration: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).

Electricity Exportation B. 101 (Mr. Conmee): Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Introduction, 2364 (ii).

Electric Light Attendant, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).

Electric Railway Charters, Number since 1896, Extensions *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4043 (iii).

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William Terminals, Investigations *re* Mixing of Grain; Prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2377 (ii).

Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, System *re* Operating: Prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3472; Amt. (Mr. Neely) 3488. Agreed to (Y. 96, N. 54) 3524 (ii).

Elliott, Geo., Emplyt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 1497 (i).

Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractors, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).

Elora Post Office Site, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 6505 (iv).

Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Embargo on British Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10344 (v)

Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8111 (v).
Emo, Matilda, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
Empire Life Insurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Employees of Rys. paid fortnightly: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
English Mail Service to Maritime Provs: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8792 (v).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1080 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Service, &c.
Ennis, D. N., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 3847 (ii).
Escott, Postmaster, Date of Apptmt., Complaints *re* late Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).
——— Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
——— Salary, Date of Increase: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7601 (iv).
Esquimalt Fort, Removal of Guns: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3220 (ii).
Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Negotiations *re* Transfer: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 799 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 799 (i).
Essex Public Building: in Com of Sup., 2110 (ii).
Estimates, 1912: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695 (i).
——— Further Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 3068 (ii), 5525 (iii), 8355, 8534, 8675, 9312 (v).
Estimates of Depts., Procedure *re* Discussing: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).
Estimates *re* Mail Service, Objection (Mr. Perley) to Passing, 4296 (iii).
Estimates for Man., Objections *re* Discussion (Mr. Staples) 2969 (ii).
Estimates, Order for Discussion *re* Depts.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2994 (ii).
——— Special Items reported as passed, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 9076 (v).
Estimates to be Voted *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 9223 (v).
Eucharistic Congress at Montreal, Guards of Honour: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) on Address, 289 (i).
——— Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 704 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Govt. Authority *re* Decoration of Govt. Buildings: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 925 (i); Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3369 (ii).
——— Number of Buildings decorated by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4667 (iii).
Eucharistic Congress and Mess. of Homage from Administrator of Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 706 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Militia in Attendance, Authorization for: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3219 (ii).
——— Militia Officers at Reception in Uniform: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 707 (i).
——— Public Procession, Authority of Govt. *re* State Officials: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 925 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Reception to Cardinal Vanutelli, Imperfect Answer: Remarks Sproule) 158 (i).
——— Reception to by Federal Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 5935 (iv).
——— Ref. to Questions: Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 158 (i).
——— Tel. to Cardinal Vanutelli by Administrator: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 702 (i).
'Eureka' Pilotage Boat, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6502-3 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Exchequer Court, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
——— Reports, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Excursion Trains *re* Political Meeting, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii), 9076 (v).
Exhibition Grants, Subsidies paid to: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii).
See 'Agriculture.'
Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3157 (ii).
Experimental Farm Bulletins: in Com. of Sup., 6185 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Number established for past year: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 656 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number operated in Dom., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1102 (i).
Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Milk Average, Eggs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 662, 1285 (i).
Experimental Farms, Reps.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).
——— Stock *re*: Remarks (Mr. Best) in Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) on M. for Sup., 8995 (v).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Explosives, Regulation of: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
Explosives, Number of Factories, Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 2374 (ii).

Exports and Imports from Canada to Australia, Japan, &c. from 1906-11, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9369 (v).

Express Co.s.' Statements: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Express Cos'. Unclaimed Balances: *See* 'B. No. 8.'

Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 10196 (v).

——— *See* 'Post Office—Parcel Post.'

External Affairs, Absence of Minister from Washington Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 1658 (i).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 7 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).

Extradition: *See* 'Fedorenko.'

Fabre, Mr. Hector, Date of Apptmt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5933 (iv).

Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (i).

Falconer System of Book-keeping, Adoption of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1904 (i).

——— *See* 'Govt. Bookkeeping.'

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of: M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 2263 (ii).

Farmers' Bank Failure, Applications *re* Establishment: M. for Papers (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1726 (i).

——— Assets *re* Keely Mine, Value &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2152 (ii).

——— Application *re* Charter, Date and Names: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1970 (ii).

——— Cor. with Dom. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1726 (i), 2230 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1904 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4468 (iii).

——— Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation *re* Double Liability: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4111 (iii).

——— Par. in 'News' *re* Endorsation of Premier: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 2264 (ii).

——— Proceedings *re* Commission: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10471 (v).

Farmers' Bank, Negligence of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. on Ways and Means, 8193, 8209, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 97) 8232 (v).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) *re* Mr. Calvert's connection, 5730 (iii).

——— Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4826 (iii).

——— Representations to Finance Dept. *re* Stability: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2151 (ii).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation: Amt. (Mr. Henderson) to Com. on Ways and Means, 5295: Neg. (Y. 62; N. 97) 5523 (iii).

Debate:

(Mr. Fielding) 5306; (Mr. Lalor) 5314; (Mr. Beattie) 5316; (Mr. Middlebro) 5324; (Mr. Porter) 5325; (Mr. Foster) 5329; (Mr. Miller) 5354; (Mr. Northrup) 5363; (Mr. Crothers) 5377; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5389; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5395; (Mr. Edwards) 5412; (Mr. Nesbitt) 5424; (Mr. Blain) 5431; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5438; (Mr. Thornton) 5440; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5450; (Mr. Armstrong) 5453; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5456; (Mr. Lalor) 5456; (Mr. Donnelly) 5461; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5465; (Mr. Carvell) 5481; (Mr. Porter) 5487; (Mr. Hughes) 5496; (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 5498; (Mr. Boyce) 5508; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 97) 5523 (iii).

Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission *re*: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1510 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 7560 (iv).

Farmers' Bank Investigation, Treasury Board Ref.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 5552 (iii).

——— Treasury Board Minutes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4741 (iii).

Farmers' Bank Failures, Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificate: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2666 (ii).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question, 2679 (ii).

Farmers' Delegation from the West, Article in Grain Growers' Guide *re* Hudson Bay Ry., Denial of Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1574 (i).

——— Control of Hudson Bay Ry. Rates: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1508 (i).

——— Govt. Ownership of Elevators: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1504 (i).

Farmers' Delegation: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to print Speeches, 3054 (ii).

——— Distribution of Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 6908 (iv).

——— Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1454 (i).

——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Farm and Garden Products imported from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Mr. Boyce) 7034 (iv).

Farmers' Interests, Assurance of Member for N. Oxford *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 5541 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4663 (iii).

——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Farm Labourers, O.C. *re* Immigration Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 10099 (v).

Farm Products, Dutiable Exports by Provs. into U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 7026 (iv).

Farm Products entered at Windsor from 1906-1910: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 7596 (iv).

Farm Products exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 8701 (v).

Farm Products imported from U.S. into Kingston Port, Quantities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3668 (ii).

Farm Products imported from other Countries, &c., Reciprocity Treaty: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3668 (ii).

Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets, 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8096 (v).

——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1496 (i).

Farran's Point, Lower Entrance improvement: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

Favoured Nation Treaties before Imperial Conference, Abrogation of: Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (Mr. Armstrong) 5292 (iii).

——— Importations from Most Favoured Nations: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4111 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4113 (iii).

——— Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 4114 (iii).

——— Names of Countries affected by Treaty *re* Importations into Canada (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4131 (iii).

——— Entry of Canadian Goods into their Markets: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4104; Reply (Mr. Fielding) 4134 (iii).

———Names of Favoured Nation Treaty Countries: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4665 (iii).

Fedorenko, A., Extradition of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10 (i).

Fences on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Fencing along Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Fenelon Falls Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation: on Amt., M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Middlebro) 9595, Neg. (Y. 45; N. 61) 9633 (v).

——— Compensation to: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 658 (i).

——— Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1089 (i).

——— Number surviving, Pensions &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1715 (i).

——— *See* 'Militia.'

Fergus Post Office Site, Remarks (Mr. Stratton) in Com. of Sup., 1883 (i).

Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Festival of the Empire in London: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Sup., 3775 (ii).

Festival of the Empire: Chateauguay, Battle, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 8105, 9251 (v).

FINANCE :

Accounts Outstanding, Total Amounts *re* Financial Statement: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5403 (iii).

American Silver Coin, Amount exported from Canada: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).

Aud. Gen., Cor. *re* Overpayments by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Best) 1010 (i).

——— Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1485 (i).

Bank Act, Consideration of by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6674 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6441, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).

——— Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govt. Action: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5632 (iii).

——— *See* 'Farmers Bank.'

Bankers Association, Agreement *re* Competition: Ques. (Mr. Low) 3466 (ii).

Bankers Association, Bylaws, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4116 (iii).

Bank Curators' Reports: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 3142 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2670 (ii), 4569, 5038 (iii), 7556 (iv).

Bank Failures, Stmnt. of Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses: (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2670 (ii).

Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., Ref. to Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 926, 1091 (i).

Budget, The—Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 6577 (iv).

——— Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).

Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency, Charge *re* Frauds: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1716 (i).

Charing Cross Bank and Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. with Govt. (Mr. Ames) 1726 (i).

——— *See* 'Railways.'

Coins, Foreign and Uncurrent, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).

Estimates, 1912: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695 (i).

——— Suppl. (1911): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 3068 (ii). 5525 (iii), 8355 (v).

——— Suppl, 1912: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 8534, 8675, 9312 (v).

Estimates, Order for Discussion *re* Depts: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2994 (ii).

——— Procedure *re* Discussing: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).

Estimates to be Voted *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 9223 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission *re* Investigation: Amt. (Mr. Henderson) to Com. on Ways and Means, 5295; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 97) 5523 (iii).

——— Negligence of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. on Ways and Means, 8193, 8209, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 97) 8232 (v).

——— Application *re* Charter, Date and Names: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1970 (ii).

——— Assets *re* Keeley Mine, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2152 (ii).

——— M. for Papers (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1726 (i).

——— Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation *re* Double Liability: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4111 (iii).

——— Incorporation, Cor. with Dom. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1726 (i), 2230 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4468 (iii).

——— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 7560 (iv).

——— Par. in 'News' *re* Endorsation of Premier: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 2264 (ii).

——— Proceedings *re* Commission: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10471 (v).

——— Question *re* Incorp.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1904 (i).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) *re* Mr. Calvert's connection, 5730 (iii).

——— Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4826 (iii).

——— Representations to Finance Dept. *re* Stability: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2151 (ii).

——— Royal Commission *re*: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1510 (i).

——— Treasury Board, Ref.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 5552 (iii).

——— Treasury Board Minutes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4741 (iii).

——— *See* 'Treasury.'

——— Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificate: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2666 (ii).

——— Remarks re answer to question, 2679 (ii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 6577; Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).

——— Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6441 (iv).

Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U.S. and British, Authority *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9985 (v).

Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 794 (i).

Loans and Investments in U.S., Amount, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rutan) 6595 (iv).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Loans, Negotiations for 1909-10, Financial Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 797 (i).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3281 (ii).

Loans and Sinking Funds, ref. to by Mr. Guthrie for 1895-6: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3772 (ii).

Mint Operations, Implementing Information: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).

Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation, &c., Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3065 (ii).

Revenue and Expenditure, Total for 1890-1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9932 (v).

Sinking Fund, Legal Amount required, Bounties paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 982 (i).

Treasury Board Minutes: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4659 (iii).

Treasury Board Minutes *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5136 (iii).

——— *See* 'Bank Curators,' &c.

Vancouver Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3066 (ii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 6577: Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).

——— Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6441 (iv).

Fire Arms, Carrying of: *See* 'B. No. 86.'

Fire Bricks imported into N.S., Number of, Ports &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).

Fire Escapes for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3160 (ii).

Fire Extinguishers for Passenger Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii).

Fires in Forest Reserves: *See* 'B. No. 85.'

Fiscal Policy of Canada, P.M.G.'s Speech at Montreal Banquet: Remarks (Mr. Neely) 2079 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2266 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 58 & 185

FISHERIES—

Bait Freezer at Barrington Passage, Assistance *re* Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Jameson) 3947 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5039, 5293 (iii), 8791 (v).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) 8889 (v).

Bait Freezers, Construction in Louisburg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 6505 (iv).

Bay of Fundy Fishing Service: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Bounty in Kings, P.E.I., Names of Persons Receiving Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7246 (iv).

Bounties, Payments *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 6670 (iv).

Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Canadian Fisheries, Extent in Marine Miles, Amounts realized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1289 (i).

Dog Fish Industry: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 8044 (v).

Fish Ladders on Trent Canal: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 4824 (iii).

——— Preservation, Action of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 1503 (i).

Fish Landed by Canadian Atlantic Fisheries since 1870, Quantities, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1501 (i).

Fish Transportation: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (iv).

Fish Transportation, Expenditure annually, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6271 (iv).

——— Amounts paid out of Aiding Funds, Further Information: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6506, 7106 (iv).

——— Statement read (Mr. Brodeur) 7259 (iv).

Fisheries Appointments: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Porter) 5836 (iii).

Fisheries Commission *re* Saskatchewan and Alberta, Interim Rep,, laid on Table (Mr Brodeur) 10590 (v).

Fisheries Arbitration at Washington, Sir John Thompson's Memorandum: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2004 (ii).

Fisheries on the Great Lakes, Regulations *re* Commission: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) on M. for Sup., 5217 (iii).

Fisheries Inspectors, Dom. Appointments in Ontario: in Com. of Sup., 6613 (i).

Fisheries Regulations, Changes at Washington: on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8479 (v).

——— Further Information: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8479 (v).

——— Mess. from Wash.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6504 (iv).

——— 1908, Proclamation *re*: Remarks (Mr. . D. Taylor) 5035 (iii).

———1908, Non-fulfilment by U.S.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6528 (iv).

——— *See* 'Fisheries, International.'

Fisheries Regulations between Can. and U.S., Proclamation *re*, Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1725 (i).

Fisheries Regulations agreed to at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2088 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Fisheries Regulations at Washington Conference, Printing of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4207 (iii).

Fisheries Regulations at Washington, Trap Nets, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2070 (ii).

Fisheries Regulations agreed to at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2088 (ii).

Fishery Regulations, Complaint *re* C. K. Golden for Violation of: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2367 (ii).

——— Penalties *re* Violation of: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 1806 (i).

Fisheries Service of Can., Control by Federal Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 983 (i).

Fisheries Treaty of 1871 *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7022 (iv).

Fishing Vessels and Customs Regulations, Request to place on Govt. Orders (Mr. Jameson) 3373 (ii).

Fish Tariff Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2886 (ii).

Fish Wardens in Victoria, N.B.: Inquiry for Rets. (Mr. Maddin) 5629 (iii), 6672 (iv).

———Remarke (Mr. Brodeur) 5732 (iii).

Fishways and Clearing Streams: in Com. of Sup., 6659 (iv).

Fishways on Pembina River: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pembina.'

Glace Bait Association, Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 4044 (iii).

——— Payments to from 1906-10, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3670 (ii).

——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Maddin) 3948 (ii).

Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).

Grand Manan Fisheries, Prices charged per Hogshead, Weir Licenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2367 (ii).

——— Hatcheries under Dom. Control, Location, Applications for Fish Fry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1494 (i).

——— Hatcheries in East Elgin, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) 5137 (iii).

Herring Traps, Close Season *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 2086 (ii).

International Fisheries Commission Regulations, Modifications of: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1803 (i).

——— Date of Operation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3465 (ii).

——— *See* 'Fisheries Regulations.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*

International Fisherise Commission Regulations: Proclamation *re* Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1725 (i).

——— Ratification of: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 1654 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7259 (iv).

James Bay, Fishing Lease to Arch. McNee, Duration of, Rental &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thoburn) 4830 (iii).

Lake Winnipeg Fisheries Investigation Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 796 (i).

Legal Expenses *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Lobster Fishery Regulations laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 529 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Bradbury) 4207, 5035 (iii).

Manitou Lake, Fishing Privileges, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1348 (i).

Markey Fishing Rights on Nelson River, Extension of, Cancellation of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4664 (iii).

——— M. for Papers (Mr. Campbell) 4382 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5954 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 6119 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 4208 (iii), 6761 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6914 (iv).

Modus Vivendi Licenses: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).

Montreal Govt. Weir: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 2065 (ii).

Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmnt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1104 (i).

Newfoundland Fisheries, North Atlantic, &c.: *See* main heading 'Hague.'

Northwest Fishing Co.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5630 (iii).

Ontario Fisheries Service, Number of Officers, Services, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6157 (iv).

Otter, Beaver or Stream Trawling in Northumberland Strait: M. for Cor* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 980 (i).

Overseers: in Com. of Sup., 3809 (ii), 6159 (iv).

Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Oyster Industry, Memorials, Surveys, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Warburton) 714 (i).

Pelagic Sealing Conference: in Com. of Sup., 8678 (v).

——— Further Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3670, 3769, 3839 (ii).

——— *See* 'Seal'.

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Pembina Fish Dam, Placing of Ladder, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1090 (i).

——— *See* 'Fishway'.

Poachers in Lake Superior, Par. in Otawa Free Press: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 1459 (i).

Poachers on Pacific Coast, Protective Service *re*: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 2080 (ii).

——— Par. in Victoria Daily Colonist: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 1458 (i)

P. E. I. Coast Fisheries, Fines, Penalties *re* Breach of Regulations: M. for Ret. (Mr. Fraser) 1501 (i).

Protection Service *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 3807 (ii).

——— Number of Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 805 (i).

——— Seizure by 'Rainbow' of Str. 'Edric': Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 4116, 4208 (iii).

Robichaud, Wm., Compensation *re* Fire: in Com. of Sup., 6105, 6159 (iv).

St. Andrew's Dam, Fishway, Correction in Stmnt. (Mr. Bradbury) 1650 (i).

St. Andrew's Rapids, Fish Ladders &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).

Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2853 (ii)

Seal Fisheries Treaty, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9594, 10196 (v).

——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10337 (v).

——— *See* 'Pelagic.'

Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3607 (ii)

Smelt Fishing in N.S., Pet. *re* Change for Open Season: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9984 (v).

Steam Trawlers, Application *re* Fishing Bounty: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4046 (iii).

——— 'Wren' and 'Croquette', Registration in Can.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4046 (iii).

Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3074 (ii).

Tetagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishing: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7806 (iv).

Whitemouth River Fishway: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).

Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Apptmt. of Keeper &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4041 (iii).

Fishing Vessels' Licenses: *See* 'B. No. 27'.

Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders from P. W. Dept. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 2648 (ii).

——— *See* 'St. George's'

Flags flying on Govt. Buildings on St. David's Day: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3671 (ii).

Flags Flying on Public Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4724 (iii).
Flags, Regulation by Govt. *re* Flying with Foreign Flags: Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4347; M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) to adjn. Debate, Agreed to (Y. 89; N. 49) 4380 (iii).
Flax Exports from Saskatchewan: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 10521 (v).
Fleming Grain Growers' Association, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5550 (iii).
Floods on the Assiniboine, Pets. to Govt., Political Interference *re*: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii), 6006 (iv).
Flour and Meal, Sale of in Bags: *See* 'B. No. 117'.
Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale: Prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 3226. (ii)
Foods; Adulteration of: *See* 'B. No. 35 & 112.
Foreign Consuls, Official Status: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9511 (v).
Forest Fires caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 197'.
Forest Reserves and Parks: *See* B. No. 85'.
Forestry Convention at Quebec, in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).
Fort Churchill and Nelson River Survey: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5954 (iv).
Fort Frances Water Power: *See* 'B. No. 109'.
Fort Osborne Barracks, Purchase by Man. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Fort William Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).
'Fossy Jaw': *See* 'B. No. 10 & 96.'
Franking Privilege, Fraudulent Use of: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Fraser River Mail Service, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).
Fraser Mills Postmaster, Defalcations, Bonds &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1566 (i).
Fredericton, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).
Fredericton Public Building, Pavement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1612, 1665 (i).
Freight Car Service, I.C.R., Complaints, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Freight Rates on Coal &c. in Mar. Provs., Classification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6156 (iv).
—— *See* 'C.P.R.'
Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1285 (i).
Free Delivery of Mail: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
—— *See* 'Post Office.'
Freeman, Cecil Ernest, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Free Trade Offer by U.S., Pres'dt. Taft's Speech: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5293 (iii).
—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
French, Gen. Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 76 (i).
—— Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9 (i).
French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty, &c., Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8097 (v).
—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
French River Dam: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
French Translation of Inland Revenue Act: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
French Translation of Revised Statutes: *See* 'B. No. 136.'
Fruit Clause in Reciprocity Treaty, Par. in Ottawa Citizen: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 3283 (ii).
Fruit Duty, Res. from B. C. Inland Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Burrell) 3377 (ii).
Fruit Growers Association, B. C., Protest *re* Duty: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3373 (ii).
—— Burlington: Read (Mr. Henderson) 4122 (iii).
—— Tel. read from Fruit Dealers *re* Duty affecting B. C. (Mr. Burrell) 3770 (ii).
—— Tel. from Mission City Agricultural Ass'cn.: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3955 (iii).
Fruit Growers Delegation: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Burrell) 6120 (iv).
Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Delegates, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3529 (ii).
—— Report of Proceedings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Print, 3952 (iii).
—— French Editions: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9075 (v).
Fruit and Vegetables Amt. *re* Reciprocity: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sealey) 7666 (iv).
—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Apptmt., Qualifications &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 8701 (v).
Fruit Packing and Marking: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Galleries of the House of Commons, Applause by Visitors: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4468 (iii).
—— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Galops Canal—Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).
Gananoque Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).
Garden Seeds, Purchase for Indians in N.W., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1717 (i).
Garnishment of Civil Servants' Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 12.'

Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i).
Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* Appropriatinfg Scrap Brass, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6664 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7601 (iv).
Gas Meters in Toronto, Complaints *re* Excessive Measurements: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3280 (ii).
Gaspe and Dalhousie SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8785 (v).
Gaspe Mail Service, Revenue *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3854 (ii).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging Contracts: Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10203, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 92) 10308 (v).
Geological Survey Explorations: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Geological Survey Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 9690 (v).
Georgetown Public Building, Drainage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).
Georgian Bay Ship Canal, Estimates *re*: Remarks (Mr. G. White) 2004 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Globe' *re* Commencement of: Remarks (Mr. German) 2261 (ii).
——— Use by Americans: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7804 (iv).
——— *See* 'Transportation.'
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Germany, Trade Relations with: *See* 'Trade Relations.'
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt., Fined for Electoral Corruption: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2673 (ii).
Glace Bay Bait Association, Application re Subsidy for Building: M. for Copy* (Mr. Maddin) 3948 (ii).
——— Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c.: (Mr. Maddin) 4044 (iii).
——— Payments to from 1906-10, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3670 (ii).
Globe Printing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U.S. and British, Authority *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9985 (v).
——— *See* 'Finance.'
Goldschmidt Thermit Co.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Govt. Appointments from South Grey since 1904, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 1912 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 2555, 3059 (iii).
Govt. Bills, Withdrawal of: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2080 (ii).
Govt. Book-keeping, Names of Employees in Depts: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1718 (i).
——— *See* 'Falconer.'
Govt. Business, Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10095 (v).
——— Precedence on Mondays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4114 (iii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).
See 'Business.'
Govt. Buildings, Draping for His Majesty's Death: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Govt. Goods purchased in U.S., Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 817 (i).
Govt. Loans, Negotiations for 1909-10, Financial Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 797 (i).
Govt. Loans and Sinking Funds, ref. to by Mr. Guthrie for 1895-6: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3772 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 982 (i).
Govt. Loans, Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3281 (ii).
——— *See* 'Finance.'
Govt. Officials in Political Contests: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1054 (i).
——— *See* 'Civil Servants.'
Govt. Printing, Amounts paid to Newspaper Offices: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Monk) 944 (i).
Govt. Railways constructed previons to Comfederation, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 4829 (iii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 794 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com of Sup., 5811 (iii).
Govt. Steamers of Marine Dept., Winter Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6559 (iv).
Gov. General's Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6446 (iv).
Gov. General, Duke of Connaught, Rumours *re* Apptmt: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 1725 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec. Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
Graham, Mr. Duncan, Apptmt. as Indian Agent: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).
Grain Elevators: *See* 'Elevators.'
Grain Growers Grain Co. Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
Grain Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 209.'
Grain stored in Port Arthur and Ft. William Elevators, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3605 (ii).
Grand Bend, Ont., Right of Way, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1287 (i).

Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).
Grand Falls and St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Cor. re: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 9371 (v).
——— *See* 'St. John Valley.'
Grand Forks Public Building, in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).
Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).
Grand Manan Fisheries, Prices charged per Hogshead, Weir Licenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2367 (ii).
Grand Narrows, I.C.R. Construction at, O.C.s, &c., *re* Claims of Contracts: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5640 (iii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
G.T.R. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. Nos. 55 and 223.'
G.T.Ry. and I.C.R., Arbitration Commission, Points to be determined, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3665 (ii).
——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Foster) 4205 (iii).
Grand Trunk Development Co., Govt. Reserve *re* Homestead Lands: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3466 (ii).
G.T.Ry., Pension Fund. Rules, Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2153 (ii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, and Action of Labour Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).
——— Agreement *re* Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 811 (i).
——— Arrangement *re* Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 654 (i).
——— Basis of Settlement by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 809 (i).
——— Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 3383 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Apptmt. of Judge Barron *re* Investigation: Ques. Mr. Macdonell) 2158 (ii).
——— Investigation by Judge Barron, Remuneration to: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 1805 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 2376 (ii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, Minister's Efforts a Success: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 810 (i).
——— Reinstatement of Dismissed Officials: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1071 (i).
——— Reinstatement of Employees: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 1507 (i).
——— Res. from Order of Ry. Conductors: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).
——— Settlement of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 786 (i).
——— Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 9692 (v).
——— Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike: Status of Men Reinstated: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3375 (ii).
——— Tel. sent by Minister of Labour to Messrs. Berry and Murdock: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1105 (i).
G. T. P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY:

Classification, Arbitrators Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Sharpe) 696 (i).
Eastern Division Overbreak, Agreement *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1570 (i).
Government Director, Remuneration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6448 (iv).
G. T. P. Developing Co., Number of Acres sold by Govt., Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 2366 (ii).
——— Land Purchased from: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 2666, 3466 (ii).
Labourers at Lafond in Alberta, Amounts owing for Wages: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3669 (ii).
Lake Superior Division, Construction Limit, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1492 (i).
Lumsden Investigation, Total Cost re: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1493 (i).
See 'Natl. Transcl.'
Grant, Gertrude Maud, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 200."
Grazing Leases in the Foothills, Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1492 (i).
G. B. and Canada, State-owned Cable, Proposal *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1905 (i).
G. B. and U. S., Arbitration Treaty, Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowke) 5834 (iii).
——— *See* 'U. S.'
Great Northwestern Telegraph Co., Request for Board of Conciliation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5639 (iii).
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Conditions *re* Public Health: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 5535 (iii).
——— Water Filters, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).
Guardian Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 115.'
Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2161 (ii).
Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7038 (iv).
Guysborough 'Times', Application *re* Postal Privileges: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6505 (iv).

Hague Arbitration (Bay of Fundy) North Atlantic Fisheries, Production of Papers: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) on M. for Sup., 4588 (iii).
—— Debate resmd.: (Mr. Brodeur) 4678 (iii).
Hague Arbitration Award, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8093 (v).
Hague Arbitration Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 6164 (iv), 9560 (v).
Hague Arbitration, Award *re* Fisheries: Remarks in Speech on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 24 (i).
—— Fisheries Negotiations with U. S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1725, 1804 (i).
—— Fisheries Regulations: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 2365 (ii).
—— Stmnt. (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 1988 (ii).
Hague Arbitration: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 4337 (iii).
Hague Arbitration *re* Newfoundland Fisheries, Counsel, Expenditure &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 797 (i).
—— Statement on Address (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 664 (i).
Hague Tribunal, Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1913 (i).
—— *See* 'Fisheries'.
Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 7806 (iv).
Half-breed Scrip, Cor. with Rt. Rev. George Holmes: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 1912 (i).
Half-breed Scrip issued to J. W. Malboeuf: M. for Cor* (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2161 (ii).
Halifax Citadel, New Quarters: on Com. of Sup,. 1581 (i).
Halifax Customs Officials, Complaint *re* Treatment *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Bill, 8723 (v).
—— *See* 'Civil Service'.
Halifax Docks: in Com. of Sup., 9561 (v).
Halifax Dom. Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1592 (v).
Halifax Increased Accomodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
—— Pier at Cunard Wharf, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2150 (ii).
Halifax Post Office Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
—— Completion of Repairs &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 653 (i).
Halifax and St. John Wharfage &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7807 (iv).
Halifax Terminals, Accommodation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).
—— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2647 (ii).
—— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Hall's Prairie P. O., Pets *re* Location, Postmaster &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3468 (ii).
Hall's Prairie Timber Limits, Requests *re* Removal of Timber: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3282 (ii).
Hamilton Cotton Co., Stmnt. of Employees *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Goodeve) 5747 (iii).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 10101 (v).
Hamilton Provident and Loan Society: *See* 'B. No. 172'.
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 149'
Hampton Public Building: Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).
Haney, Quinlan & Robertson, Contract *re* Construction of Locomotive Shops east of Winnipeg: M. for Copy*(Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1339 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
—— N. S., Estimates to be Voted for Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9501 (v).
—— *See* 'Public Works'.
Harling, Mr. Thos., Compensation *re* Report: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (iv).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
Hartland Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1617 (i).
Haskett, Havelock and New Tusket Post Offices, Distance between &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8991 (v).
Hawke, Mr. John T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).
See 'I. C. R.'
Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 930 (i).
Hawkesbury Interprovincial Bridge: Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Perley) 4224 (iii).
Hay Claims, Delay in Repayment to Canadian Exporters: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5403 (iii).
Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U. S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8984 (v).
Hay transported free from Quebec Prov. to Mar. Provs: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5134 (iii).
Healy, Fanny Mary, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 199'.
Herring Traps, Close Season *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 2086 (ii).
Hickman, W. A., Immigration Agent to G. B.: Payments to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).
High Commissioner's Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup. 1486 (i).

High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 202.
Highways on I. C. Rys., Protection: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii), 9560 (v).
Hillsborough Brirge, P. E. I., Material purchased, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i).
Hochelaga Census Enumerators, Name, &c: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9432 (v).
Holland Peat Bog, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4303 iii).
Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
Homage: *See* 'Eucharistic.'
Homestead Applications, Cancellations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).
—— Infractions of Regulations, Punishment, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5561-2 (iii).
Homestead Applicants in New Westminster District, Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).
Homestead Entry of Mr. John Bradley, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 5584 (iii).
Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1722 (i).
Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908, Total Amount in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4112 (iii).
Homestead Regulations in B.C., Application *re* Ry. Belt: M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 2855 (ii).
Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1284 (i).
Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage available: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1907 (i).
—— *See* 'Interior.'
Homicide while Hunting: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Hope Suburban Townsite, Date of Payment by Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3068 (ii).
—— Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3846 (ii).
Hornell, Ethel May, Relief: *See* 'B. No 144.'
Horses admitted into Canada from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).
Horses Diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 7427 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Govt. Works: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Hours of Labour on Public Works, Printing of Proceedings *re* Com.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3280 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, Representation *re* I.C.R. Workingmen: Correction of Stmnt. (Mr. King) 4116 (iii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4825 (iii).
Charwomen: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1453 (i).
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Committees: in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).
Coronation of King George V., Invitation to Members of Parlt: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1580 (i).
See main heading.
Divorce Bills: Ques. of Privilege *re* Remarks made by Senator Kirchhoffer (Mr. Ethier) 4201 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska, Electoral District: Certificate *re* (Mr. Speaker) 259 (i).
Elections Deferred in B.C. and Generally: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 10376 (v).
Electric Light Attendant: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Fraudulent Use of: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Galleries of the House of Commons, Applause by Visitors: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4468 (iii).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 10101 (v).
House of Commons' Appointments: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 5288, 5400 (iii).
—— Number of people residing in: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3847 (ii).
See 'Restaurant.'
—— Sessional Employees since 1896: M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3471 (ii).
House of Commons and Senate: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2556 (ii).
Library Improvements *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2590 (ii).
Messengers, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6172 (iv).
Minority Representation, Redistribution Bill, Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9988 (v).
Pages: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).
Parliament, Opening and Closing Date of from 1896 to 1910: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 786 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Quebec Members, Revolt against Extra Session, Newspaper Articles: Denial of (Mr. Talbot) 10096 (v).

Questions and Answers, Orally and Written: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 989 (i).

——— Copies given to Press (Mr. Hughes) 900 (i).

——— Procedure *re* Answering orally or written: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 700 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1080 (i).

——— Incomplete Answers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1013 (i).

Restaurant, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 469 (i).

Restaurant and Speaker Rooms, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1085 (i).

Richelieu Electoral District, Charges against Mr. Lanctot *re* Painting Private Dwelling: Notice of Motion (Mr. Nantel) 4566 (iii).

Rules of House, Amendment *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 10470 (v).

Servants: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).

Sessional Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).

——— Application *re* Increase of Salary: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5404 (iii).

Sessional Employees of H. of C., Names, Ages, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 980 (i).

Speakers' Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 926 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* Pianos: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).

——— Purchase of Birds: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).

——— Purchase of Glassware: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).

——— Purchasing Gramaphone Records: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).

Speaker's Gallery, Discourtesy to Clergymen: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 269 (i).

Speaker of House of Commons, Wearing of Official Robes on State Occasions, Procedure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 705 (i).

Speech from Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

Stationery: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).

Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 6171, 6337 (iv).

Translators for H. of C., Apptmt. of: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7015 (iv).

——— Translation Staff, Promotions: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 527 (i).

Vacancy, Arthabaska and Drummond Electoral District: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 4473 (iii).

——— *See* 'Ottawa Buildings.'

——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4209 (iii).

Victoria Electoral Div., Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 7602 (iv).

Voter's Lists, Preparation of: Inquiry for Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10096 (v).

——— On Stmnt. of Sec. of State: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10455 (v).

Voter's Lists in Unorgnized Territories, Proclamation *re* Earlier Date: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 9990, 10142 (v).

Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 56.'

Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'

Hudson Bay, Position *re* Hague Award: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 673 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, Policy of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 660 (i).

——— Lands, Number of Acres sold *re* Construction Fund: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 796 (i).

Humber River Bridge, G.T.Ry. Plans *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2885 (ii).

——— Obstruction to Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5403 (iii).

Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).

Hungry Bay Dyke Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Hunting Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 40.'

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'

Hydro-Electric Commission Toronto, Mr. McGann's Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 1574 (i).

——— Decision of Minister: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1598 (i).

Hydro-Electric Commission, Water Power Lease on Ottawa River: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9430 (v).

———Tenders called for: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9352 (v).

Iberville Bridge Construction: in Com of Sup., 6356 (iv).

Ice Contracts, I.C.R., at Rivière du Loup, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2437, 3853 (ii).

Immigration Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 47, 146.

IMMIGRATION:

Agencies, Can. and G.B.: in Com of Sup., 6047 (iv).

Agents in G. B. and Europe, List, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 981 (i).

———Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 5165; Reply (Mr. U. Wilson) 5177 (iii).

Agents: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 4729 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Aliens Outside of Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 7554 (iv).

Amount expended in Belgium and France: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9990 (v).

Amount expended in U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9991 (v).

Bonuses paid *re* Three Swiss Girls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2436 (ii).

Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. by Govt. as Immigration Agent: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 5191 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv).

Chinese Immigration, Total Number, Capita Tax, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 788 (i).

Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1103 (i).

Chinese Immigration, Investigation Commission, Rep. of Mr. Justice Murphy: Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9594 (v).

——— Censure of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10383, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 10454 (v).

——— Discussion *re* Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9926 (v).

——— Evidence read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9786 (v).

——— Rep. of Judge Murphy: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9897 (v).

——— Stmnt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion with Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Ralph Smith) 2738 (ii).

Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4930, 5038 (iii).

Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to *re* Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8308 (v).

Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4470 (iii).

Commission to Agents in Western Canada: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9991 (v).

Commission to Immigration Agents, Total Amount paid: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2436 (ii).

Creighton, Mr. W. O., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4828 (iii).

——— Payments to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).

Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8111 (v).

Ennis, D. N., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 3847 (ii).

Expenditure in U.S. and G.B. for 1910: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 4300 (iii).

Farmers sent to G. B. from Man.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1489 (i).

——— as Immigration Agents: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 799, 1284 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Farm Labourers, O. C. *re* Immigration Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 10099 (v).

Hickman, W. A., Immigration Agent to G. B.: Payments to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).

Immigration Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

Immigrants entering Canada, Cognizance of Destination: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 814 (i).

Immigrants, Money Qualifications *re* Operation of Act: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 150 (i).

Immigrants, Number received from Europe, Amount expended &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 809 (i).

——— Number from G. B., U. S. &c., Amount expended, Names of Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 807 (i).

Immigration into Eastern Canada: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).

Immigration, Number since 31st March last to present, &c.: M. (Mr. U. Wilson) for Ret., 1498 (i).

Immigration Organizations, Cor. with Miss Wileman: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 9376 (v).

Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions in Canada: M. (Mr. Lake) to adjn., 1551 (i).

——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Lake) 1503 (i).

——— Ruling *re* Discussion (Mr. Speaker) 1551 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 790 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1339 (i).

Lake St. John Repatriation Society, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Girard) 9994 (v).

Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Doherty) 9375 (v).

Medical Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1716 (i).

Negro Immigrants, Prohibition into N. W.: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 5911 (iii).

——— Restrictions re: Remarks (Mr. Thorburn) 6523 (iv).

——— Treatment of, Prohibition into Canada &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 5941 (iv).

See 'Civil Service', 'Coloured' &c.

Premiums by Canadian Govt. for 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9991 (v).

Seed Grain for Immigrants: in Com. of Sup., 3836 (ii).

Statistics, Publication of: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2366, 2556 (ii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Statistics, Publication of: Statement (Mr. (Mr. Oliver) 2557 (ii).

Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1723 (i).

U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadian Travellers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6119 (iv).

U. S. Immigration Officers residing in Can. Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1723 (i).

Imperial Conference, Attendance of Prime Minister, Opposition Compromise: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8033 (v).

Imperial Defence Conference, Additional Copies: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 2215 (ii).

——— M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 944 (i). 3073 (ii).

——— Navy Defence Papers: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10467 (v).

Imperial Conference Proceedings, Cor. with Mr. Harcourt: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10338; M. to print, 10340 (v).

Imperial Conference, Minister's Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).

Imperial Conference, Precis *re* Conference: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9693 (v).

——— Information *re* Precis Rep. and Further Reps.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 9690, 9783 (v).

Imperial Conference, Report *re*, Complete Rep. presented to Parlt.: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10103 (v).

Imperial Conference, Questions to be submitted by Canada: Par. from 'Morning Post' quoted (Mr. Lennox) 4298 (iii).

——— Secretariat Formation: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Foster) 7352 (iv).

Imperial Steamship Co.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

Imperial Traction Co.: *See* 'B. No. 102.'

Implements, Agricultural, Imports into Can. since 1908, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1350 (i).

——— Manipulation re Duties: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1358 (i).

——— *See* 'Agriculture.'

Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 5634 (iii).

Indian Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 95 & 117.'

Indian River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'

INDIANS—

Annuities for Indians, Man. Sask., &c.: in Com. of Sup. 8884 (v).

Bear Indian Reserves, Medical Officer, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3223 (ii).

Beausoleil Indian Agent at Christian Island, Place of Residence: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5288 (iii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits *re* cutting Timber, Agent's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4304-5 (iii).

——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4567 (iii).

Chacastapasin Indian Reserve, Owner, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 4301 (iii).

Garden Seeds, Purchase for Indians in N. W., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1717 (i).

Graham, Mr. Duncan, Apptmt. as Indian Agent: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4725 (iii).

——— Medical Attendance, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 6035 (iv).

James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1082 (i).

Lafferty, Dr. J. D., Payments to *re* Indians N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6046 (iv).

Obabikong Bay and Sabiskong Indian Land, Tenders *re* Burnt Timber: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1344 (i).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages re Fires: Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 8586 (v).

———Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1082 (i).

Reserves in Ont., Fences, Settlement of Disputes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1910 (i).

Reserve Lands Outside of Ry. Belt, B.C., Jurisdiction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2678 (ii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions to Rev. J. McDougall, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Bradbury) 1292 (i).

——— Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).

——— Amounts received from Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).

——— Chief Justice Howell's Commission: M. for Copy of Evidence* (Mr. Bradbury) 7039 (iv).

——— Investigation by Rev. Dr. McDougall: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).

——— Moneys paid by Govt., Complaints, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).

——— Original Document, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 8109, 8192 (v).

——— Original Documents before Royal Commission: Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 8477 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8356 (v).

——— Rep. in 'Winnipeg Telegram' *re* Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Oliver) 3840; Explanation (Mr. Bradbury) 3841 (ii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Request by Commission for Official Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 9899 (v).

Semmens, Rev. John, Payments to *re* Indians, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6036 (iv).

Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6272 (iv).

Six Nation Indians Reserve, Grant to Merrill to bore for Natural Gas, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Amts. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii).

—— Act, Demand for Repeal: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 6929 (iv).

—— *See* 'Conciliation.'

Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 2927 (ii).

Industrial Training Royal Commission, Incompetent Reporting: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 3463 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act, French Translation: *See* 'B. No. 132.'

Inspection and Sale Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9, 35, 117, 153, 154, 157.'

I.C.Ry., Equipment Renewal: *See* 'B. No. 156.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

Accidents, Causes of, Pars. from N. S. Newspapers: Read (Mr. Rhodes) 6676 (iv).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Stanfield) 1571 (i).

Advertising Time Tables in Conservative Papers, N.B.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6388 (iv).

——*See* 'Printing.'

Air Brake, Triple Valve: in Com of Sup., 5913 (iii)

Air Brakes for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii)

Bell, G. W., Pass Investigation *re* I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

Branch Lines, Acquisition of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6768 (iv).

Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Builders Woodworking Co., Expropriation of Land for Moncton Extension: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Crocket) 6158 (iv).

—— *See* 'Moncton.'

Campbellton, Increased Ry. Accommodation in Com. of Sup., 5914, 5983 (iv).

Chatham, Diversion of Line: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Construction, Letter of Gloucester Farmers Union: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5985 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5832 (iii).

Dismissals from Nov. 1908, Number reinstated &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3666 (ii).

Drawbars for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Eastern Extension: Prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1106 (i).

Excursion Rates *re* Monument National Demonstration in Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1347 (i).

Excursion Trains *re* Political Meetings: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).

See 'Special Trains,' 'Truro' &c.

Fire Extinguishers for Passenger Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii).

Fredericton Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).

Freight Car Service, Complaints, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Freight Rates on Coal &c. in Mar. Provs., Classification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6156 (iv).

Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* Appropriating Scrap Brass, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6664, 7601 (iv).

General Operations: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Grand Narrows Contract: *See* 'Macdonald' &c.

Gross Earnings, Cost per Ton Mile, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5129 (iii).

Halifax, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

Halifax Terminals, Accommodation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).

—— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2647 (ii).

Halifax Docks: in Com. of Sup., 9561 (v).

Hawke, Mr. John T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

—— *See* 'Moncton.'

Hay Transported free from Quebec Prov. to Mar. Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5134 (iii).

Highways Protection: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii); 9560 (v).

Ice Contracts at Riviere du Loup, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2437, 3853 (ii).

I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8513 (v).

I.C.R. and G.T.Ry. Arbitration, Commission, Points to be determined, Cost, &c.: (Mr. Foster) 3665 (ii).

—— Disputed Questions: Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Foster) 4205 (iii).

Locomotives purchased since 1896, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7033 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Macdonald and McLellan, Construction at Grand Narrows, O. Cs., &c. *re* Claims of Contracts, M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5640 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10470 (v).

Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

Mail Clerks, allowing Friends to travel in Mail Cars: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

Moncton Extension, Acquisition of Land from Builders Woodworking Co., Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6157 (iv).

——— Site purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1291 (i).

——— *See* 'Builders.'

Moncton Freight Transfer, Letter to Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 653 (i).

——— *See* 'Hawke.'

Moncton, Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 5926 (iii).

Payments to Dr. C. A. Murray *re* Tickets: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7031 (iv).

Pension Fund, Delegation *re* Amendments: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2159 (ii).

Petit Rocher, Spur, Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6156 (iv).

Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2152 (ii).

Porters: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 6339 (iv).

Printing, Amounts paid to 'Globe': Corrected Statement (Mr. Graham) 2886 (ii).

——— See 'Advertising.'

Pullman Berths: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5990 (iv).

Renewal Equipment, Cor. &c., with Aud. Gen., Stmnts. &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 784 (i).

Rolling Stock,: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii), 8513 (v).

Rolling Stock, &c., Mileage, Value of: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3668 (ii).

Ste. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 2436 (ii).

Special Trains *re* Monument National Demonstration: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2996 (ii).

——— *See* 'Excursion.'

Steamer 'Scotia,' New Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Telegraphers Board of Conciliation, Statute re Grant: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2853 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Traffic Westbound and Eastbound for five Years, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2162 (ii)

Truro, Freight Shed Fire: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Truro Political Meeting, Excursion Train over I.C.R., Instruction to Agents, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).

——— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 3343 (ii).

———*See* 'Excursion.'

Windsor Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).

Working Expenses: in Com of Sup., 6338 (iv).

Interest Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 6, 146.'

INTERIOR.

Algoma Timber Permits, Amounts paid *re* Dues: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4673 (iii).

Aylwin Irrigation Grant, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 6158 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 6445 (iv), 8192, 9076 (v).

Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application *re* Homestead, Date of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3221 (ii).

Bidwell Bay, B.C., Govt. Land Reserves, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1284 (i).

Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases issued: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).

Dominion Lands, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 5553, 5581 (iii).

———Patents for S. E. ¼ of Section 6, Twp. 7, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Stables) 5834 (iii).

——— Sections 11, 12, 14, 22 in Twp. 10, Range 22, Applications *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wallace) 980 (i).

———S. W. ¼ Section 10, Twp. 38, Range 15, 2nd Meridian, Applications *re* Entry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 1501 (i).

——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).

Dom. Lands, Timber, Natural Resources &c. of Alberta, Provl. Control of: M. for Cor. (Mr. Herron) 1500 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 2271 (ii).

Dom. Lands in Saskatchewan, Gross Receipts &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3221 (ii).

Dom. Lands, Timber and Mineral Rights: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3955 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of: M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 2263 (ii).
Grand Trunk Development Co., Govt. Reserve *re* Homestead Lands: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3446 (ii).
Grazing Leases in Foothills, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1492 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip, Cor. with Rt. Rev. George Holmes: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 1912 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip issued to J. W. Malbœuf: M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2161 (ii).
Hall's Prairie Timber Limits, Requests *re* Removal of Timber: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3282 (ii).
Homesteads, Applications, Cancellations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).
——— Infractions of Regulations, Punishment &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5561-2 (iii).
Homestead Applicants in New Westminster District, Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).
Homestead Entry of Mr. John Bradley, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 5584 (iii).
Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1722 (i).
Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908, Total Amount in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4112 (iii).
Homestead Regulations in B. C., Application *re* Ry. Belt: M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 2855 (ii).
Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage available: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1907 (i).
Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1284 (i).
Hope Town Lots, Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3846 (ii).
——— Date of Payment by Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3068 (ii).
Interior, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).
Krenzer, Mr. J., Dispute with Mr. Greenway *re* Purchase of Land: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3225 (ii).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).
Manitoba Swamp Lands, Concession to Province: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6759 (iv).
New Westminster District, Govt. Lands, grants issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Tayloy) 1291 (i).
———*See* 'Timber.'

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Pre-emptions and Purchased Homesteads, Total Acreage, Amounts received, Annual Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 812 (i).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Pet. *re* Withdrawal of Lands &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8636 (v).
Ruddock, Mr. R. F., Application *re* Homestead in B. C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3279 (ii).
School Lands in Alberta, Revenues from, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1488 (i).
School Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 800, 1345 (i).
——— Total Acreage, Revenue from Sales: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1911 (i).
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3462 (ii).
Total Acreage, Amounts realized &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1908 (i).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10121 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1293 (i).
Seed Grain, Advances to Settlers: in Com. of Sup., 6047 (iv), 9551 (v).
——— Indebtedness, Amount *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3225 (ii).
——— Quality and Price: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8041 (v).
Talbot, Hon. Senator, Applications for Irrigated Lands Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 803 (i).
Timber Licenses in New Westminster, B.C., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3222 (ii).
——— *See* 'New Westminster.'
Internal Economy Commission: Mess. from His Ex., 377 (i).
International Naval Conference, Final Protocol: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 3073 (ii).
——— *See* 'Imperial.'
International Fisheries Regulations, Mess. from Wash.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6504 (iv).
——— Modifications of: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1803 (i).
——— Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7259 (iv).
——— Ratification of: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 1654 (i).
——— *See* 'Hague.'
International Prison Congress, Canadian Representative, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5405 (iii).
International Ry. Co. and International Traction Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
International Ry. Traffic, Points of Crossing Boundary &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 4466 (iii).

International Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Sir George Gibbons: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4741 (iii).

—— Names of Members, Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3861 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Macdonell) 4569 (iii).

International Waterways Commission (Lake Erie) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 924 (i).

International Waterways Commission: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 6158 (iv).

—— Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3470 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Renewal of: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3274 (ii).

—— Total Amounts paid since 1896: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3607 (ii).

'Iroquois', Str. Report *re* Wreck: Remarks (Mr. Ralph Smith) 7104 (iv).

Irrigation Rights in Boundary Rivers: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Jackson Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).

Jacques Cartier Census Enumerators, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9431 (v).

James Bay Fishing Lease to Arch. McNee, Duration of, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thoburn) 4830 (iii).

James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1082 (i).

—— *See* 'Indians.'

Japan, Customs Arrangements: *See* 'B. No. 224.'

Japanese Immigration, Application *re* Special Purposes: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1339 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 790 (i).

Japanese Treaty, Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9076 (v).

Jardine, John, Par. in 'Daily Times' *re* Claims on Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3847 (ii).

—— Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 4670 (iii).

—— Payment to by Govt. in excess of Work performed: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 5405 (iii).

Jesus River Improvements, Completion, Suspension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 804 (i).

'John B. Young' Str., Stranding of, Govt. Assistance *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2368 (ii).

Johnston, Mary Hamilton, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 140.'

Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 186.'

Judges appointed since 1896, Names, Residence &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8095 (v).

Judicial Vacancy in P.E.I., Delay in Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 7553 (iv).

—— *See* 'P. E. I.'

Justice, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 469 (i).

—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i), 6160 (iv).

—— Deputy Minister acting as Counsel for outside Cases: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).

—— *See* 'Bank of Montreal.'

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 39 & 189.

Juvenile Delinquents Act, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 4383 (iii).

Kelly, Robt., Emplymt. by Govt. at Vancouver, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 2665 (ii).

Kentville Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Crosby) 5548 (iii).

—— Read (Mr. Rhodes) 5749 (iii).

Kerr, Mrs. Elizabeth, Compassionate Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).

Kettle Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'

King, Dr., Residence at Experimental Farm, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 804, 1349 (i).

Kingston Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2886 (ii).

Kingston R. M. College Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

—— Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

Kingston Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

Kirkland, Walter Harvey, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 164.'

Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7805 (iv).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'

Krenzer, Mr. J., Dispute with Mr. Greenway *re* Purchase of Land: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3225 (ii).

La Banque International du Canada: *See* 'B. No. 123.'

Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 3801 (ii).

—— Conciliation Board: in Com. of Sup., 3378, 3399 (ii).

—— *See* 'G.T. Trainmen.'

—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. King) 7 (i).

Labour Dept., Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1484 (i).
'Labour Gazette:' in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii), 6057 (iv).
——— Name on Mailing List: M. for Copy* (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1727 (i).
Labour, Hours of on Govt. Works: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Labour Strikes, Letter from Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P., *re* Militia: Read (Mr. King) 10344 (v).
——— 'Point of Bayonet': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9784 (v).
——— Militia Interference: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 10345 (v).
——— *See* 'Coal Strikes.'
Lachine Canal, Concrete Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6358, 6410 (iv).
——— Tugs: in Com. of Sup., 6359, 6388 (iv).
Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Lachine Wharfs and Basins: in Com. of Sup., 6359 (iv).
Lafleur, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt., Interference in Elections: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1907 (i).
Lafferty, Dr. J. D., Payments to, *re* Indians N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6046 (iv).
Lajord Post Office, Change to Accounting Office: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iv).
Lake St. John Repatriation Society, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Girard) 9994 (v).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries Investigation Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 796 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Lake Winnipeg Navigation: Ice-breaker, *re* Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4217 (iii).
Lanctot, Mr. A.: *See* 'Privileges and Elections,' 'Richelieu.'
Land Patents for S.E. ¼ of Section 6, Twp. 7, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5834 (iii).
——— *See* 'Southwest.'
Lands, Timber and Mineral Rights: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3955 (iii).
Land, Timber, Natural Resources, &c. of Alberta, Provl. Control of: M. for Cor. (Mr. Herron) 1500 (i).
——— *See* 'Interior.'
Langdon Subdivision of C. P. Ry., Mail Service in Northwest: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1346 (i).
L'Ardoise Beach Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
La Sauvegard Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Prime Minister's Birthday, Congratulations (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8 (i).
——— Reception at Montreal, Montreal Harbour Commission's Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 9982 (v).
——— See 'Post Office, Ministers' Speeches.' 'Premier', &c.
Leach, R. E. A., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).
Leamington Postoffice, Cost in Detail, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 9782 (v).
"Le Devoir": *See* 'Drummond', &c.
Legal Agents, appointed by Govt. Precautions *re* acting for Private Parties: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 813 (i).
——— *See* 'Justice'.
Legal Expensese re Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Lethbridge Postoffice, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).
Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).
Lethbridge, Speech of Member for Pictou: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
Letter Carrier's Boots: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Free Transportation *re* Tramway System: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1104 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2194 (ii).
Letter Carriers Superannuation, Amt. to the Act: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1488 (i).
Levis Armoury and Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (i).
Levis Dry Dock, Plans filed by Sir Robt. Perks, Subsidy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 712 (i).
Library of Parlt., Apptmt. of Mr. O. Souliere: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8789 (v).
——— Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 309 (i).
Lt. Governor, N.S., Apptmt. of, Cor. *re* Director of N. S. Steel & Coal Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2670 (ii).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5822 (iii).
——— Names of Recipients: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3849 (ii).
Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).

Lighthouse Agencies, Rents: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091, 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse, Construction and Purchase of Supplies: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Dates of Apptmts., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 771 (i).
Lime Kiln Crossing Boat: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).
Live Stock Industry and Cold Storage Systems: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1184; Neg. (Y. 66; N. 111) 1275 (i).
Lloydminster Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).
Load Lines on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Lobster Fishery Regulations laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 529 (i).
Lockmen Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
——— *See* 'Canals.'
Logan, Robert William, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Long Sault Dam, Cor. between Govt. and British Ambassador: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3530 (ii).
Long Sault Dam, on St. Lawrence River: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3228 (ii).
——— on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).
——— Rep. of American Commissioners, Canada's action, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1651 (i).
——— *See* 'St. Lawrence.'
Long Sault Water Power: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Lorneville Wharf, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (iii).
Loughrin, Police Commissioner at Cochrane, Number of Convictions before: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1568 (i).
Lumber Cargoes Regulations: *See* 'B. Nos. 210 and 212.'
Lunenburg, N.S., Dredging, Plans *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2157 (ii).
Lunenburg Postoffice, Clock Tower: in Com. of Sup., 1592, 1625 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2359, 2578 (ii).
Lunenburg Post Office Clock, Statement of Chief Architect: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 2360 (ii).
Lymburner Contracts with Govt.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3205 (ii).
Macdonald & McLellan, Construction Contract, I.C.R.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10470 (v).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Macleod Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3003 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9588 (v).
McClary Manufacturing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
McGillivray, Judge *re* Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
McGill University, Grant *re* Applied Science: in Com. of Sup., 6445 (iv).
Magazines sent through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).
Magnetic Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
Mahone Bay Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4383 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4301 (iii).
Mail Clerks, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Mails delayed and mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii) 4667 (iii).
Mail Delivery Free in Towns &c., Conditions: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4925 (iii).
Mails, Illegal Use of for fraudulent Schemes: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 802 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1356; ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1364; Statement (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).
Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mildlebro) 9538 (v).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Mail Service with Allan SS Co.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4428 (iii).
Mail Service to Mar. Provs., Delivery of English Mails: Remarks on M. for Sup (Mr. Emmerson) 9541 (v).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv), 8752 (v).
Maisonneuve Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1685 (i).
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals *re*: Remarks (Mr. Staples) on M. of Sup., 6201 (iv).
——— Negotiations with Dom. Govt.: M. for Cor *(Mr. Staples) 980 (i).
——— Speech of Prime Min. at Winnipeg re, Cor. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 709 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Bradbury) 4207, 5035 (iii).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Man. Grain Act, Inspection &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Man. Legislative Building, Purchase of Fort Osborne Barracks, Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii), 6054 (iv).
Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* B. No. 19.'
Man. Radial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Manitoba and Southeastern Ry. Co.'s Charter, Transfer, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCarthy) 6505 (iv).
——— Inquiry for O. C. (Mr. Foster) 6915 (iv).
Manitoba Swamp Lands, Concession to Province: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6759 (iv).
Manitou Lake Fishing Privileges, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1348 (i).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
Maple Sugar, Adulteration, Pet. *re* Amt. to Foods Act: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5131 (iii).
Margaree Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
Marieville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4666 (iii).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1697 (i).

MARINE:

Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 6455 (iv).
Aids to Navigation on St. Lawrence, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 799 (i).
'Alva' Str., Purchase of, Dimensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1909 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* to Philip & Son: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2438 (ii).
'Arctic' Str., Provisions: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).
——— Rep. of Capt. Bernier: Inquiry for (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Bay of Fundy Buoy Lights: in Com. of Sup., 6458 (iv).
Beddington, Mr., Pension *re* Pilotage: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Brier Island Light, Application *re* new House: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).
——— Lightkeeper's Salary: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 5859 (ii).
Callender Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 6497 (iv).
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid *re*, Complaints of Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 661 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Clayoquot Life Saving Station, Investigation *re* Irregularities: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Barnard) 785 (i).
'Crissie Toomey' Schooner, Purchase of, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re*: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 9247 (v).
——— Ans. (Mr. Brodeur) 9374 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9374 (v).
Declaration of London, Consideration by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5935 (iv).
——— Adoption of: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Monk) 3530 (ii).
'Earl Grey' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1972 (ii).
——— Construction: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).
'Eureka' Pilotage Boat, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6502-3 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii).
——— Winter Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Lake Winnipeg Navigation, Icebreaker *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4217 (iii).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5822 (iii).
——— Names of Recipients: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3849 (ii).
Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).
Lighthouse, Agencies, Rents: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091, 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse Construction, Salaries &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
——— Purchase of Supplies: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Dates of Apptmts., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 771 (i).
Lime Kiln Crossing Boat: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Magnetic Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Committee, Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 4048 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 7 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1463 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchase of Ships: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).

Marine Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 6567 (iv).

Masters and Mates Examiners Certificates, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5821 (iii).

Masters Certificates for Inland Lakes, Dates, Examiners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).

Menzies, Wm., Payments to *re* Magnetic Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Midland and Tiffin Lighthouse: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1724 (i).

Morrison, N. L., Pocock, H. A., and Stevens, Captains, Dates of Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).

Navigation Licenses on Great Lakes, Regulations from Washington: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2375 (ii).

Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).

Owl's Head Lighthouse, N.S., Construction, Apptmt. of Lighthousekeeper, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3465 (ii), 5832 (iii).

Patrol Boats in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).

Pensions for Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).

'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3605 (ii).

Pilotage Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 6533 (iv).

Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9782 (v).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (iv).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Buoys at Sorel Shipyards, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).

——— *See* 'Sorel'

Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iii).

Shipbuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6484 (iv).

Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4467 (iii).

Shipping Registration: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*

Shipping List: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 9690 (v).

Shipwrecks on B.C. Coast, Inspection *re* Loading Vessels, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 7257 (iv).

Shipwrecked Seamen, Care of: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).

Sick Mariners Dues, Amount of Money in Trust, Investment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9993 (v).

——— Law *re* Payment of Dues: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1904 (i).

Sick Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 6567 (iv).

Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

Sorel Shipyards, Investigation into Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6758 (iv).

——— Buoys stolen, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7216 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7026 (iv).

——— Complaints *re* Thefts: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1088 (i).

——— Dismissal of Mr. A. Senecal: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) 5732 (iii).

——— Instructions to Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7039 (iv).

——— Rep. of Commissioner *re* Investigation Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9994, 10203, 10096 (v).

Sorel Shipyards: Painting Member's House

——— *See* 'Priv. and Elections.'

'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1910 (i).

Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).

Telephone for Life Stations on St. Lawrence Route: in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).

Thunder Bay Ice Breaker: in Com. of Sup., 6500 (iv).

Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2367 (ii).

U.S. Tax on Canadian Shipping, Legislation at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 9247 (v).

Vessels Transferred between Can. and Newfoundland, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3464 (ii).

Westport Signal Stations, when erected, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1091 (i).

Wharfs for Lighthouse and Coast Service Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (i).

Wireless Telegraph Stations owned by Govt., Locations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Armstrong) 1340 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6457 (iv).

MARINE—*Con.*

Wood Island Life Boat, Dimensions, Accommodation, &c., :Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3224 (ii).

Wrecking Plant Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).

Maritime Mail, Delays *re*, Representations by Board of Trade at Halifax: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).

——— *See* 'Postoffice.'

Maritime Road, Gaspé Shore: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

Markey Fishing Leases, Cancellation of, Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 4208 (iii), 6761 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6914 (iv).

——— M. for Papers (Mr. Campbell) 4382 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4664 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5954 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 5630 (iii), 6119 (iv).

Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Doherty) 9375 (v).

Marriage Laws, Parliamentary Powers, Govt.'s Intention: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8585, 10195 (v).

Marriage Laws in Quebec, Action of Roman Catholic Church: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7207 (iv).

Marriages, Validity of, Law respecting: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6269 (iv).

Masonic Property stolen in Montreal, Par. in 'Free Press' *re* Apology to Counsel: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Hughes) 7873 (iv).

——— Verdict of Montreal Jury, Counsel's Action: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7552 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7207 (iv).

Masters Certificates for Inland Lakes, Dates, Examiners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).

Masters and Mates Examiners Certificates, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5821 (iii).

Match Factories, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1976 (ii).

Match Factories using Phosphorus, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1717 (i).

Matches of White Phosphorus: See 'B. Nos. 10 and 96.'

Mather Bridge and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'

Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1347 (i).

Medical Council Bill, Par. in 'Globe', Correction *re* (Mr. Black) 2991 (ii).

Megantic Postoffice: in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1860 (i).

Melfort Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Menzies, Wm., Payments to *re* Magnetic Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Merchants and Employers Guarantee and Accident Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'

Mercier, Mr. Geo., Customs Official at Dalhousie, Member of Town Council: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4044 (iii).

Mergers: *See* 'Industrial.'

Mess. from His Ex., Estimates 1912, Suppl.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 8534 (v).

——— Estimates, 1911: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695 (i).

Messengers, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6172 (iv).

Meteghan Landing Place, Report *re* Defective Conditions: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4043 (iii).

Meteghan Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Mexico Trade: *See* 'Trade Commissioner.'

Meyer, Paulin Verena, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 145.'

Mica Exports 1900 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Best) 5290 (iii).

Mica Imports: Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4827 (iii).

Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2142 (ii).

Midland and Tiffin Lighthouse: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

MILITIA:

Alberta Rangers, Macleod Squadron, Organization of, Capt. D. J. Campbell's connection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7340 (iv).

Annual Drill, Number called out from 1894 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 8699 (v).

——— Number of Officers, Men, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 9352 (v).

Armouries, &c. in Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 1460 (i).

——— *See* 'Drill Halls.'

Baby Farm, Toronto, Sale of, Competition *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2155 (ii).

——— *See* 'Toronto.'

Bear River Rifle Range, Pets. *re*: Ques. Mr. Jameson) 3606 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii), 6057 (iv).

Bliss, Lt.-Col. D. C., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8100 (v).

B.C. Militia, Complaints *re* Treatment, Par. in B.C. Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 9248 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Coal Miners Strike, Remarks of Mr. Geo. Taylor, 9720 (v).

——— *See* 'Labour.'

Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of: Remarks (Mr. Russell) 9996 (v).

Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4659 (iii).

——— Apptmnt. of Col. Landry: Personal Explanation (Mr. Lemeiux) 8093 (iv).

——— Cadets from Canada: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 706 (i).

——— Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3608 (ii).

——— Indian Contingent, Par. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6506 (iv).

——— Names of Officers, Cadets, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7105 (iv).

——— Naval Cadets, Method of Selection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9986 (v).

——— Regulations *re* Apptmt., Number, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3277 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* Selecting Corps: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4464 (iii).

——— Rule *re* Apptmts: Ques. (Mr Middlebro) 3220 (ii).

——— Selection of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4828 (iii).

Customs Duties *re* Militia: in Com of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Drill Halls, Generally, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Drill Halls, Man., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1975 (ii).

Esquimalt Fort, Removal of Guns: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3220 (ii).

Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 799 (i).

——— Negotiations *re* Transfer: Ques (Mr Paquet) 799 (i).

Eucharistic Congress, Militia in Attendance, Authorization for: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3219 (ii).

——— *See* 'Eucharistic.'

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation: Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Middlebro) 9595, Neg. (Y. 45; N. 61) 9633 (v).

——— Compensation to: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 658 (i).

——— Number surviving, Pensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1089, 1715, (i).

——— *See* 'Veterans.'

Fort Osborne Barracks, Purchase by Man. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii), 6054 (iv).

——— *See* 'Winnipeg.'

MILITIA—*Con.*

French, Gen.: Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9 (i).

——— Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 76 (i).

Imperial Conference, Military Adviser to, Apptmt. of Mr. S. Hughes: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 9072 (v).

Imperial Defence Committee Report: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 944 (i).

Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2886 (ii).

Kingston Military College Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

——— *See* 'R.M.C.'

Labour Strike, Militia Interference: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 10345 (v).

——— Privelege, Ques. of: (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9784 (v).

——— Letter from Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P. *re* Militia: Read (Mr. King) 10344 (v).

——— *See* 'Coal.'

Military School, Montreal, Selection of Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).

Militia Allowances: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).

Militia and Agriculture Expenditure from 1867 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9371 (v).

Militia Dept, showing Passes by Members of Parlt.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1090 (i).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 7 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1020 (i).

Militia Expenditures, Total Amount since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 3467 (ii).

Militia Officers: *See* 'Eucharistic.'

Militia Regiments, Number in Montreal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7595 (iv).

Militia Regulation governing Admission to Militia Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 1001 (i).

——— Ques.(Mr. Campbell) 1090 (i).

Militia Supplies, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4667 (iii).

Militia Surveys, Expenditure in each of last five years: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1102 (i).

Militia, Total Annual Cost from 1867 to 1910, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1289 (i).

Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse.: Remarks (Mr Crosby) 2261, 2265; Members' remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2262 (ii).

Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 3144 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

N.B. Regiment of Artillery, Annual Drill: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).

Nicolet Military Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).

Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Association, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7340 (iv).

Pensions to Veterans: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 6915 (iv).

——— *See* 'Veterans.'

Petewawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Force Training: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4465 (iii).

——— Extent of Damage by Fire: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 9090 (v); Remarks (Mr. King) 9250 (v).

Rifle Associations: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).

Rockliffe Rifle Ranges, Additional Land purchased: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8994 (v).

——— M. for Cor.*, 8994 (v).

Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own while in England: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1087 (i).

——— Loaned by Can. to G.B. at Bisley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1085 (i).

——— Number issued to Queen's Own Regiment: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9781 (v).

——— Recommendation to British Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7552 (iv).

R.M. College, Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

——— College Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

——— *See* 'Kingston.'

St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2674 (ii).

Springhill Mines, N.S., Strike: Remarks *re* Militia (Mr. Blain) 2641 (ii).

Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10335 (v).

——— Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 8583 (v).

Toronto Barracks Site (Baby Farm) Reps., Valuation, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 981 (i).

——— *See* 'Baby.'

Veterans, Grants to: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 5211 (iii).

Veterans of 1866, Compensation to: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9999 (v).

——— *See* 'Fenians.'

Winnipeg, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 3052 (ii).

——— Fort Osborne Barracks, Purchase of, Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii).

——— *See* 'Ft. Osborne.'

MILITIA—*Con.*

Winnipeg Rifle Range: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iv).

——— Sale of, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7343 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported to U.S. for 1910-11, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7038 (iv).

——— Value of Export to U.S. for March and April, 1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8790 (v).

Milk and Cream exported, Quantity for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6269 (iv).

Milk and Cream Shipped from Western Ont., Accommodation *re* Handling: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).

Milk River Diversion: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Milk River and St. Mary's River Boundary: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. on Bill, 9101 (v).

Milton Post Office Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 1871 (i).

Mineral Deposits, Circular *re* Information by F. H. Forchet: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4305 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Capture of, Return to Can.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 4384 (iii).

Mines Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1475 (i).

Ministerial Association, Ottawa, Attack *re* Speech: Personal Explanation (Mr. Hughes) 3352 (ii).

——— Res. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Miller) 3059 (ii).

Ministers of Crown, Absence on Public Business for 1908-10, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1340 (i).

Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials, Acceptance of: Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2747, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 118) 2826 (ii).

——— Explanation *re* Discussion (Mr. Boyce) 2438 (ii).

——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Boyce) 2150, 2254 (ii).

Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 2261, 2265; Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2262 (ii).

Ministers' Travelling Expenses for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 817 (i).

——— *See* 'Public Works.'

Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 9993 (v).

Minnedosa Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Roche) 3046 (ii).

Minority Representation, Redistribution Bill, Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9988 (v).

——— Speech by Sir Richard Cartwright: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 9693 (v).

Mint Operations, Implementing Information: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).
'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1724 (i).
Miramichi Bay, N.B., Dredging Contracts, Specifications, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Crocket) 1340 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2556 (ii).
Mississippi, Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 9252 (v).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2146 (ii).
Modus Vivendi Licenses: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
—— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation &c., Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3065 (ii).
Moncton Armoury: in Com of Sup., 1623 (i).
Moncton Extension, I.C.R., Acquisition of Land from Builders Woodworkng Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6157 (iv).
—— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Moncton, Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 5926 (iii).
Moncton Station, I.C.R., Site purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1291 (i).
Monetville Cut, Lake Nipissing Public Works, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1495 (i).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1863 (i), 2567, 3144 (ii).
Montreal Customs House Employees leaving since 1st July, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1340 (i).
Montreal Govt. Appointments since 1st Jan., 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Gervais) 3225 (ii).
Montreal Govt. Weir: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 2065 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Montreal Legal Firms, Amounts paid for Services: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 984 (i).
Montreal Letter Carriers, Additional Number: Remarks (Mr. M. Martin) 2647 (ii).
Montreal and Maritime Provs., Mails forwarding of: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
—— *See* 'Post Office.'
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Montreal Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1861 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Alterations &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1862 (i).
—— Electrical Fixtures, Drawings *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).
—— Mailing and Registering Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1715 (i).
Monument Nationale Demonstration in Montreal, Excursion Rates *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1347 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2996 (ii).
—— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Moodie, Maj. J. D., Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).
Moosejaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).
Mormon Propaganda, Prevention by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5135 (iii).
Morrison, Nellie Bridgland, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Morrison, N. L., Pocock, H. A., and Stevens, Captains, Dates of Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).
Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1104 (i).
Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Mounted Police: *See* 'R. N. W. M. P.'
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2149 (ii).
Munderloh & Co., Ltd., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Murray Canal Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).
Murray Canal, New Scow: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).
Murray, Dr. C. A., I. C. R. Payments to *re* Tickets: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7031 (iv).
Nanaimo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).
Napanee River Dredging, Instructions &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 981 (i).
—— Papers laid on Table, 1903 (i).
—— Ret.: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2065 (ii), 4049 (iii).
Napierville Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1865 (i).
Nash, Fred. J., Emplymt. by Govt. in Inland Revenue, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2668 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. No. 222.'

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY:

Changes in Original Specifications &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Change in Structures to the amount of $10,000: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Classification, Arbitration *re*, Rep. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1490 (i).
—— Investigation, Reps.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 4677 (iii).
—— Information *re*: (Mr. Lennox) 6272 (iv), 9995 (v).

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Classification: Reductions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9899 (v).

Commission, List of Members of Engineering Staff, who have resigned &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Commissioners' Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).

Construction Work, Change in Concrete used, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 1499 (i).

Construction Work, Estimated Quantity, Bridges, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).

Contracts, Estimated Quantities *re*: Ques (Mr. Ames) 1491 (i).

Contracts, Security Deposit, Amount of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1971 (ii).

Contract Work, Delay *re* Execution: Ques (Mr. Lennox) 6668 (iv).

Contractors, Amounts paid on Force Account, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Cost Estimated and Mileage of Fencing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1094 (i).

Customs Duties on Supplies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8583 (v).

Defaulting Contractors, Penalties &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1281 (i).

Eastern Division, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1099 (i); correction of figures (Mr. Graham) 1293 (i).

Eastern Division, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1095 (i).

——— Overbreak, Agreement *re* Progress Estimates: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2434 (ii).

——— Section Houses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1099 (i)

Eastern Division, Total Cost to 31st Dec. 1910, inclusive of Quebec Bridge: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5130 (iii).

——— Eastern Div., Total Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 9430 (v).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 5136 (iii).

Eastern Div., Total Cost to Dec. 1910: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2434, 3064 (ii).

——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 3144 (ii).

Expenditure, Difference in Amounts in Ret.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4827 (iii).

Expenditure, Estimated Cost of Completion of Winnipeg and Moncton Div.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1727 (i).

G.T.P. taking over Completed Sections, Provision in Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1093 (i).

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Haney, Quinlan & Robertson, Contract *re* Construction of Locomotive Shops east of Winnipeg: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).

Labour Conditions, Charges *re* Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 8596 (v).

Land Damages, Compensation *re* Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3949 (iii).

Moncton and Winnipeg Contracts, Original Estimates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

N.B. Section, Pusher Grade: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4051 (iii).

——— Standard, Estimated Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4047 (iii).

Payments to: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 1572 (i).

Rails and Fastenings, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1099 (i).

Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt., or N.T.Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2851 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Moncton Div., Completion of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1711 (i).

Shops, Plans and Specifications for Machinery: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1569 (i).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. W. J. Press: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2157 (ii).

Temiskaming and Northern Ry., Agreement *re* Running Rights: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2435 (ii).

Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5135 (iii).

Total Expenditure to 31st Dec. 1910, Estimated Cost of Winnipeg and Moncton Section: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1497 (i).

Train Hauled Filling, Payments *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Western Div., Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7591 (iv).

National Weekly Indemity Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'

Natural Resources, &c.: in Sask. and Alberta, Provincial Control, Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3462 (ii).

Naval Policy of Govt.: *See* 'Address.'

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA:

Applications from Canadian and British Navy: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1339 (i).

Boot Contract, Tenders, Patterns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2675 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1723 (i).

'Bristol' Type, Specifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1279 (i).

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA—*Con.*

'Bristol' Type, Building of Cruiser: Remarks (Mr. Nantel) 196 (i).

Canadian Navy *re* Home Rule: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1461 (i).

Coal Consumption by Govt. Cruisers, Quantity per Day: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv). (iv).

Construction, Tenders *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8355 (v).

Coronation Contingent, Names of Officers. &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) 9375 (v).

Cruisers manned by Canadian Marines, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 805 (i)

Date and Port of Sailing of Niobe and Rainbow: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1091 (i).

English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1080 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1093 (i)

Expenditure *re*: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5638 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 4471 (iii)

——— Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) 4659 (iii).

International Naval Conference, Final Protocol: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 3073 (ii).

Medical Examiners *re* Recruits: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 8991 (v).

Naval Cruisers ordered for Canada, Stmnt. in'Navy': Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 793 (i).

Naval Defence Proposals: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 34 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).

Naval Defence. Govt. Proposals: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Address, 112, Amt. 133, Neg. (Y. 67; N. 120) 651 (i).

——— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Amt., 228, Neg. (Y. 70; N. 126) 649 (i).

Naval Service Dept., Names of Employees Domicile, Duties assigned, Salaries, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Monk) 932 (i).

Navy Act, Rules and Regulations: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1499 (i).

——— Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4665 (iii).

Navy Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 1463 (i).

'Niobe', Contracts *re* Provisions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).

——— Date of laying Keel, Repairs in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).

——— Wages of Seamen, Discontent *re*: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 530 (i).

——— statement : read (Mr. Brodeur) 664 (i).

'Niobe' and 'Rainbow', Cost to Date, Price, Repairs and Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 791 (i).

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA--*Con.*

'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 792 (i).

——— Gun Practice, Approximate Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv)

——— Loan by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 983 (i).

——— Names of Officers: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 9090 (v).

——— Par. in Naval Annual *re* Scrapping of Cruisers: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 931 (i).

——— Speed, Result of Official Trials: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv).

'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price Paid, &c.: Ques (Mr. Monk) 788 (i).

——— Guns, Type, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1490 (i).

——— Listed as inffective: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1070 (i).

——— Struck off effective List: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1081 (i).

Recruiting by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).

——— Regulations, O. C. *re* Remuneration &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7804 (iv).

Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 799 (i).

Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service at Public Function: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 932 (i).

——— Approval of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1288 (i).

——— Preparation of Answer: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 1351 (i).

Ships ordered by Govt.: Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press': Remarks (Mr. Monk) 866 (i).

Tenders for Cruisers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8700 (v).

Total Cost of Cruisers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 791 (i).

Navigable Waters, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 178.

Navigation Licenses on Great Lakes, Regulations from Washington: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2375 (ii).

Neepawa Postoffice Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

Negro Immigrants, Prohibition into N. W.: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 5911 (iii).

——— Restrictions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thorburn) 6523 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 5941 (iv).

——— *See* 'Civil Service.'

Nelson Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

Nelson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'

Netherland Loan Co., Cor. between Mr. Preston and Dom. Govt.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 3142 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5639 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 7349 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co., Investments in Canada, Rep. of Mr. W. T. R. Preston *re* : M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 776 ; Prop Res. (Mr. Monk) 781 (i).
——— Rep. of W. T. R. Preston, Cor. with Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 789 (i).
——— Statement by Mr. Preston *re* Chief Justice Fitzpatrick, Official Notification : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2669 (ii).
N.B. Regiment of Artillery, Annual Drill: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
New Edinboro', N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1283 (i)
Newfoundland Export Trade, Total Value, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2854 (ii).
Newfoundland, North Atlantic Fisheries, &c.: *See* 'Hague.'
New Harmony Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 6084 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Cor. with Mr. E. J. Walsh and Dept.: M. for Copies.* (Mr. Wallace) 5136 (iii).
——— Expenditure for 1910, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5830 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wallace) 7556 (iv).
——— Rep. of Mr. Walsh *re* : Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10474; Neg. (Y. 45; N. 79) 10532 (v).
Newmarket Canal : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Newspaper Special Train, Cost of Operation : Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 9982 (v).
New Westminster District, Govt. Lands, Grants issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D.Taylor) 1291 (i).
New Westminster Penitentiary Employees, Increase of Salaries: M. for Cor. (Mr. J D. Taylor) 2183 (ii).
Niagara Falls Water Power: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Niagara Falls Water Power, Quantity developed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5132 (iii).
——— Regulations *re* : Stmnt. (Mr. Pugsley) 8890 (v).
——— Treaty Obligations, &c., Par. in Press: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8791 (v).
Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 99.'
Nicolet Customs Collections for 1906-11: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).
Nicolet Military Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).
Nicolet Post Office, Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8789 (v).
Nicolet Post Office Building, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).
——— Pet. re Annex: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).
Nicolet River Dredging, Contract re : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).
'Niobe' Cruiser, Contracts *re* Provisions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).
——— Date of laying Keel, Repairs in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).
——— Gun Practice, Approximate Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (v).
——— Names of Officers: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 9090 (v).
——— Speed, Result of Official Trials: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv).
——— Wages of Seamen, Discontent *re*: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 530 (i).
——— statement: Read (Mr. Brodeur) 664 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Service.'
Nominingue Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).
North Atlantic Collieries, Application *re* Conciliation Board: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Maddin) 3947 (ii).
——— Protest *re* Nomination on Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) 4209 (iii).
——— *See* 'Labour.'
North Bay; Burk's Falls and Maganatawan Wharfs, Total Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Arthurs) 981 (i).
——— Information *re* (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2556 (ii).
Northern Ontario, Settlement of by Govt. Assistance: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 6767 (iv).
North Shore Tax Payers and Voting at Federal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1082 (i).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2435 (ii).
Northumberland, East Riding, Opposition to Reciprocity: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Owen) 6767 (iv).
Northwest Fishing Co.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5630 (iii).
See 'Markey.'
N. W. Ter. School Lands, Complete Procedure *re* Disposal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 800 (i).
N. W. M. Police, Coronation Contingent, Number, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 5836 (iii).

N. W. M. Police, Loss of Men on Macpherson Yukon Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7254 (iv).
Northwest Scrip to Old Settlers, Refusal of Claims &c.: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1293 (i).
North York, Challenge *re* Contest Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7220 (iv).
N. S. Breakwaters, Contracts *re* Construction in Digby County: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 657 (i).
Oaths of Office: B. No. 1, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1*, *pro forma*, 1 (i).
Obabikong Bay and Sabiskong Indian Land, Tenders *re* Burnt Timber: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1344 (i).
Objections *re* Interruptions Reciprocity Treaty: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4451 (iii).
Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii), 6089 (iv).
Offensive Weapons: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Offensive Weapons, Pets. *re* Legislation: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 3064 (ii).
—— Sale of, Par. in Montreal Papers: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 2557 (ii).
Official Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
Okanagan Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Oleomargarine, Admission of Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6504, 6668 (iv).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges Against *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. 8309; Amt. (Mr. Borden) 8309-14, Neg. (Y. 69; N. 102) 8347; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8348, Neg. (Y. 65; N. 99) 8353 (v).
—— M. for Com. *re* Investigation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8791 (v).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8032 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8092 (v).
—— Inquiry for Meeting of Com. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9899 (v).
Ontario and Abitibi Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Ontario Fisheries Service, Number of Officers, Services, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6157 (iv).
—— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Ont., Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.: *See* B. No. 76.'
Ontario-Michigan Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Ont. and Minnesota Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B No. 109.'
Ont. Northern and Timagimi Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Opium, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. Nos. 13, 22, 97.'
Orders Discharged (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4464 (iii).
Orders Dichharged: M. (Mr. Macdonell) 4464 (iii).
Order, Ques. of *re* Homestead, Member asked to withdraw Word 'Liar' (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 5561 (iii).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 100.'
Oshawa Customs Collector, Retirement of Mr. Blamey: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3225 (ii).
Oshawa Fruit Growers Ass'cn., Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Fowke) 5747 (iii).
Ottalie Stream, N. B., Public Works, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1287 (i).
Ottawa Buildings: Elevators &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
—— Excessive Rentals by Govt., Censure *re*: Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2271; Neg. (Y. 61; N. 104) 2358 (ii).
—— Furniture &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
—— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2590, 3162 (ii), 6027 (iv).
—— Improvement Commission's Report: Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 2004, 3672 (ii).
—— Lavatories: in Com. of Sup., 2583 (ii).
—— Lighting Contract: in Com. of Sup., 3173 (ii).
—— McGillivray's Contract: in Com of Sup., 5993 (iv).
—— Municipal Lighting Plant, Number of Govt. Buildings lighted by: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1280 (i).
—— New Leases, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1281 (i).
—— Parlt. Grounds, Pavement: in Com. of Sup., 2593, 2602 (ii).
—— *See* 'Parliament.'
—— Pavements &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8883 (v).
—— Plaza, 6507 (iv).
—— Rideau Hall Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 3170 (ii), 8872 (v).
—— Sanitary Condition of City, Rep. of Dr. Hodgetts: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5535 (iii).
—— Seybold Building Elevator, Reimbursement *re* Installation: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1350 (i).
—— Steel Cases: in Com. of Sup., 2582 (ii).
—— Sussex Street Deptl. Buildings, Alterations in Plans: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 2075 (ii); Plans laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 4824 (iii).
—— Sussex St. Deptl. Block: in Com. of Sup., 3172 (ii).
—— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 3169 (ii)
—— Victoria Museum: *See* 'Victoria.'
Ottawa City Health Conditions: Amt. (Mr. Lewis) to Com. of Sup., 6367 (iv).
Ottawa City, Typhoid Epidemic, Criticism of: Remarks: Explanation (Mr. Black) 4720 (iii).

Ottawa City Typhoid Epidemic, Pollution of City Water: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 4475 (iii).
—— Prorogation of House: Remarks (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4676 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Black) *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' 4656 (iii).
—— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 2583 (ii).
—— Water Supply for Parlt. Buildings, *re* Typhoid Epidemic: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 2004 (ii).
Ottawa City, Woods and Canadian Buildings, Cancellation of Contracts *re* Heating and Elevators: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1088, 1344 (i).
—— Cor. with Mr. Ellis and City Council: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3672 (ii).
—— Date of last Cheque paid to Imperial Realty Co. for Lighting: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1279 (i).
—— Lighting Contract with Electric Co.: in Com. of Sup., 3175 (ii).
—— Inaccurate Answer: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 999 (i).
—— Contract with Imperial Realty Co. *re* Lighting &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 794 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. S. Sharps) 3948 (ii).
—— Stmnt. *re* Discrepancy in Figures (Mr. Pugsley) 1011 (i).
—— *See* 'Public Works.'
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Ottawa River and Carillon Water Power, Leases &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 9994 (v).
Ottawa, Beaver or Steam Trawling in Northumberland Strait: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 980 (i).
Ottlecock Dam, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2852 (ii).
Owen Sound Dock, Work *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 10337 (v).
Owl's Head Harbour, Pet. *re* Light: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3465 (ii).
Owl's Head Lighthouse, N.S., Construction, Apptmt. of Lightkeeper, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5832 (iii).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Oyster Industry, Memorials, Surveys, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Warburton) 714 (i).
Pacific and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Pacific, Northern and Omenica Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Pacific and Peace Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Pages, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).
Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Association, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7340 (iv).
Paper Imports into U. S., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).
—— *See* 'Pulp.'
Parcel Post between Canada and G. B. Colonies, &c., Loss *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 805 (i).
Parcel Post, Express Rates: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 9930 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9909 (v).
Parcel Post Rates, Reduction *re*: Ques. (Mr Armstrong) 5934 (iv).
Paris Agency: in Com of Sup., 8694 (v).
Paris Exposition, 1900, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 7602 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Condition of: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6768, 7023 (iv).
—— *See* 'Ottawa.'
—— Water Supply, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7345 (iv).
Parliament, Opening and Closing Dates from 1896 to 1910: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 786 (i).
—— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 1805 (i).
Parliament, Opening of: Com. from Gov. Gen's. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Parliament Site, Winnipeg, Reservation in Crown Grants, &c.: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. A. Haggart) 7039 (iv).
—— *See* 'Manitoba,' &c.
Parrsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1598 (i).
—— Instructions to Officials *re* Plans, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Rhodes) 1727 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 8535 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Parry Sound Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).
Pasqua's Indian Reserves, Claims for Damages re Fires: Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 8586 (v).
—— *See* 'Indians.'
Patent Record: in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
Patent Relief: *See* Bills Nos. 43, 165, 187, 188 203.
Patrol Boats in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).
Peace River Water Belt: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Peat Gas, Generating Electric Power, Process, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 708, 985 (i).
Pecuniary Claims Convention, *re* Hay Claims, Objections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 802 (i).
Peel County Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7247 (iv).
—— *See* 'Post Office.'

Pelagic Sealing Conference: in Com. of Sup., 8678 (v).
——— Treaty between G. B. and U. S. *re* Protection to: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3670 3769, 3839 (ii).
——— *See* 'Fisheries'.
Pembina Fish Dam, Placing of Ladder, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1090 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries'.
Penny Bank Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 221'.
Pensions for Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).
Pensions to Veterans: Remarks (Mr. G. V White) 6915 (iv).
——— See 'Militia'.
Peoples Ry. Co.: See 'B. No. 110'.
Percy Aylwin Irrrigation Grant, O. Cs.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 6158 (iv).
———*See* 'Interior'
Peterborough Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 5750 (iii).
Peterborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2603 (ii).
Petewawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Force Training: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4465 (iii).
——— Extent of Damage by Fire: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 9090; Remarks (Mr. King) 9250 (v).
Petewawa Wharf: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).
Petit Rocher Spur, I. C. R., Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6156 (iv).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April 1910: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6267 (iv).
'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3605 (ii).
Pickford and Black, SS Service between Can. and W. Indies, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 4465 (ii).
——— *See* 'W. Indies.'
Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2152 (ii).
Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons, Imported: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1721 (i).
Pig Iron Imports, used in Steel Rail Mills, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4828 (iii).
Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 7590 (iv), 8103 (v).
Pilotage Fees on Coal Barges: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Pilotage Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 6533 (iv).
Pilotage Rules: See 'B. No. 155.'
Plains of Abraham, Battlefield: *See* 'B. No. 222'.
Plaza, Ottawa, Removal of Poles: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6507 (iv)
——— *See* 'Ottawa.'
Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 3223 (ii).
Poachers Fishing on Pacific Coast, Par. in Victoria Daily Colonist: Remarks (Mr. Bernard) 1458 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9782 (v).
Poisons, Sales of: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Porcupine, Disasters by Fire, Aid to: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 9694 (v).
———Remarks (Mr. W. R. Smyth) 9635 (v).
——— Request for Tents, Supplies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 9983 (v).
Pork Packing Industry, Delegation *re*: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Blain) 2530 (ii).
Portage le Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (iv).
Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
Port Credit, Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).
——— Public Works, Expenditures for 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5638 (iii).
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1101 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Port Mulgrave, &c., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8786 (v).
Port Perry Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1880 (i).
Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 985 (i).
Post Office Act Amts.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Post Office Act (salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 216.'

POST OFFICE:

Acton Vale, Upton and St. Pie Post Office Revenues: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 980 (i).
Allan SS. Co. Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4428 (iii).
Arrow Lake Postal Clerk: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Athol Mail Route, Establishment of, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Rhodes) 2161 (ii).
Atlantic Fast Service and All Red Route, Establishment of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1726 (i).
Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).
Austin Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Aylmer Post Office Revenue for 1908-9, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 984 (i).

Bark Lake Post Office, Closing and Opening: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).

Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

Birch Grove Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) 6073 (iv).

Bonaventure River, Quebec, and N.B. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8764 (v); M. for Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).

Canada and Japan Mail Subsidy: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1802 (i).

Canso and Guysborough Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8994 (v).

Chemin Gouin Postmaster, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7038 (iv).

——— A. C. Miquelon, Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames, 7210 iv).

Cobalt Mail Service, Delays and Inefficient Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1649, 1663, 1804 (i).

Coronation Stamps: Inquiry *re* (Mr. Armstrong) 9247 (v).

——— *See* 'Stamps.'

Collingwood Corner, Postmaster, Name Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).

Crooks, Mr. Wesley, Postmaster at Peggy's Cove, Increase in Salary: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).

Curren, R. C., Gratuity *re* Post Office Service: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3948 (ii).

Dixon Post Office, Pets. *re* Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4669 (iii).

Donland Post Office, Removal of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 9994 (v).

Don Post Office, Mail Service to Toronto, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).

Dunnville Postal Collections, Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3470 (ii).

Echo Lake Post Office, Application *re* Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8993 (v).

English Mail Service to Maritime Provs.: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8792 (v).

——— *See* 'Mails,' &c.

Escott Postmaster, Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

——— Date of Apptmt., Complaints *re* late Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).

——— Postmaster's Salary, Date of Increase: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7601 (iv).

Fergus Post Office Site: Remarks (Mr. Stratton) in Com. of Sup., 1883 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Fraser Mills Postmaster, Defalcations, Bonds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1566 (i).

Fraser River Mail Service, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Free Delivery of Mail: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1285 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4925 (iii).

Gaspé Mail Service, Revenue *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3854 (ii).

Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7038 (iv).

Guysborough 'Times,' Application *re* Postal Privileges: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6505 (iv).

Halifax Post Office Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).

——— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 653 (i).

Hall's Prairie P.O., Pets. *re* Location, Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3468 (ii).

Haskett, Havelock and New Tusket Post Offices, Distance between &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8991 (v).

Jackson Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).

Lajord Post Office, Change to Accounting Office: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).

Langdon Subdivision of C. P. Ry., Mail Service in Northwest: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1346 (i).

Leamington Post Office, Cost in Detail, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 9782 (v).

Letter Carrier's Boots: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).

Letter Carriers, Free Transportation *re* Tramway System : Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1104 (i).

Letter Carriers in New Westminster, Free Transportation on Tramways: M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2194 (ii).

Letter Carriers Superannuation, Amt. to the Act: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1488 (i).

Magazines sent through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).

———*See* 'U. S.'

Mails delayed and mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii), 4667 (iii).

Mails, Illegal Use of for fraudulent Schemes: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 802 (i).

Mails used Illegally for Lottery Schemes &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1356 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Mails Used Illegally for Lottery Schemes, &c.: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1364; Stmnt. (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).

——— *See* 'Sheldon.'

Mail Service to Mar. Provs., Delivery of English Mails: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 9541 (v).

———Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).

——— *See* 'English.'

Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 9538 (v).

——— *See* 'Rural.'

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv), 8752 (v).

Meteghan Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

Ministers Speeches distributed by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9253 (v).

——— Speeches of Prime Minister, Distribution by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9071 (v).

Montreal Letter Carriers, Additional Number: Remarks (Mr. M. Martin) 2647 (ii).

Montreal Post Office, Mailing and Registering Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1715 (i).

Montreal and Maritime Provs., Forwarding of Mails: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).

Neepawa Post Office Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

Nelson Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

New Harmony Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 6084 (iv).

Newspaper Special Train, Cost of Operation: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 9982 (v).

Nicolet Post Office Building, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

——— Pet. *re* Annex: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

——— Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8789 (v).

N. S. Post Office Service, Weekly and Biweekly, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 982 (i).

Parcel Post between Canada and G. B., Colonies, &c., Loss *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 805 (i).

Parcel Post System, Express Rates: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 9930 (v).

——— Reduction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5934 (iv).

———Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9909 (v).

Parrsboro Post Office: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 8535 (v).

Peel County Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7247 (iv).

——— Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 10355 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Postal Clerks, Superannuation *re*: in Com. of Sup., 4284 (iii).

Postal Conventions with Spain, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 1104 (i).

Postal Regulations, Distribution of short date Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10340 (v).

Postmasters' Association, Pets. *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).

Postmaster General's Mission to Rome, Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3606 (ii).

Postmasters' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4289 (iii).

——— Increase to, Classification of Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5934 (iv).

Post Office Buildings, Policy of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1870 (i).

Post Office Buildings in Rural Districts, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).

Post Office Buildings, Total Value, Expenditure, Subsidies *re* Mails, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

Post Office Buildings: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3954 (iii).

Post Office Collections, Revenues in Cities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3862 (ii).

Post Office and Customs Revenue for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw from 1906 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4673 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).

——— Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).

——— Estimates *re* Mail Service, Objection (Mr. Perley) to Passing, 4296 (iii).

——— Money Orders, Printing of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1101 (i).

——— Outside Service, Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 6073 (iv).

——— Outside Service, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6178 (iv).

——— Overcrowding in Basement: Ques. Mr. Sproule) 6667 (iv).

——— Post Office Matters, Generally: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).

——— Promotions and Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 10469 (v).

——— Revenue and Expenditure: Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 10335 (v).

——— Savings Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1568 (i).

——— Supplies for Western Provs., Distribution of: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 1282 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Pratt's Siding, Establishment of Post Office, Requests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3067 (ii).

P.E.I. Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Use of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7109 (iv).

——— *See* 'Stamps.'

Railway Mail Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 4281, 4285 (iii), 6179 (iv).

——— Compensations: in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

——— Accidents to, Grants *re* Injuries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3859 (ii).

——— Compensated for Accidents, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9537 (v).

——— Examinations: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6082 (iv).

——— Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

——— Maximum and Minimum Salary, Claims *re* Increase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2160 (ii).

——— Names and Date of Apptmts. of Persons not passing Qualifying Examinations: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3855 (ii).

Railway Mail Clerk's Salaries: *See* 'Civil Service Bill 217."

Revenue for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw from 1906 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4673 (iii).

Roberval Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).

'Review of Reviews,' Collection of Extra Postage: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).

Rosendale Mail Service, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1291 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Generally: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10365 (v).

Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery in Renfrew County: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Stamps and Postcards, Manufacture of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).

——— *See* 'Mail Routes,' 'Peel,' &c.

Rural Mail Service in East Elgin, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 983 (i).

——— Number operating in Man.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1105 (i).

——— Routes, Number in Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 983 (i).

Rural Postmasters: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).

St. Johns Postmaster, Refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir': Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1089 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Ste. Marie de Monnoir Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1698 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

Saskatchewan Post Offices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6505 (iv).

Selkirk Post Office Box: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Shelburne Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Best) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Sheldon, Mr. C. D., Illegal Use of Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).

——— Action of Govt. *re* Returning to Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6200 (iv).

——— *See* 'Mails,' &c.

Stamp Cancelling Machines, Cost, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).

Stamps, New Issue by P.O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).

——— Canadian Design: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 7106 (iv).

——— Condemnation *re*: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 9990 (v).

——— Prize *re* Best Design, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 5402 (iii).

——— Refusal of Imperial Design: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6908 (iv).

——— *See* 'Coronation,' 'Quebec,' &c.

Tadousac Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges *re*, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5133 (iii).

Tilbury, &c., Post Office Revenue at, for 1904-10: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 807 (i).

——— *See* 'Walkerville.'

Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3466 (ii).

Toronto Post Office, Addition to, Changes *re* Specifications: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 805 (i).

Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance to Widow: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3861 (ii).

U. S. Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 984 (i).

——— *See* 'Magazines.'

Walkerville Post Office Building and Mail Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) *re* Staff, 2559 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).

——— *See* 'Tilbury.'

Westbrook Mail Contract, Tenders re: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1103 (i).

Westville Post Office, Number of Bricks used: Ques. Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Windsor, N.S., Letter Carriers, Salary: Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).

Potato Barrels, Standard Size: *See* 'B. No. 9.'

Potato Bushel, Standard Weight: *See* 'B. No. 153.'

Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6271 (iv).

Pratt's Siding, Establishment of Post Office, Requests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3067 (ii).

Precedence at Official Receptions: M. for Cor. (Mr. Sproule) 949 (i).

——— *See* 'Eucharistic.'

Pre-emptions and Purchased Homesteads, Total Acreage, Amounts received, Annual Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 812 (i).

——— *See* 'Interior.'

Preferential Tariff Concessions granted to G. B.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

Premier's Return from Conference, Reception, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9780 (v).

——— *See* 'Laurier, Sir W.'

Prime Minister's Tour through the West: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 25 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 45 (i).

Prime Minister's Visit to Imp. Conference, Reciprocity and Editorials in 'Christian Guardian': Read (Mr. Thornton) 9072 (v).

P. E. I. Coast Fisheries, Fines, Penalties *re* Breach of Regulations: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Fraser) 1501 (i).

P. E. I. and G. B., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8788 (v).

P. E. I. Ry.—Harmony-Elmira Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).

P. E. I. Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 6923, 7553 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7428, 7803 (iv) 8355 (v).

P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Warburton) 3863, 3917 (ii).

P. E. I. Supreme Court, Apptmt. of Judges: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8355 (v).

P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorials, Reps., &c., *re* Survey; M. for Copies (Mr. Richards) 2176 (ii).

P. E. I. Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

——— Contracts *re* Coal, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 2677 (ii).

Prince Rupert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Islands, B.C., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8787 (v).

Printing Bureau Boilers: in Com. of Sup., 2361, 2582 (ii).

Printing Bureau Employees, Religious Status: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3606 (ii).

Printing Bureau Investigation: M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7687, Neg. (Y. 56; N. 92) 7801 (iv).

——— Distribution of Evidence: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1364 (i).

——— Evidence under Oath, Printing, &c., Dismissal of Mr. R. E. Cook: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2672 (ii).

——— Irregularities, Money Loss, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 794 (i).

——— Number of Dismissals, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. Taylor) 708 (i).

——— Paper purchased, Inspection of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2373 (ii).

——— Investigation, Report of: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 8; M. to print, 8 (i).

——— Printing of: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1351 (i).

Printing, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 309 (i).

Private Bills: M. to extend Time (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1454 (i).

——— Second Readings: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 8641 (v).

Privileges and Elections Com., 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. German) 6756 (iv).

Privileges and Elections Com., Charges *re* Mr. A. Lanctot: M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7873; Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7889, Neg. (Y. 56, N. 98) 8030 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Molloy) *re* Absence from his seat in the House, 1353 (i).

——— *re* Blocking Public Accounts Com.: (Mr. Lennox) 990 (i).

——— (Mr. Geo. Taylor) *re* Labour Strikes, 9784 (v).

——— (Mr. Best) *re* Members paying for Speeches, 1355 (i).

——— *re* Montmagny Electors, (Mr. Roy) Correction in Hansard, 1356 (i).

——— *re* Speech by Member for Dauphin as to Selection of Capital for Saskatchewan (Mr. Neely) 5620 (iii).

——— Telegram delayed, &c: (Mr. Gilbert) 1456 (i).

Privy Council, Clerkships: in Com. of Sup., 8750 (v).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

Protection Service *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 3807 (ii).

——— *See* 'Fisheries.'

Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen's. Rep. to Committee, 527, 818; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 823; Amt. to Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 827; Agreed to (Y. 98; N. 74) 864 (i).

Public Accounts Committee: Meetings and Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 309 (i).

——— Proposed Amendment (Mr. Lennox) Notice *re*, 696 (i).

Public Buildings, Erection of and Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lalor) 4319 (iii).

Public Buildings in former Estimates, Precedence over new ones: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).

Public Buildings: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 5541 (iii).

Public Buildings for Post Offices, &c., Number, Expenditure &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 786 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7347 (iv).

Public Buildings, System adopted *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).

——— Total Cost for several Years: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii); Ques. of Order *re* Discussion (Mr. Pugsley) 2101; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2101 (ii).

Public Work Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).

Public Works, Expenditure generally: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).

Public Works promised during Western Tour: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1630 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS:

Advertising Govt. Works, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).

Alien Labour Law, Employment of Foreigners on Public Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 10367 (v).

Amaguadees Pond, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 9500 (v).

Ancona Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Argyle Sound, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).

Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

Assiniboine Floods, Pets. to Govt., Political Interference *re*: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii).

——— River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

Athens Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2088 (ii).

Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Aylmer, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1672 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Banff Park Water Works: in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).

Bathurst Dredging Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 803, 1285 (i).

Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2970 (ii).

——— Cor.: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3005 (ii).

——— Further Cor.: Read (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 3029 (ii).

Belleville Docking Facilities: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iv).

Belleville Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Big Bay Point Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).

Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiation with U. S. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1575 (i).

Bracebridge Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Brantford Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).

Brighton Wharf, Vote *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 1655 (i).

Bronte Harbour Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).

Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247 (iv).

Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

——— Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

——— Draping for His Maj.'s Death: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

——— Electric Power: in Com. of Sup., 3210 (ii).

——— Rents, Engineers Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3212 (ii).

Buildings, Que., General Repairs &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).

——— Yukon, Salaries &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3214 (ii).

Burlington Bay Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sealey) 7341 (iv).

——— Remarks on Question (Mr. Sealey) 7348 (iv).

Calgary Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).

Campbellton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).

Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities dredged, Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1905 (i).

Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8983 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Chatham, N.B., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1610 (i).

—— Purchase of Site, Name of Owners: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (iii).

Chesley Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2103 (ii).

Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).

Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).

Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3013 (ii).

Cribbins Point Wharf: in Com of Sup., 6029 (iv).

Deep Brook, N.S., Wharf, Expenditure *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 4383 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii).

Digby Public Works, Expenditures *re*: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).

Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for Current Year: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).

Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 2105 (ii).

Duncan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Dunnville Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).

Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by 'International': M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1498 (i).

East Chezzetcook Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).

Eastern Dredging Co., Letting of Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 813 (i).

—— *See* 'Gaspereaux.'

Elbow and Bow Rivers Water Power, Privileges *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1345 (i).

—— M. for Copies* (Mr. McCarthy) 1501 (i).

Elora Post Office, Site, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 6505 (iv).

Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Essex Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2110 (ii).

Experimental Farms Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3157 (ii).

Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (i).

Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Fire Escapes for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3160 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders from P.W. Dept. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 2648 (ii).

Fort William Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Fredericton Public Building, Pavement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1612 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

French River Dam: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).

Gananoque Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i).

Gaspereau Harbour Dredging Contracts: Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10203, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 92) 10308 (v).

Gaspé Shore, Maritime Road: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

Georgetown Public Building Drainage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).

Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).

Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).

Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Water Filters &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).

Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 7806 (iv).

Halifax Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i).

—— Citadel, New Quarters: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).

Hampton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1339 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).

—— N. S., Estimates to be Voted for Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9501 (v).

Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Hartland Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1617 (i).

Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 930 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge, P. E. I., Montreal, purchased, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works, Printing of Proceedings *re* Com: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3280 (ii).

Humbolt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).

Hungry Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Iberville Bridge Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (iv).

Immigration Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

Jesus River Improvements, Completion, Suspension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 804 (i).

Kingston Postoffice Building: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

Knight's Point Breakwater, P. E. I., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7805 (iv).

Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv).

L'Ardoise Beach Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).

Lethbridge Postoffice, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).

——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).

Levis Armoury and Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (i).

Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).

Lloydminster Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).

Lorneville Wharf, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (ii).

Lunenburg, N. S., Dredging, Plans re: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2157 (ii).

Lunenburg, Public Building, Clock Tower: in Com. of Sup., 1592, 1625 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2359 (ii).

——— Statement of Chief Architect: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 2360 (ii).

——— Specifications *re* Tower Clock: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2578 (ii).

Macleod Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3003 (ii).

——— Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9588 (v).

Maisonneuve Postoffice: in Com. of Sup., 1685 (i).

Margaree Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1697 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Marieville Public Building, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4666 (iii).

Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1347 (i).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1710, 1860 (i).

Melfort Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Meteghan Landing Place, Report *re* Defective Condition: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4043 (iii).

Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2142 (ii).

Milton Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 1871 (i).

Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 9993 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Roche) 3046 (ii).

Miramichi Bay, N. B., Dredging Contracts, Specifications, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Crocket) 1340 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2556 (ii).

Mississippi, Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 9252 (v).

Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2146 (ii).

Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1623 (i).

Monetville Cut, Lake Nipissing Public Works, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1495 (i).

Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1863 (i), 2567 (ii).

Montreal Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1861 (i).

Montreal Postoffice, Alterations &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1862 (i).

——— Electrical Fixtures, Drawings *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).

Moosejaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2149 (ii).

Nanaimo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).

Napanee River Dredging, Instructions &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Wilson) 981 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 1903 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2065 (ii), 4049 (iii).

Napierville Postoffice: in Com. of Sup., 1865 (i).

Nelson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

New Edinboro, N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1283 (i).

Nicolet River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).

Nominingue Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).

North Bay, Burks Fall and Maganatawan Wharfs, Total Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Arthurs) 981 (i).

—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2556 (ii).

'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2435 (ii).

N. S. Wharfs and Breakwaters, Contracts *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2160 (ii).

—— Contracts *re* Constructions in Digby County: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 657 (i).

Okanagan Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Ottalie Stream, N.B., Public Works, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1287 (i).

Ottawa City, Dom. Buildings, Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2590 (ii).

—— Deptl. Steel Cases: in Com. of Sup., 2582 (ii).

—— Lavatories: in Com. of Sup., 2583 (ii).

—— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 2583 Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2553 (ii).

—— Woods Building, Lighting Contract, Cor. with Mr. Ellis and City Council: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3672 (ii)

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3948 (ii). *See* 'Ottawa.'

Ottawa River and Carillon Water Power, Leases, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 9994 (v).

Ottlecock Dam, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2852 (ii).

Owen Sound Dock, Work *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 10337 (v).

Parrsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1598 (i).

—— Plans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

—— Instructions to Officials *re* Plans, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Rhodes) 1727 (i).

Parry Sound Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).

Petawawa Wharf: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).

Peterborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2603 (ii).

Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6267 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 7590 (iv), 8103 (v).

Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (iv).

Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).

Port Credit Public Works, Expenditure for 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5638 (iii).

Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1101 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).

Port Perry Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1880 (i).

Postoffice Buildings, Total Value, Expenditure, Subsidies *re* Mails, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

—— Inquiry for Rets,. 4567. 5541 (iii).

Postoffice Buildings, Policy of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1870 (i).

Postoffice Buildings in Rural Districts, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).

Prince Rupert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of and Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lalor) 4319 (iii).

Public Buildings in former Estimates, Precedence over new ones: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).

Public Buildings, Plans approved by Depts. previous to Aug. 5th, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 698 (i).

Public Buildings for Postoffices, &c., Number, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 786 (i).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7347 (iv).

Public Buildings, System adopted *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in of Sup., 1669 (i).

Public Buildings, Total Cost for several Years: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii).

—— Ques. of Order *re* Discussion (Mr. Pugsley) 2101: Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2101 (ii).

Public Works, Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).

Public Works, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).

—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1032 (i), 5993 (iv).

—— Travelling Expenses: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8356, 9071 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Public Works Estimates, Objection to Vote in full: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).

Public Works Estimates, Quebec, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com of Sup., 1639 (i).

Public Works, Expenditures generally: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).

Public Works, Labour Hours: *See* 'Hours.'

Public Works promised during Western Tour: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1630 (i).

Public Works, Supply for: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 10354 (v).

Quebec City Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).

——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

Red Point Wharf, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).

Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3017 (ii).

Rigaud Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).

——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 3067 (ii).

Rivière des Prairies, Completion of Deepening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).

——— Rep. of Engineer &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2161 (ii).

——— M. for Copy (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2162 (ii).

Rock Island Building: in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i).

St. Andrew's Dam, Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3035 (ii).

——— Sums for Completion: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 1508 (i).

St. Andrew's Wharf, P.Q., Tenders *re* Construction, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3608 (ii).

St. Catharines Drill Hall Site: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1680 (i).

St. Croix River, N.B., Construction of a Public Work, Proposal *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1348 (i).

St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i), 4666 (iii).

St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).

St. John Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1624 (i).

——— Contract *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).

St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar Contract, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5631 (iii).

——— Quantity of Material taken out by Maritime Dredging Co. under Beacon Bar Contract: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5129 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, completed, &c.: Ques, (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).

——— Rental of Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2673, 3065 (ii).

St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1894 (i).

——— Option *re* Lands: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2677 (ii).

——— Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2577 (ii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 10509 (v).

Ste. Marie Division Post Office, Defective Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10336 (v).

St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., Wharf &c., Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247, 7344 (iv).

Ste. Therese Post Office, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1715 (i).

Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).

Seagull Dock, St. Joseph's Island, Date of Construction, Expenditures, &c.: (Mr. Boyce) 1349 (i).

Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4825 (iii).

Sharbot Lake Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).

Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).

Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).

Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).

Summerside Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1602 (i).

Swan Creek Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings, &c. for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 2159 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, Sask. and Alberta, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Three Rivers, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).

——— Post Office, Temporary Building: Ques. (Mr. Clare) 8984 (v).

Tignish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1602 (i).

Tilbury Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).

Tilbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).

——— *See* 'Walkerville.'

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Toronto Barracks, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7557 (iv).

—— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2153 (ii).

—— *See* 'Militia.'

Toronto Federal Buildings, Plans of Erection: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8479 (v).

Tillsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).

Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).

Uxbridge Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1084 (i).

—— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9782 (v).

Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2630 (ii).

Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).

Vegreville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).

Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).

Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).

Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2633 (ii).

Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1101 (i).

Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2634 (ii).

Water Powers owned by the Dom., Legislation *re* Regulation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7803 (iv).

Water Powers on St. Lawrence, Concessions granted: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 9780 (v).

West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 811 (i).

West Dublin Bay, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).

Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).

Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).

Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).

Weymouth Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1601 (i).

Whitby Post Office Site, Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).

Wiarton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2636 (ii).

Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 6272 (iv).

Wingham Public Building Tower Clock, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6664 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Winnipeg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018, 3029 (ii).

Winnipeg River, Water Rights, Grants, Leases, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 2162 (ii).

Wolfe Island, Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).

—— Protection to Road: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1599 (i).

Yarmouth, Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).

—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1600 (i).

Pullman Berths, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5990 (iv).

Pulp and Paper Duties, Par. in New York 'Herald': Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2638 (ii).

—— Information *re* (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2646 (i).

—— Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper by U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4468 (iii).

Pulp Wood Exports to the U. S., Value of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).

—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Paterson) 5126 (iii).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Pure Foods: *See* 'B. No. 35.'

Quaker Oats Co., Reciprocity with U.S.: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 4120 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Govt. Advances: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 7245 (iv).

Quarantine, Animals Health: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Quarantine, Public Health: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iv).

Quarantine Stations, Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3213 (ii).

Que. Battlefields: *See* 'B. No. 222.'

Quebec and Blanc Sablon SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8788 (v).

Quebec Boundaries, Cor. with Ont. and Dom. Govts., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 981 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders *re* Contract: M. for Copies (Mr. Lennox) 713 (i).

—— Advertisement *re*: M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copy, 1497 (i).

—— Tenders *re*: M. for Copies (Mr. Lennox) 3068 (ii).

Quebec Bridge, American Engineers consulted by Min. of Rys.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 697 (i).

—— British Empire Bridge Co.'s Deposit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9981 (v).

Quebec Bridge, Caisson, Damage to, Claims *re*:Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4045 (iii).
——— Carriage Way, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9979 (v).
——— Commission of Expert Engineers, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Emplymt. of Mr. Cooper *re* Inspection: Ques. Mr. Lennox) 6663 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Construction, Information re: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4319 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Contract with M. P. Davis, dated July 27th 1903, Transfer of same to Govt, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4567 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Contract *re* Construction, Resignation of Chairman, Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4205 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Reconstruction: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4740 (iii).
——— Date of Completion, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2667 (ii).
——— Estimated Cost, Tunnelling, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Donelly) 3278 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8102 (v).
——— Fair Wage Clause *re* Workmen: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6757 (iv).
——— Fair Wage Clause, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5835 (iii).
——— Financial Loan, Interest &c.: (Mr. Lennox) 4665 (iii).
Quebec Bridge and Labour Organizations: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 7039 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Members of Construction Board: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9981 (v).
——— Payment of $100,000 with Phœnix Bridge Co.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 981 (i).
——— Plans, Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6273 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Price) 7103 (iv).
——— Approval by Chief Engineer of G. T. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4826 (iii).
——— Specifications, Instructions *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lennox) 4677 (iii).
Quebec Bridge River Bed, Tests, &c., Investigations: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 658 (i).
——— Superstructure Contract, Letting of: Announcement (Mr. Graham) 6669 (iv).
——— Supervision, Amount expended: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6671 (iv).
——— Supervisor, Remuneration by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6449 (iv).
——— Tunnel Construction, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6268 (iv).
Quebec Civil Servants, Names of Permanent and Temporary Employees since 1st Jan. 1905, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lachance) 2376 (ii).
Quebec, Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).
Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8992 (v).
Quebec and Great Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Quebec Harbour Commission, Advances to, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2851 (ii).
——— Number *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2436 (ii).
Quebec Members, Revolt against extra session, Newspaper Articles: Denial of (Mr Talbot) 10096 (v).
Quebec , Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Que. and N. B. Ry: Co.: See 'B. No. 120.'
Quebec Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Que. Savings Banks Act. Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 219.'
Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Use of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7109 (iv).
Questions, Answering orally or written, Procedure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 700 (i).
Questions and Answers, Orally and Written: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 989 (i).
——— Copies given to Press (Mr. Hughes) 900 (i).
Questions answered orally: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1080 (i).
Questions, Incomplete Answers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1013 (i).
Questions and Motions proposed to be Introduced: Notice of (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1502 (i).
Questions of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Mr. Pugsley's Public Record, 10202 (v).
Ques. of Priv., Charges *re* Obtaining Lumber for Govt. Stores (Mr. Lanctot) 8695 (v).
——— *See* 'Privileges and Elections Com.'
Ques. of Privilege, Cor. *re* Connection with Riordan Paper Co. and Reciprocity (Mr. Perley) 10197 (v).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Rabies, Outbreak of, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).
Racial and Religious Prejudices, Liberal Pamphlets, Quotations &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Address, 531 (i).
Race Track Gambling: M. to print Evidence (Mr. Miller) 10467 (v).
Ry. Accidents, Inquests: *See* 'B. No. 2.'

Railway Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 4, 8, 23, 78, 197.'
Rys. and Canals Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Ry. Act Amt. (1903), c. 31, Proclamation *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 786 (i).
Ry. Water Belt in B. C.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Railway Commission, Apptmt. of French Canadian: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1103 (i).
Ry. Commission's Powers: *See* 'B. No. 197.'
Railway Committee: M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of House, 10190 (v).
——— M. to sit during sessions of the House (Mr. Guthrie) 9226 (v).
Ry. Employees, Forthnightly Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
Ry. Employees, Permission to Vote: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Ry. Employees, Protection: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Ry. Locomotive Boilers, Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Railway Mail Clerks, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4285 (iii), 6179 (iv).
——— Compensations: in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
——— Compensated for Accidents, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9537 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3859 (ii).
——— Examinations: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6082 (iv).
——— Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
——— Maximum and Minimum Salary, Claims *re* Increase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2160 (ii).
——— Names and Dates of Apptmts. of Persons not passing Qualifying Examinations: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3855 (ii).
Railway Mail Clerks Salaries: *See* 'Civil Service Bill 217.'

RAILWAYS:

Accidents *re* Canadian Railways, Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3922 (ii).
Accidents since 1st April, 1909, on running Trains, Construction Work, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ralph Smith) 713 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3853 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Quebec Oriental Ry. Co. and New Canadian Co., Date of Incorporation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2161 (ii).
——— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 4048 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*: Personal Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 8187 (v).
——— *See* main heading.

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

C. P. R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 766 (i).
——— Land Tax, Information *re* Privy Council's Decision, (Mr. Bradbury) 2992 (ii).
——— Reduction of Rates, &c.: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1806 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1573 (i).
Capitalization of Railways: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 5233, 5246 (iii).
Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Charters to Railway, Granting to by Parlt. Conditions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) on Railway Estimates, 5122 (iii).
Electric Railway Charters, Number since 1896, Extensions *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4043 (iii).
Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 10196 (v).
——— *See* 'Postoffice—Parcel Post.'
Gov. General's Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6446 (iv).
Govt. Railways constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 4829 (iii).
See 'I. C. R.'
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. Subsidy, Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 9371 (v).
——— *See* main heading.
G. T. Ry. Trainmens' Strike, Reinstatement of, Apptmt. of Judge Barron: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 2376 (ii).
——— Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 9692 (v).
——— *See* main heading.
Humber River Bridge, G. T. Ry. Plans *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2885 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, Policy of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 660 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Lands, Number of Acres sold *re* Construction Fund: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 796 (i).
I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 8513 (v).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
International Ry. Traffic, Points of Crossing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 4466 (iii).
Level Crossings: in Com. of Sup., 9509 (v).
——— *See* 'Ry. Crossings.'
Manitoba and Southeastern Railway Co.'s Charter, Transfer, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCarthy) 6505 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Manitoba and South Eastern Ry. Co.: Inquiry for O. C. (Mr. Foster) 6915 (iv).

Official Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).

P. E. I. Ry.—Harmony-Elmira Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).

——— Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractors, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).

——— Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (iv).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Govt. Advances: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 7245 (iv).

Railway and Canals Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1473 (i).

Ry. Commission Board: in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv), 9508 (v).

——— Apptmt. of French Canadian: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1103 (i).

——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).

——— Ry. Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission, Agreement *re* Traffic between U. S. and Can.: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 3054 (ii).

——— Vacancy on, Apptmt. of Farmer: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1291 (i).

Railway Crossings, Action of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).

——— *See* 'Level.'

Railways Owned, Operated in U. S. and Can., Mileage, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Rutan) 6158 (iv).

Ry. Rates to Clergymen, Reduction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2434 (ii).

Railway Rates in the West: Remarks on Address (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 98 (i).

Railway Rates, Comparison with U.S. Ry. Rates: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6431 (iv).

Railway Traffic Connections, Arrangements between Province and Ry. Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 696 (i).

Railways, Transportation problem: Stmnt. on M. for Sup. (Mr. Graham) 5039 (iii).

Regina and Moosejaw Town Site, C.P.R.'s Interest *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 3281 (ii)

Section Men, Complaints *re* Overwork: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).

Shelters for Working Men: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).

Subsidies, Total Amount since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 3467 (ii).

——— Corrected Statement (Mr. Graham) 6196 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Surveys and Inspections, Canals and Railways: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii) 6452 (iv).

Telegraph &c., Control of Rates: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 8356 (v).

——— *See* 'Express.'

'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 788 (i).

'Rainbow' and 'Niobe,' Cost to Date, Price, Repairs and Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 791 (i).

——— Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 792 (i).

'Rainbow', Struck off effective List: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1081 (i).

——— *See* 'Naval Service.'

Rainy River Power Development: *See* 'B. No. 109.'

Rapide Plat Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Absence of Ministers during Discussion: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8358 (v).

Agricultural and Farmers Associations, Res. approving Tariff: Read (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5546 (iii).

Agricultural Implements: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5745 (iii).

Agricultural and Manufactured Products of the U.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Stmnt. made by Mr. M. Clark, 4196 (iii).

Alterations &c., Better information placed before House: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4933 (iii).

American Boats through Can. Canals: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).

Answers of Ministers to Questions: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4137 (iii).

Associated Boards of Trade, Ont., Res. by: Read (Mr. Middlebro) 4121 (iii).

Australia and Can., Reciprocal Negotiations since 1900: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

Berlin Board of Trade Res., Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) 5726 (iii).

Boards of Trade, Saskatchewan, Despatch from W. A. Shepherd: Read (Mr. Schaffner) 5752 (iii).

Boston Speech of Min. of Militia: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 5751 (iii).

British Ambassador's Warning to Can. Ministers: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6200 (iv).

——— *See* 'Negotiations.'

British Demand for Tariff Concessions: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6574 (iv).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

British Preference, Increase of, Readjustment of Tariff, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7210 (iv).

British Preference Trade Policy: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5619 (iii).

——— *See* 'Preference.'

British Tariff Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6268 (iv).

Butter and Eggs, Prices in London, Statistics *re*: Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce *re* Return (Mr. Perley) 6508 (iv).

Canadian Coasting Laws, affecting Grain and Hogs: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 5133 (iii).

Champ Clark, Speech of, *re* Annexation: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3608 (ii).

——— Cor. with U. S., *re* Speech of Champ Clark; Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 3954 (iii).

——— Stmnt. of Mr. Clark *re* Opposition to: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 4227 (iii).

Comparative Prices Special Rep. of: Laid on Table (Mr. King) 10468; M. to Print 10590 (v).

——— *See* 'Statistics.'

——— Printing of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10469 (v).

Conferences, Length of Session, Names of Representatives, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7036 (iv).

——— *See* 'Negotiations.'

Correction of Figures in Speech in Hansard (Mr. Lennox) 3770 (ii).

Cor. laid on Table (Mr. Fielding) 3068 (ii).

Cor. with G. B. and Can. *re* Negotiations &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Turcotte) 3948 (ii).

Countries affected by Treaty *re* Importations into Canada (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4131 (iii).

Creston Fruit and Produce Association, Res. from: Read (Mr. Goodeve) 4119 (iii).

Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario, Denial of Stmnt. of Minister of Customs (Mr. Armstrong) 4570 (iii).

——— Correction *re* Stmnt. (Mr. Paterson) from Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario (Mr. Lalor) 4223 (iii).

Debate: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).

———Resuming of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 5939 (iv).

See 'Obstruction.'

Denial of Stmnt. of member for Cape Breton (Mr. Northrup) 5035 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Northrup) *re* Quotations made by member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) 5410 (iii).

Dufferin Board of Trade Res.: Read (Mr. Black) 5547 (iii).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Editorial in Montreal 'Star': Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 4139 (iii).

Farmers' Delegation from the West, and Govt. Ownership of Elevators: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1504 (i).

——— Article in Grain Growers' Guide *re* Hudson Bay Ry.: Denial of Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1574 (i).

——— Control of Hudson Bay Ry. Rates: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1508 (i).

——— Representations to the Govt., Printing &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1454 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to print Speeches, 3054 (ii).

——— Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 6908 (iv).

Farmers and Manufacturers Interests, Speech of Mr. Nesbitt: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4663 (iii).

Farmers Interests, Assurance of member for N. Oxford: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 5541 (iii).

Farm Products imported from other Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3668 (ii).

Favoured Nations, Importations from: Ques (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4111 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4113; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 4114 (iii).

——— Entry of Canadian Goods into their Markets (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4134, Reply (Mr. Fielding) 4134 (iii).

——— Favoured Nation Treaty Countries, Names of: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4665 (iii).

Fishing Bounties, Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 6670 (iv).

Fish Tariff, Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2886 (ii).

Fleming Grain Growers' Association Res.: Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5550 (iii).

Free Trade Offer by U. S., Pres'dt. Taft's Speech *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5293 (iii).

French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8097 (v).

Fruit Clause in Reciprocity Treaty, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 3283 (ii).

Fruit Duty, Res. from B. C. Inland Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Burrell) 3377 (ii).

——— Tel. read from Fruit Dealers *re* Duty affecting B. C. (Mr. Burrell) 3770 (ii).

——— *See* 'Summerland.'

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Fruit Duty, Tel. from Mission City Agricultural Ass'cn: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3955 (iii).

Fruit Growers Association, B. C., Protest *re* Duty: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3373 (ii).

Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnson before Com. on Ag.: Remarks (Mr. Schell) 2992 (ii).

Fruit Growers' Association, Burlington, Res. from: Read (Mr. Henderson) 4122 (iii).

Fruit and Vegetables Amt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sealey) 7666 (iv).

——— *See* 'Vote.'

Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Delegates, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3529 (ii).

——— Report of Proceedings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Print, 3952 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Burrell) 6120 (iv).

——— French Editions: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9075 (v).

Hamilton Cotton Co., Stmnt. of Employees: Read (Mr. Goodeve) 5747 (iii).

Interruption of Speakers, Denial of Stmt. *re* member for East Hastings, 5029: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5032 (iii).

——— Interruptions not Relevant: Remarks Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7527 ,iv).

——— Objections *re* Interruptions: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4451 (iii).

Kentville Board of Trade, Res.: Read (Mr. Rhodes) 5749 (iii).

——— Read: (Mr. Crosby) 5548 (iii).

Letter from Market Gardeners: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 4130 (iii).

Letter read by Member for Saltcoats, Giving Name of Writer: Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7264 (iv).

Lord Strathcona's Telegram *re* Reported Interview: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5126 (iii).

——— Explanation (Mr. Goodeve) 5210 (iii).

——— Mess. from Associated Press : Read (Mr. Fielding) 5292 (iii).

Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 5545 (iii).

Minister's Visit to Washington, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 4566 (iii).

——— *See* 'Negotiations.'

Negotiations between U. S. and Can.: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 32 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 48 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 72 (i).

Negotiations at Washington: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1506 (i), 2271 (ii).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Negotiations at Washington: Further Information *re* (Mr. Foster) 2070 (ii).

——— Instructions to Mr. Bryce: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4140 (iii).

——— *See* 'Conferences.'

——— Reported Draft of Proposals: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2065 (ii).

——— Submission to Hse. for Ratification: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1805 (i).

Negotiations by Mr. J. A. Macdonald of 'Globe' at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) *re* Speech at St. Catharines, 2560 (ii).

——— Attack of Ministerial Association, Ottawa: Personal Explanation (Mr. Hughes) 3352 (ii).

——— Editorial in 'Globe': Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2743 (ii).

——— Letter of J. A. Macdonald in Stratford 'Herald' *re* Visit to Washington: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4299 (iii).

Newspaper Reporters and Announcement of Treaty, Par. in Winnipeg 'Free Press' *re* Treatment of: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 2642 (ii).

North York, Challenge *re* Contest: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7220 (iv).

Obstruction, Articles in Press *re*: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 9999 (v).

——— M. to adjn. debate (Mr. Best), Obstruction, &c., 9885 (v).

Oleomargarine, Admission of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6668 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6504 (iv).

Opposition to Pact: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) 5739 (iii).

Opposition in Northumberland, East Riding: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Owen) 6767 (iv).

Oshawa Fruit Growers Ass'on. Res.: (Mr. Fowke) 5747 (iii).

Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) M. (Mr. King) to print, 10590 (v).

Par. in Moosejaw 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2639 (ii).

Par. *re* Quaker Oats Co.: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 4120 (iii).

Peterborough Board of Trade Res.: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 5750 (iii).

Pets. Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).

——— Inquiry for Pets. (Mr. Foster) 2439, 3057 (ii).

Preferential Tariff Concessions granted to G. B.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

——— *See* 'British.'

Prime Minister's Visit to Imp. Conference, Editorials in 'Christian Guardian': Read (Mr. Thornton) 9072 (v).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Private Cor.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2985 (ii).

Private Correspondence produced, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 10197 (iii).

Procedure in the House *re* Resolutions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5752 (iii).

Protests *re*: laid on Table (remarks) 3951 (iii)

Protocols, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2555 (ii).

Pulp and Paper Duties: Information *re* (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2646 (ii).

——— Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper by U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4468 (iii).

——— Par. in New York 'Herald': Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2638 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Cor. *re* Connections with Riordan Paper Co. and Reciprocity (Mr. Perley) 10197 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Owen *re* Vote, 3343 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., Resolutions *re*: M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Fielding) 2440, Schedules laid on Table, 2465, 2477 (ii).

Debate:

(Mr. R. L. Borden) 2497; (Mr. Monk) 3284; (amt.) 3289, Neg. (Y. 72; N. 97) 3292; (Mr. Fielding) 3289; (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3294; (Mr Paterson) 3316; (Mr. Foster) 3327, 3530; (Mr. Neely) 3563; (Mr. Burrell) 3579, 3611; (Mr. Guthrie) 3629; (Mr. Lennox) 3681; (Mr. Warburton) 3709 (ii); (Mr. Armstrong) 3737 (ii); (Mr. Kyte) 3956; (Mr. Sproule) 3980, 3995; (Mr. Lemieux) 4005; (Mr. Monk) Amt. *re* Loyalty, 4051; (Mr. Fielding) Denial re Annexationist, 4054; (Mr. Lemieux) Denial *re* Annexationist, 4054; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4057; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4058; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4062; (Mr. Fielding) 4073; (Mr. Macdonell) 4078; (Mr. Devlin) 4082; (Mr. Ames) in Com. on Res., 4083; (Mr. M. Clark) 4143; (Mr. Blain) 4167; (Mr. Molloy) 4183; (Mr. Sifton) 4385; (Mr. Fisher) 4409; (Mr. German) 4482; (Mr. Carvell) 4496; (Mr. Middlebro) 4535; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4741; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4771; (Mr. Templeman) 4811; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4830; Amt. 4844, Neg. (Y. 70; N. 111) 4875 (iii); (Mr. Fielding) 4845; (Mr. Foster) 4852; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4856; (Mr. Northrup) 4861; (Mr. Guthrie) 4868; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4873; (Mr. Harris) 4877; (Mr. Miller) 4937; (Mr. Goodeve) 4969; (Mr. McKenzie) 5014, 5260; (Mr. Bradbury) 6680 (iv); (Mr. Ralph Smith) 6709; (Mr. Broder) 6739; (Mr. Cash) 6952; (Mr. Jameson) 6966; (Mr. Hunt) 7006; (Mr. Thornton) 7040; (Mr. Devlin) 7064; (Mr. Crothers) 7077; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 7110; (Mr. Hughes) 7126; (Mr. Sexsmith) 7224; (Mr. MacNutt) 7262; (Mr. Lancaster) 7281; (Mr. Robb) 7328; (Mr. Edwards) 7393; (Mr. Beauparlant) 7450; (Mr. Wright) 7461, 7481; (Mr. Turcotte) 7506; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 7517; (Mr. Sealey) 7530, amt. 7547; (Mr. Henderson) 7633; (Mr. Allen) 7661 (iv); (Mr. Nantel) 8130 (v); (Mr. Turriff) 8148; (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 8162; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8244; (Mr. Schaffner) 8281 (v); (Mr. Magrath) 8373; (Mr. A. Haggart) 8389; (Mr. Arthurs) 9646; (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9673; (Mr. U. Wilson) 9727; (Mr. Porter) 9745; (Mr. Macdonell) 9938; (Mr. Smyth) 9966, 10146; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 10151, 10310; (Mr. Donnelly) 10456; (Mr. Beattie) 10533; (Mr. Maddin) 10550; (Mr. Kidd) 10572 (v).

Resolutions, Presenting of, Reading &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5948; (Mr. Speaker) 5948, Rule Read (Mr. Foster) 5953 (iv)

Ret., Incomplete: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1652 (i).

Ret. Suppl.: Laid on Table (Mr. Fielding) 4383 (iii).

Saskatchewan Boards of Trade, Res.: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5751 (iii).

——— Saskatchewan Municipalities, Telegrams: Read (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5534 (iii).

Speech of Min. of Ag. in Montreal: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) 6199 (iv)

Statement in White Book, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sharpe) 10193 (v).

Statistics, Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 6508 6675 (iv).

Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Canada: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, (Mr. Perley) 6769; (Amt.) Neg. (Y. 64; N. 98) 6837 (iv).

——— Vote of Member for Labelle, Ques. (Mr. Perley) 6839 (iv).

Statistical Tables of Prices: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6840; Accepting as Read, and Printing in Hansard (Mr. Hughes) 6840 (iv).

Statistics, Purpose of Negotiations: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7037 (iv).

Statistics, Further Inquiry for from Trade and Commerce Dept.: (Mr. Perley) 6508, 6675 (iv).

——— Tabulated Statement: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2985, 3059 (ii).

——— Trade Statistics, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2737 (ii).

Statistics from U. S., Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4931 (iii)

——— Mess. to President Taft *re* Request for Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4471 (iii).

——— Publication *re* Bureau of Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6673 (iv).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Summerland Farmers' Institute, &c.: Read (Mr. Burrell) 5549 (iii).

Summerland 'Review', Editorial re Fruit Growers: Read (Mr. Paterson) 4123 (iii).

——Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Obstruction by Minister of the Crown 4124: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4124 (iii).

Swift Current Board of Trade, Res. from: Read (Mr. Knowles) 4119 (iii).

Talking Between Ministers during Debate: Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 7292 (iv).

Tariff Negotiations &c., Prime Minister's Remarks in the West: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 65 (i).

Tel. from Min of Fin. to High Commissioner: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3274 (ii).

Tel. of Senator Cummins *re* Manufactured Products: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 4115 (iii).

Trade with other Countries affected: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3667 (ii).

Trent River Paper Co. Res.: Read (Mr. Porter) 4117 (iii).

Tupper, Sir Charles, Letter from, Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) Reference to Previous Debate, 8252; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) read, 8277; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 8279 (v).

Vote on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Personal Explanation (Mr. German) 4929 (iii).

Vote on Amt (Mr. Monk): Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Wallace) 3461 (ii).

Vote *re*, Par. in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lortie) 3953 (iii).

Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt.: 'Globe' Report *re* Explanation (Mr. Lennox) 7602: (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7619 (iv).

—— Original Document: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7668; Letter from Hansard Reporter: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 7675; Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7675; Explanation (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7670 (iv).

Western Farmers Interests: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 5543 (iii).

—— *See* 'Farmers.'

Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. from: Read (Mr. Lalor) 4121 (iii).

Wool in the Fleece omitted from Free List: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6264 (iv).

Yarmouth Farmers' Association, Res. from: Read (Mr. Law) 4122 (iii).

Red Point Wharf, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).

Regina and Moosejaw Town Site, C. P. R's. Interest *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 3281 (ii).

Restaurant, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 469 (i).

—— *See* 'House of Commons.'

Restigouche Riparian Association: *See* 'B. No. 176.'

Returns, Delay in Preparation: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 7554 (iv).

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5733 (iii), 8093 (v).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7256 (iv).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 2150 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Rhodes) 1001 (i).

Returns, Notice to Members: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 5938 (iv).

Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3017 (ii).

Revenue and Expenditure, Total for 1890-1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9992 (v).

'Review of Reviews', Collection of Extra Postage: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).

Revillon Frères Trading Co. Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 158.'

Revised Statutes, French Translation: *See* 'B. No. 136.'

'Rexall', Registration by United Drug Co. in Canada: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4672 (iii).

Richelieu Electoral District, Charges against Mr. Lanctot *re* Painting Private Dwelling: Notice of Motion (Mr. Nantel) 4566 (iii).

—— Labour: M. for Com., 4654 (iii).

—— *See* 'Priv. and Elections.'

Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 192.'

Rideau Canal, Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

—— Lockmen, Increase of Pay: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

—— Removal of Stumps: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Pet. *re* Withdrawal of Lands &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8636 (v).

Rifle Associations: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).

Rigaud Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).

—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 3067 (ii).

Riordon Paper Co. and Reciprocity: *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Riparian Rights in Boundary Waters: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Riviere des Prairies, Completion of Deepening &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).

—— M. for Copy (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2162 (ii).

—— Survey, Rep. of Engineer &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2161 (ii).

Robertson, Lorne Forbes, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Roberval Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).
Robichaud, Wm., Compensation *re* Fine: in Com. of Sup., 6105, 6159 (iv).
Rock Island Building: in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Additional Land purchased: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8994 (v).
—— M. for Cor.*, 8994 (v).
Rolling Stock, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii), 8513 (v).
Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 799 (i).
—— Speech *re* Naval Service at Public Function: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 932 (i).
—— Speech *re* Naval Service, Approval of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1288 (i).
—— Speech, Meaning of Word 'Faction' Preparation of Answer: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 1351 (i).
Rosendale Mail Service, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1291 (i).
Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own while in England: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1087 (i).
—— Rifles loaned by Can. to G. B. at Bisley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1085 (i).
—— Number issued to Queen's Own Regiment: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9781 (v).
—— Recommendation to British Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7552 (iv).
R. M. College, Additions &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
—— *See* 'Militia.'
R. N. W. Mounted Police, Coronation Contingent: in Com. of Sup., 8752 (v).
—— Death of Inspector on Northern Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
—— Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
—— Pay and Allowance, &c: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 8101 (v).
Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt., or N. T. Ry. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2851 (ii).
Ruddock, Mr. R. F., Application *re* Homestead in B. C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3279 (ii).
Rules of House, Amendment *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 10470 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Generally: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10365 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Stamps and Postcards manufacture of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).
—— Number in Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 983 (i).
—— East Elgin, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 983 (i).
—— Man.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1105 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery in Renfrew County: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).
Rural Postmasters: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9995, 10095 (v).
St. Andrews Dam, Bridge &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3035 (ii).
St. Andrews Dam, Sums for Completion: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 1508 (i).
—— Correction in Stmnt. (Mr. Bradbury) 1650 (i).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Fish Ladders &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
St. Andrew's Wharf, P. Q., Tenders *re* Construction, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3608 (ii).
St. Catharines Drill Hall Site: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1680 (i).
St. Charles Rifle Range, Winnipeg, Sale of, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7343 (iv).
—— *See* 'Militia.'
St. Croix River, N. B., Construction of a Public Work, Proposal *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1348 (i).
St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i), 4666 (iii).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly Flag: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7553, 7687 (iv).
—— *See* 'Flags.'
St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2674 (ii).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).
St. John, N. B., Drill Hall, Contract *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1624, 1664 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar Contract, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5631 (iii).
—— Quantity of Material taken out by Maritime Dredging Co. under Beacon Bar Contract: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5129 (iii).
St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).
—— Rental of Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2673, 3065 (ii).
St. John River, Navigation Rights: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
St. John River Vally Ry., Lease to Govt.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'
St. Johns, Que., Postmaster, refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir': Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1089 (i).

St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1894 (i).
—— Option *re* Lands: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2677 (ii).
—— Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2577 (ii).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 10509 (v).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Annual Payments *re* Light and Power &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3468 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Damming Long Sault Rapids: on M. for Com. of Sup., 2887 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Dams, Diversion of Channel: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3058 (ii).
—— Information *re* Bill before U.S. Senate: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4210 (iii).
—— Protests *re* from Dom. Govt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4210 (iii).
—— Further Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3058 (ii).
—— Legislation at Washington, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3282 (ii).
—— Letter from Mr. J. Wesley Allison: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3767 (ii).
—— Letter from Gov. Dix.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3839 (ii).
—— *See* 'Long Sault.'
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Buoys at Sorel Shipyards, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).
—— See 'Sorel.'
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (iv).
—— Depth at Low Tide below thirty feet: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1718 (i).
Ste. Marie Division Postoffice, Defective Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10336 (v).
Ste. Marie de Monnoir Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1698 (i).
St. Mary's River Diversion: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
St. Ours Locks, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).
Ste. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 2436 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., Wharf Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247 (iv).
St. Peter's Breakwater, Repair, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7344 (iv).
St. Peter's Canal, C.B., Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8103 (v).
—— Answer to Ques.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8355 (v).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iv).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve: Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).
—— Amounts received from Sales, &c.: Ques. Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).
St. Peters Indian Reserve, Chief Justice Howell's Commission: M. for Copy of Evidence* (Mr. Bradbury) 7039 (iv).
—— Instructions to Rev. J. McDougall, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Bradbury) 1292 (i).
—— Amounts received from Sales &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Moneys paid by Govt., Complaints, &c.: Ques. Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).
—— Original Document, Cor, &c.: Read (Mr.
—— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 8477 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8356 (v).
—— Rep. in Winnipeg 'Telegram' *re* Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Oliver) 3840; Explanation (Mr. Bradbury) 3841 (ii).
—— Request by Commission for Official Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 9899 (v).
Ste. Therese Postoffice, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1715 (i).
Sadler, Maggie Florence, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
Sand supplied to Kingston Penitentiary, Payments to R. H. Fair: Ques. (Mr. Edwards 5406 (iii).
Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2853 (ii).
Saskatchewan Boards of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5751 (iii).
Saskatchewan Capital City: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Neely) 5620 (iii).
Saskatchewan Municipalities, Telegrams *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5534 (iii).
Saskatchewan Postoffices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6505 (iv).
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).
Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Upper Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
—— Concrete Walls: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).
—— Lock Gates, Tugs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
—— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Labour Strike: Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in 'Sault Express', 6359 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Boyce) 6365 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6186 (iv).
Saunderson, Pauline Winslow, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 181.'

School Lands in Alberta, Revenues from, &c.: Ques (Mr. McCarthy) 1488 (i).
School Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1345 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1911 (i).
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3462 (ii).
——— Total Acreage, Amounts realized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1908 (i).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iii).
Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 6556 (iv).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10121 (v).
——— *See* 'Interior.'
Scugog River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).
Seagull Dock, St. Joseph's Island, Date of Construction, Expenditure, &c.: (Mr. Boyce) 1349 (i).
Seal Fisheries, Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9594 (v).
——— Cor *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10196 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10337 (v).
——— *See* 'Pelagic'.
Secretariat at London: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 1506 (i), 5836 (iii).
——— *See* 'Imperial Conference.'
Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 7 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).
Secret Commissions: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Sections 11, 12, 14, 22 in Twp. 10, Range 22, Applications *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wallace) 980 (i).
Security Trusts Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Seeds and Farm Weeds: in Com. of Sup., 6213 (iv).
Seed Grain for Immigrants: in Com. of Sup., 3836 (ii).
Seed Grain: in Com. of Sup., 6047 (iv), 9551 (v).
Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amount still owing by Farmers: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 3848 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3225 (ii).
Seed Grain, Quality and Price: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8041 (v).
Seeds, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Selkirk Exhibition: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9076 (v).
——— *See* "Winnipeg.'
Selkirk Postoffice Box: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (v).
Selkirk Route, Welland Canal: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
Semmens, Rev. John, Payments to *re* Indians, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 6036 (iv).
Senate, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2680 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) re Discussion, 1726 (i).
Senate Amendments to Public Bills, Consideration of: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3845 (ii).
Senate Chamber, Expenditure for Decorating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1100 (i).
Senate of Canada, Cost for each year from 1896 to 1911: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1339 (i).
——— Correction in Motion (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1453 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 1805 (i).
Senate Messenger: in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iv).
Senate, Preparation of Address to His Ex.: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Senate of Canada, Reform of: Prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4306 (iii).
Senate Stationery: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) in Com. of Sup., 6337 (iv).
Senate Vacancy from P. E. I., Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 2072 (ii).
Sessional Clerks, House of Commons: in com. of Sup., 6167 (iv)
——— Application *re* Increase of Salary: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5404 (iii).
——— Names, Age, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 980 (i).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4825 (iii).
Sevigny Island, Change of Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 1491 (i).
Sewage, Disposal of. *See* 'B. No. 122,' also 'Ottawa City.'
Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3607 (ii).
Shafting imported, Quantities and Values since April, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 7593 (iv).
Sharbot Lake Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).
Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).
Sheep and Lambs imported into Canada from U. S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).
Sheet Steel Co., Emplymt. of Men *re* Ice Blockades. Remarks (Mr. Broder) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
Shelbourne Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Best) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Sheldon, C. D., Action of Govt., re Returning to Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong 6200 (iv).
—— Illegal Use of Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).
—— *See* 'Mails.'
Shipbuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6484 (iv).
—— *See* 'Marine.'
Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4467 (iii).
Shipping Registration: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
Ships, Load Lines: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Shipwrecks on B. C. Coast, Inspection *re* Loading Vessels, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 7257 (iv).
Shipwrecked Seamen, Care of: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).
Sick Mariners' Dues: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Sick Mariner's Dues, Amount of Money in Trust, Investment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9993 (v).
—— Law *re* Payment of Dues: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1904 (i).
Sick Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 6567 (iv).
Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'
Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6272 (iv).
Six Nation Indians Reserve, Grant to Merrill to bore for Natural Gas, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Small Pox Epidemic, Sanitary Condition of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7252 (iv).
—— *See* 'Ottawa', &c.
Smelt Fishing in N.S., Pet. *re* Change for Open Season: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9984 (v).
Soil Fertility, Memorandum from Experimental Farm: Read (Mr. Armstrong) 5965 (iv).
Songhees Indian Reserve: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Sorel Shipyard, Buoys stolen, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7216 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7026 (iv).
—— Complaints *re* Thefts: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1088 (i).
—— Dismissal of Mr. A. Senecal: Remarks Mr. Blondin) 5732 (iii).
—— Rep. of Commissioner *re* Investigation: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 10096, 10203 (v).
—— Instructions to Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7039 (iv).
—— Investigation into Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6758 (iv), 9994 (v).
Sorel Shipyards: *See* 'Priv. and Elections.'
Soulanges Canal, Claim for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).
—— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
—— Leaks and Trimming Slopes: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).
—— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
—— Protection Works, Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).
—— Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* Administration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6273 (iv).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).
S. African Parlt, Rep. of Postmaster General: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 1580 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 84.'
South Grey Appointments: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3344 (ii).
South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
S. W. ¼ Section 10, Twp. 38, Range 15, 2nd Meridian, Applications *re* Entry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 1501 (i).
—— *See* 'Lands.'
Speakers' Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 926 (i).
—— Expenditure *re* Pianos: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).
—— Purchase of Birds: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).
—— Purchase of Glassware: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).
—— Purchasing Gramophone Records: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).
—— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Speaker's Gallery, Discourtesy to Clergymen: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 269 (i).
Speaker of House of Commons, wearing of Official Robes on State Occasions, Procedure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 705 (i).
Speech of Min. of Ag. on Reciprocity in Montreal: Ques. of Prv. (Mr. Lake) 6199 (iv).
Speeches of Prime Minister, Distribution by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9071, 9253 (v).
Speech from Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Springhill Mines Strike, Conciliation Board *re* Labour Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 4236 (iii).
—— Further Information: Stmnt. (Mr. King) 2740 (ii).
—— Present Condition: Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6362 (iv).
—— Remarks *re* Militia (Mr. Blain) 2641 (ii).
—— *See* 'Labour.'

Stamp Cancelling Machines, Cost, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).
Stamps, New Issue by P. O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Stamp Vending Machines: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1910 (i).
Stapleton, Dalton Mabel, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Canada *re* Reciprocity: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, (Mr. Perley) 6769; Amt. Neg. (Y. 64; N. 98) 6837 (iv).
——— Vote of Member for Labelle, Questioned (Mr. Perley) 6839 (iv).
Statistical Tables of Prices *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6840 (iv); Accepting as Read and Printing in Hansard (Mr. Hughes) 6840 (iv).
——— Mess. to President Taft *re* Request for Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4471 (iii).
——— Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Perley) 6508, 6675 (iv).
——— Special Rep. Comparative Prices, Printing of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10469 (v).
——— Special Rep. M. (Mr. King) to print, 10590 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 10590 (v).
——— Special Rep. of Comparative Prices laid on Table (Mr. King) 10468; M. to Print, 10590 (v).
——— Stmnt. in White Book, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 10193 (v).
Statistics, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2737 (ii).
Statistics from U.S., Information re: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4931 (iii).
——— U. S. Govt. Publication *re* Bureau of Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6673 (iv).
Statutes, French Edition, Corrections in Translation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8088 (v).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).
Steamer 'Scotia,' New Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).
Steamship Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Steam Trawlers, Application *re* Fishing Bounty: Ques. Mr. Jameson) 4046 (iii).
——— Negotiations *re* Prohibiting: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3074 (ii).
——— 'Wren' and 'Croquette', Registration in Can.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4046 (iii).
Steel Bounties, Govt. Inspectors, Salaries, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5936 (iv).
——— See 'Iron.'
Steel Company of Canada, Date of Incorporation, Capital, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 9690 (v).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Subsidies *re*: M. for Memorials* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3948 (ii).
——— Intention of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6613 (iv).
Sterling Trusts Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Stone Cut, Duty between U. S. and Can., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1287 (i).
Strathcona Public Building; in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10335 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 8583 (v).
Suburban Ry. Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).
Summerland Farmers' Institute, &c. Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Burrell) 5549 (iii).
Summerland 'Review,' Editorial *re* Fruit Growers: Read (Mr. Paterson) 4123 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Obstruction by Minister of the Crown 4124. Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4124 (iii).
Summerside Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1609 (i).
Superannuation *re* Postal Clerks: in Com of Sup., 4284 (iii).
Supply Bills: See 'Bills Nos. 128, 160 and 225'
Supply: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 695 (i).
Supply for Public Works: Remarks (Mr Owen) 10354 (v).
Supply Schedules, Proportion of Votes Presented (Mr. Fielding) 9566 (v).

SUPPLY—
Committee—
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 6184 (iv).
Dairying Industry, &c., 6234 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, Grant, 9089 (v).
Exhibitions, 3775 (ii), 9076 (v).
Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c., 6185 (iv).
Health of Animals, 5955 (iv).
Patent Record, 6184 (iv).
Seed Control Act, 6213 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, 6262 (iv).
Year Book, 6184 (iv).
Charges of Management:
Foreign Coin in Circulation, 6059 (iv).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 1474 (i), 5954 (iv).
Customs, 1048 (i), 5992 (iv).
Depts., Generally, 1486 (i).
External Affairs, 1472 (i).
Gov. Gen's. Sec's. Office, 1013 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 1486 (i).
Indian Affairs, 4725 (iii).
Inland Revenue, 1047 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Civil Government—*Con.*

Interior, 4726 (iii).
Justice, 1014 (i).
Labour, 1484 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 1463 (i).
Militia, 1020 (i).
Mines, 1475 (i).
Post Office, 4280 (iii), 6062, 6068 (iv).
Privy Council Office, 1013 (i), 8750 (v).
Public Works, 1032 (i), 5993 (iv).
Railways and Canals, 1473 (i).
Secretary of State, 1472 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 1485 (i).

Customs:

Salaries, &c., 5993 (iv).

Dominion Lands:

Salaries, &c., 5552, 5581 (iii).

Dominion Police:

Gratuity to Constable Shore, 6161 (iv).

Fisheries:

Building Fishways, &c., 6659 (iv).
Can. Fisheries Exhibit, 6661 (iv).
Compensation to Wm. Robichaud, 6105, 6159 (iv).
Fresh Fish Transportation, 6092 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 6661 (iv).
Licenses, 6160 (iv).
Oyster Culture, 6661 (iv).
Protection Service, 3807 (ii).
Salaries of Inspectors, &c., 6613 (iv).

Geological Survey:

Explorations, 9551 (v).

Immigration:

Agents' Salaries, &c., 5165 (iii).
Contingencies, &c., 5196 (iii), 6047 (iv).
General Vote, 4739 (iii).
Seed Grain, 3836 (ii), 6047 (iv).
Winnipeg Hospital, 5208 (iii).

Indians:

Alberta, 6046 (iv).
North West, 6036 (iv), 8884 (v).
Nova Scotia, 6036 (iv).
Quebec, 6035 (iv).

Justice:

Exchequer Court, 6160 (iv).

Labour Dept.:

Combines Investigation Act, 4280 (iii).
Conciliation, &c., 3378, 3393 (ii), 6057 (iv).
Labour Gazette, 4229, 4232, 4241 (iii).
Technical Education Commission, 3801 (ii).

Legislation:

House of Commons, 6167, 6175 (iv).
Printing, Stationery, &c., 6175 (iv).
Senate, 6166 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service:

Agencies, Rents, &c., 6454 (iv).
Aids to Navigation, 6455 (iv).
Allowance to Mrs. Kerr, 6091 (iv).
Construction of Lighthouses, 6470 (iv).
Ice Breaking, 6500 (iv).
Lifting Buoys at Amherstburg, 6091 (iv).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamer, 6546, 6550 (iv).
Lime Kiln Crossing, 6545 (iv).
Maintenance and Repairs, 6455 (iv).
Pensions to Pilots, 6091, 6533 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service—*Con.*

Repairs to Maritime Road, 6542 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 6454 (iv).
Signal Service, 6502 (iv).
Steamer 'Eureka', 6502 (iv).
Telephone Reporting Stations, 6538 (iv).
Trade to the Orient, Report on, 6092 (iv).
Wharf Repairs, 6538 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:

General Vote, 6058 (iv), 8752, 8788 (v).

Marine Hospitals:

Shipwrecked Seamen, 6572 (iv).
Sick Seamen, 6566 (iv).

Militia:

Allowances, 8514, 8528 (v).
Customs Duties, 6054 (iv).
Military College, 6054 (iv).
Winnipeg Rifle Range, 6053 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Banff Waterworks, 6052 iv).
Can. National Parks, 6049 (iv).
Dom. Forestry Convention, 6052 (iv).
Imperial Conference, Expenses, 8679 (v).
Members' Contingent to Coronation, 8679 (v).
Paris Agency, 8694 (v).
Pelagic Sealing Conference, 8678 (v).
The Hague Tribunal, 6164 (iv), 9560 (v).

Mounted Police:

Coronation Contingent, 8752 (v).
Pay of Force, 8598 (v).
Subsistence, Forage, &c., 8599 (v).

Ocean and River Service:

'Arctic,' Str., 6089 (iv).
Cattle Inspection, 5828 (iii).
Compensation to Major Moodie, 6089 (iv).
Examination of Masters and Mates, 5821 (iii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 5811 (iii).
Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, 5826 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 5829 (iii).
Registration of Shipping, 5826 (iii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 5822 (iii), 6090 (iv).
Schools of Navigation, 5823 (iii).
Winter Mail Service, 5828 (iii).
Wrecking Plants, 5829 (iii).

Post Office:

Mail Service, 4296 (iii), 6073, 6179 (iv).
Miscellaneous, 6182 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 6178 (iv).

Public Works—Capital:

Buildings:

Archives, Ottawa, 5993 (iv).

Harbours and Rivers:

Port Arthur, &c., 5994 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., 6021 (iv).

Marine Department:

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 6554 (iv).

Public Works—Income:

Buildings:

British Columbia, 3012-3018 (ii).
Generally, 3156-3161 (ii), 6026 (iv).
Manitoba, 2969, 3018-20, 3029-3054 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—*Con.*

Buildings—*Con.*

New Brunswick, 1603-1624 (i).
Nova Scotia, 1581-1603, 1625-1639 (i), 9500-09 (v).
Ontario, 2088-2150, 2361, 2582-2594, 2602-2638, 3156 (ii), 6033 (iv), 9551 (v).
Quebec, 1639, 1665-1682, 1685-1710, 1860-1903 (i), 2567, 3144 (ii).
Rents, Repairs, &c., 3161-3180, 3186-3218 (ii), 6027 (iv), 8872 (v).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2970, 3001-3012 (ii).
McGill Scholarships, 6445 (iv).
Railway Commission, 6427 (iv).
Surveys and Inspections, 6452 (iv).

Harbours and Rivers:

Nova Scotia, 6029-6033 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Decorations *re* Coronation, 9565 (v).

Telegraph Lines:

B. C., 6033 (iv).
Sask. and Alta., 6033 (iv).

Quarantine:

Salaries, &c., 5979 (iv).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 6187 (iv).

Railways and Canals:

Canals:

Chambly, 6356, 6408 (iv).
Cornwall, 6409 (iv).
Farran's Point, 6409 (iv).
Galops, 6410 (iv).
Generally, 6452 (iv).
Lachine, 6357, 6410 (iv).
Murray, 6410 (iv).
Quebec Canals, 6388, 6411 (iv).
St. Ours, Lock, 6395 (iv).
St. Peters, 6418 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, 6397, 6416 (iv).
Soulanges, 6389 (iv).
Rapide Plat, 6413 (iv).
Rideau, 6413 (iv).
Trent, 6419, 6453 (iv).
Welland, 6397, 6425 (iv).
Williamsburg, 6408, 6426 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Arbitrations and Awards, 6427 (iv).
Gov. Gen's. Car, 6445 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry., Govt. Director, 6448 (iv).

Railways:

Intercolonial Railway, 5913-5930 (iii), 5983, 6338 (iv), 8513, 9560 (v).
Prince Edward Island Railway, 6352 (iv).

Scientific Institutions:

Astronomical Surveys, 9546 (v).
Magnetic Observatory, 6557 (iv).
Meteorological Service, 6563 (iv).
Surveys of Dom. Lands, 9547 (v).

Steamboat Inspection:

General Vote, 6572 (iv).

Trade and Commerce:

Chinese Immigration Act, 6058 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, &c., 6059 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 6059 (iv).

Unprovided Items, 6160 (iv).

Surveys and Inspection for Canals and Railways: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii), 6452 (iv).

Surveys, Militia Expenditure in each of last five years: Ques. (Mr. Nantel 1109 (i).

Sussex Street Govt. Property, Names of Owners, Prices paid: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 6666 (iv).

—— *See* 'Ottawa.'

Sutherland, George Mackay, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 218.'

Swan Creek Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1723 (i).

Swift Current Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Knowles) 4119 (iii).

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings, &c. for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 2159 (ii).

Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Tadousac Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges *re*, Appointment of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5133 (iii).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Applications for Irrigated Lands Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 803 (i).

Tariff Negotiations &c., Prime Minister's Remarks in the West: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).

—— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 48 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 65 (i).

Tariff Resolutions, Par. in Moosejaw 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2639 (ii)

—— See 'Reciprocity.'

Taylor, Mr. Geo., Retirement as Chief Whip: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).

Technical Education Commission: in Com. of Sup., 3801 (ii).

—— Completion of Work: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1661 (i).

—— Progress *re*, Total Expenditure &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1721 (i)

Telegraphs Act Amt.: See 'B. No. 116.'

Telegraphs and Cable Service,: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9636 (v).

—— See 'Parcel Post,' &c.

Telegraph Cos.' Statements: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Telegraphers Board of Conciliation I. C. R. Statute re Grant: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2853 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, Sask. and Alberta, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Telephone Co.'s Statements: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Telephones, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).

Telephones for Life Saving Stations on St. Lawrence Route: in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Tetagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishway: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7806 (iv).
Thessalon Breakwater, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Smyth) 10532 (v).
Thibaudeau, Mr. Frank, Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 8100 (v).
Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Interest paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 814 (i).
Three Rivers Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).
Three Rivers Postoffice, Temporary Building: Ques. (Mr. Clare) 8984 (v).
Thunder Bay Ice Breaker: in Com. of Sup., 6500 (iv).
Tignish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1602 (i).
Tilbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).
Tilbury Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
Tillsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).
Timber Licenses in New Westminster, B.C., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3222 (ii).
Tipping System, Abolition of: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Imports and Exports from and to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).
Tobacco Leaf, Total Imports, &c. into Canada for last three years: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5405 (iii).
Tobacco Production, Encouragement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).
Toronto Barracks, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7557 (iv).
—— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2153 (ii).
—— See 'Militia.'
Toronto Barracks Site (Baby Farm) Reps. Valuation, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 981 (i).
Toronto Federal Buildings, Plan of Erection: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8479 (v).
Toronto Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2367 (ii).
Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3466 (ii).
Toronto Postoffice, Addition to, Changes *re* Specifications: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 805 (i).
Tower Clock, Parlt. Buildings, Complaint *re*: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 1624 (i), 6187 (iv).
Trade and Commerce Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1485 (i).
Trade Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Trade Commissioners for Canada, Names of Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2156 (ii).
Trade Commissioner to Mexico, Date of Mr. Bouley's Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8993 (v).
—— See 'Can. and Mexico SS. Subsidy.'
Trade Imports and Exports between B. N. A. Possessions and U. S.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4383 (iii).
Trade Relations with Germany, Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8403, 8534 (v).
Transcontinental Ry., Commissioners' Rep. Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
—— Eastern Div., Total Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 9430 (v).
—— *See* 'Natl. Transcontineneal Ry.'
Translator for H. of C., Apptmt. of: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7015 (iv).
—— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Transportation—Georgian Bay Canal as a Waterway: Amt. (Mr. Monk) on M. for Sup., 5137; Ruled out of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5163 (iii).
Transportation Problem, Stmnt. on M. for Sup., (Mr. Graham) 5039 (iii); Reply (Mr. J. Haggart) 5103 (iii).
—— *See* 'Canals', 'Railways', &c.
Travelling Expenses of Ministers, Govt. Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1340 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3954 (iii), 8356 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Murphy) 4568 (iii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers, Tips, &c.: on M. for Com. of Ways and Means (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7432 (iv).
Treasury Board, Minutes *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5136 (iii).
Treasury Board Minutes: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4659 (iii).
—— *See* 'Farmers Bank', &c.
Treaty of 1871 *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7022 (iv).
Trent Canal, Floods by Damages: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
—— Lift Lock: in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
Trent River Paper Co., Res. *re* Reciprocity with U.S.: Read (Mr. Porter) 4117 (iii).
Truesdell, Frances Whittington, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 183.'

Trussed Concrete Steel Co. of Can., Ltd., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Trusts: *See* 'Industrial.'
Truro Freight Shed Fire: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Truro Increased Accommodation I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).
Truro Political Meeting, Excursion Train over I. C. R., Instruction to Agents, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).
——— Rates on I. C. R.: Explanation (Mr. Graham) 3343 (ii).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Turkeys: *See* 'Blackhead.'
Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance to Widow: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3861 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
Unclaimed Balances in Banks: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
United Shoe Machinery Co., Application *re* Investigation, Govt. Representative, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2672 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Combines Act, Govtl. Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) 4300 (iii).
U. S. Army Deserters at Niagara Falls, Subjects of Extradition: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 707 (i).
U. S. Consuls, Names, Fees &c. residing in Can.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1727 (i).
U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadian Travellers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6119 (iv).
U. S. Immigration Officers residing in Can.: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1723 (i).
U. S.—Japanese Treaty: Inquiry for Copy (Mr. Foster) 7256 (iv).
U. S. Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 984 (i).
U. S., Reciprocity with: *See* 'Reciprocity.'
U. S. Tax on Canadian Shipping, Legislation at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 9247 (v).
U. S. Trusts and Combines, Regulations in U. S. Courts, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 4342 (iii).
U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Armament of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7026 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6362 (iv).
——— Information from Official Sources, Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6611 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1571, 1805 (i), 2556 (ii), 5629 (iii).
——— Manœuvres at Chicago, Permission of Can. Govt. *re* passing through Canals: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6116 (iv).
——— Permission to Traverse Canals: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7253 (iv).
Universal Life Assurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
University of Saskatchewan, Land Endowment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4111 (iii).
Unorganized Districts in Northern Ont., Deferred Elections: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) 10100 (v).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Unprovided Items, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2630 (ii).
——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1084 (i).
——— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9782 (v).
Vacancy, Arthabaska and Drummond Electoral District: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Vancouver Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3066 (ii).
Vancouver Chinese Immigration Frauds: *See* 'Immigration.'
Vancouver Customs Entries by Robt. Kelly, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Barnard) 713 (i).
Vancouver Dry Dock Subsidy, Nature of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3469 (ii).
Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).
Vegreville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 4473 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4209 (iii).
Verdict of Montreal Jury *re* Masonic Property stolen: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7207 (iv).
——— *See* 'Masonic.'
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).
Vessels Registered in Canada, Lists: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 9690 (v).
Vessels Transferred between Can. and Newfoundland, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3464 (ii).
Veterans of 1866, Compensation to: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9999 (v).
Veterans, Grants to: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 5211 (iii).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
Victoria Electoral Div., Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 7602 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
Victoria Museum, Ottawa, Cor. *re* Foundation: Inquiry for (Mr. Hughes) 7666 (iv).

Victoria Meseum, Ottawa, Cracking of Tower, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 5937 (iv).
——— Cracking of Walls: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 9252 (v).
——— Expenditures *re*, Space allotted &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1975 (ii).
——— Inspection *re* Defects: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 7349 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of, on Stmnt. of Sec. of State: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10455 (v).
——— Inquiry for Stmnt. ((Mr. R. L. Borden) 10096 (v).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Proclamation *re* Earlier Date: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 9900, 10142 (v).
Waddington Power Development, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 7210 (iv).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No 34.'
Walkerville Postoffice Building and Mail Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) *re* Staff, 2559 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).
——— *See* 'Post Office—Tilbury.'
Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2633 (ii).
Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1101 (i).
'Wanda' Yacht, Appraising by Customs, &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4678 (iii).
——— Changed from American to Canadian Register, Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4300 (iii).
——— Date of Entry at Canadian Port, Notice to Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5933 (iv).
——— Length, Motive Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5834 (iii).
——— Valuation of: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Paterson) 5623 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods, Complaints *re*, Investigation by Com. on Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) 6905 (iv).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
Water-Carried Freight, Value, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6671 (iv).
Water Investigations *re* Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Waterloo Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 2634 (ii).
Water Powers: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Water Powers, Conservation of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).
Water Powers owned by the Dom., Legislation *re* Regulation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7803 (iv).
Water Powers on St. Lawrence, Concessions granted: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 9780 (v).
Water Powers on St. Lawrence: See 'Long Sault.'
Water in Ry. Belt, Peace River, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Water and Sewage Pollution: See 'B. No. 131.'
Water Supply to Parliament Buildings, Rep. of Agriculture Dept.: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 5401 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2553 (ii).
——— See 'Ottawa.'
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Members, Reps. O. Cs.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 1339 (i).
Waterways Commission, International: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Waterways Treaty: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695; in Com. on Res., 867 (i).
Waterways Treaty Bill, Govtl. Intention: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 8895 (v).
——— Inquiry for Plans (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3681 (ii).
——— *See* 'International Waterways', &c.
Ways and Means: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 695 (i).
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Welland Canal, Enlargement, Change of Route, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
——— Enlargement, Memorial, Pets, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Hodgins) 1500 (i).
——— Jane St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).
——— Stone Protection to Banks: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).
Wentworth, Number of Govt. Appointments since 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 2162 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 2557 (ii).
Westbrook Mail Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1103 (i).
West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 811 (i).
West Dublin Bay, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
Western Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Western Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Western Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board, Settlement, &c.: Remarks on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9696 (v).
——— Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9070 (v).
——— See 'Coal.'
Western Farmers as Immigration Agents to Europe: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 799, 1284 (i).
Western Farmers Interests *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 5513 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

West Indies and Halifax SS Service, Arr ngements *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4674 (iii).
—— Specifications *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4925 (iii).
West Indies Trade with Canada: on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iv).
—— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Foster) 6274 (iv).
West Indies Trade, Imports, &c., Total Value: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 2854 (ii).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Westport Signal Stations, when erected, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1091 (i).
Westville Post Office, Number of Bricks used: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).
Weymouth Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1601 (i).
Wharfs for Lighthouse and Coast Service, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
Wharfs. N.S., Contracts *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2160 (ii).
Wheat Prices in West and Canada and Liverpool Market: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 6267 (iv).
Whip, Chief Opposition, Retirement of Mr. Geo. Taylor: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).
Whitby Post Office Site, Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).
Whitemouth River Fishway: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Wiarton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2636 (ii).
Wilhelm Telephone Factory, Seizure at, Compromise, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 7601 (iv).
Williamsburg Canal, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6396 (iv).
—— Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).
—— Lockmaster's House: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).
—— Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).
—— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).
Windsor Branch, I.C.R. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).
Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 6272 (iv).
Windsor, N.S., Letter Carriers, Salary: Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).
Wingham Public Building Tower Clock, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6664 (iv).
Winnipeg Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 3052 (ii).
Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity with U.S.: Read (Mr. Lalor) 4121 (iii).
Winnipeg Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3018, 3029 (ii).
Winnipeg International Exposition, Govt. Assistance to: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 708 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).
—— *See* 'Selkirk.'
Winnipeg Rifle Range: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iv).
—— *See* 'Militia.'
Winnipeg River Water Rights, Grants, Leases &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 2162 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bradbury) 3955 (iii).
Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Apptmt. of Keeper &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4041 (iii).
Wireless Stations, Number, Location, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2678 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1340 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6457 (iv).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships: *See* 'B. Nos. 41 and 116.'
Wolfe Island Customs Official, Apptmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8099 (v).
—— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
—— Protection to Road: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1599 (i).
Woods Building: *See* 'Ottawa.'
Wood, Carriage by Water: *See* 'B. No. 210 & 212.'
Wood Island Life Boat Dimensions, Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3224 (ii).
Wool in the Fleece omitted from Free List *re* Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6264 (iv).
Working Expenses, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
Workingmen's Wages, Increased Cost of Living, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 3065 (ii).
Wrecking Plant Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).
Yarmouth Board of Trade: Res. Reciprocity, Read (Mr. Law) 5550 (iii).
Yarmouth Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).
Yarmouth Farmers' Association, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Law) 4122 (iii).
Yarmouth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1600 (i).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
Yukon Buildings, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3214 (ii).
Yukon Territory Ordinances: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 8 (i).